T.	-
Paro	
Luye	1

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

ROCK RIVER WATER)	
RECLAMATION DISTRICT,)	
Petitioner,)	
and)	No. PCB 13-11
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL)	RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
PROTECTION AGENCY,)	DEC 1 4 2012
Respondent.)	STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of the above-entitled matter, held at 425 East State Street, Rockford, Illinois, on the 28th day of November, 2012, commencing at 9:00 a.m., held before Bradley P. Halloran, Hearing Officer.

	Page 2
1	PRESENT:
2	
3	DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH, by:
4	MR. ROY HARSCH
5	191 N. Wacker Dr., Suite 3700
6	Chicago, IL 60606-1698
7	Phone: (312) 569-1000
8	appeared on behalf of the Petitioner;
9	
10	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
11	STATE OF ILLINOIS, by:
12	MR. CHRISTOPHER J. GRANT and
13	MR. ROBERT PETTI
14	69 West Washington Street, 16th Floor
15	Chicago, Illinois 60602
16	Phone: (312) 814-5388
17	appeared on behalf of the Respondent.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Page 3 1 INDEX 2 WITNESS DX CX RDX RCX 3 DANA CARROLL By Mr. Harsch 30 72 4 By Mr. Petti 56 5 LARRY McFALL 6 By Mr. Harsch 73 By Mr. Petti 84 7 8 GREGORY DROESSLER By Mr. Harsch 87 110 9 By Mr. Petti 104 10 JAMES HUFF 11 By Mr. Harsch 112 181 By Mr. Petti 159 12 By Mr. Harsch (Rebuttal) 205 By Mr. Petti (Rebuttal) 207 13 By Mr. Harsch (Rebuttal) 252 By Mr. Grant (Rebuttal) 257 14 15 FRANCIS BURBA By Mr. Harsch 184 16 By Mr. Grant 193 By Mr. Grant 233 251 By Mr. Harsch 17 246 18 AMY DRAGOVICH 19 By Mr. Harsch 195 202/204 By Mr. Grant 200 204 20 21 WILLIAM BUSCHER By Mr. Grant 211 22 By Mr. Harsch 222 23 24

		Page 4
1	INDEX	
2	EXHIBITS	
3	RESPONDENT'S EXHIBIT	ADMITTED
4	Nos. 1-8	22
5	No. 9	202
6		
7	PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT	ADMITTED
8	No. 4	74
9	No. 5	78
10	No. 6	189
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Good morning. My name is Bradley Halloran. I'm a hearing officer with the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

5 I'm also assigned to this matter 6 entitled Rock River Reclamation District, 7 Petitioner, versus the Illinois Environmental 8 Protection Agency, a Respondent. Our docket 9 number is PCB 13-11. It's a permit appeal, 10 water permit appeal.

This hearing has been publicly noticed pursuant to the Board regulations and rules and will be conducted in accordance with section 101.600 of the Board's procedural rules.

I note for the record that I will not be making the ultimate decision in the case. That's left to the five Board members. I basically ensure that the hearing goes in an orderly fashion and rule on any evidentiary issues that may arise.

I want to note for the record that there are no members of the public involved, just members of the parties. With that said, Mr. Harsch, would you like to introduce ¹ yourself, please?

2 MR. HARSCH: Yes. My name is Roy M. 3 I'm a partner at the law firm of Harsch. 4 Drinker Biddle & Reath, and I represent the 5 Rockford Water Reclamation District. 6 MR. GRANT: My name is Chris Grant, 7 G-r-a-n-t-, and I'm assistant Attorney General 8 with the Illinois Attorney General's office, 9 environmental bureau. 10 MR. PETTI: Robert Petti, P-e-t-t-i, 11 also with the Attorney General's office, 12 assistant Attorney General. 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: A few 14 administration duties to fulfill. 15 Mr. Harsch just handed me a revised 16 response to respondent's motion in limine to exclude irrelevant testimony and documents not 17 18 included in the record. 19 It was previously filed, I believe, on 20 November 26th. I will take it -- I'll take it 21 as Hearing Officer Exhibit A. 22 Any objection? 23 MR. GRANT: None. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right.

I do want to -- there had been some prefiled testimony and attachments filed by the petitioner a week or so ago. There has been written briefing on it. I have read the briefs.

Page 7

6 It basically includes, I believe, two 7 documents that are attached to a couple of the 8 written testimony, and I would appreciate it at this point if you could give me four to five 9 10 minutes or a few minutes longer, if you need 11 be, to hear oral argument in the matter, 12 Mr. Harsch, and then I'll go to Mr. Grant or 13 Mr. Petti.

MR. GRANT: It's my motion.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant.
MR. GRANT: I filed a motion in limine
really on two things. One was to exclude
irrelevant testimony. The second is to exclude
documents not in the record.

As far as the documents not on the record, it's not so much of a concern so long as it's not a document that was not presented to Illinois EPA, not considered by Illinois EPA, or available to them if it's put in as an ¹ exhibit.

2 I think the second part is that the 3 final decision of Illinois EPA in this matter 4 was made on August 1, 2012. We'd like to 5 retain the right to object to anything that's 6 submitted that was generated after that date 7 and was not considered by the Agency. 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let me --9 let's go to the testimony of Jim Huff and the 10 attachments. Could you zero in on that first, 11 please? 12 MR. GRANT: Just one second. 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Something 14 about the rulemaking. You talked about the 15 rulemaking. 16 MR. HARSCH: The document referenced in 17 the motion, Mr. Grant, is the testimony of 18 Mr. Cobb. It was entered in a prior 19 proceeding. 20 MR. GRANT: We don't have any really 21 strong objections. At the time we filed it, we 22 noted that there were documents that were not 23 in the record that were being used. 24 But there are -- frankly both of us are

planning on using some other documents that weren't included in the record specifically without formally moving the Board to supplement the record with the documents, so not so much of a problem.

6 I'm more concerned about the -- a lot 7 of the reference to groundwater degradation 8 regulations. Now, the issue behind this really 9 was -- goes back to about the beginning of 2011 10 when the petitioner wanted to meet with 11 Illinois EPA and have discussions about this 12 excess flow basin as well as some other things, 13 and there were a lot of potential objections 14 that Illinois EPA had.

One of them was the groundwater anti-degradation provisions, and there was a lot of back and forth on that. There was a lot of discussion.

But when the Agency's final action was taken, it did not rely on the groundwater anti-degradation provisions of the part 628 regulations. The final decision, which they're bound by, is based only on section 12A, water pollution provisions in the statute, section

¹ 39, the provisions that require -- you know, ² that forbid the Agency from issuing a permit if ³ it violates a section of the Act, and then one ⁴ of their construction management guidelines in ⁵ part 370.

6 So my concern was, and still is, that 7 because what this hearing is all about and what 8 this matter is all about is whether or not the 9 Agency's final decision is correct, the final 10 decision based only on the water pollution 11 provisions of 12A and that construction 12 standard.

And I was concerned that there was -and we saw this in a lot of the testimony, the written testimony, a lot of discussion about whether or not Illinois EPA's interpretation of the part 620 regulations was appropriate in this case. That has absolutely nothing to do with what the case is in for.

If the Agency had in its final decision said, okay, we're going to deny this because it would violate the part 620 regulations, then that would be relevant.

Because the Agency has not and because

24

we believe this is a very open and shut water pollution case and that's what the Agency relied on, I just didn't want -- there's two problems. One is we'd spend a lot of time today on stuff that's just not relevant.

Page 11

And, secondly, I don't want the Board 6 7 to be confused as to what this hearing is all 8 about because the petitioner has the burden of 9 proof. And the way that I read it and from a 10 simple standpoint is they have the burden of 11 proof -- of proving that this excess flow basin 12 would not cause water pollution and, thereby, 13 violate the statute. That's it.

14 So that's essentially the reason that 15 we filed this. One of the reasons that I moved 16 to exclude the documents was they're not 17 relevant either if we're going to get into 18 testimony on groundwater regulations and what 19 the anti-degradation provisions are. That just 20 doesn't have any relevance to what we're doing 21 here today.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Let me stop you. I'm looking at what Mr. Harsch submitted, the testimony of James E. Huff. And

Page 12 1 there's quite a number of attachments. 2 Attachment four, it's a water pollution control 3 permit. 4 Do you have a problem, first of all, 5 with the testimony of James Huff, the written 6 testimony? 7 MR. PETTI: In total? 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: In total. 9 MR. GRANT: As long as I'm able to No. 10 retain my objection to testimony regarding the 11 620 regulations and groundwater degradation, 12 that entire area, which we do. 13 Anything that doesn't have to do with water pollution including groundwater pollution 14 15 because groundwater pollution -- because then 16 we don't think -- because the hearing is based 17 only on the final decision of the Agency, not 18 on what discussions they had over all sorts of 19 other potential bases for rejection of the 20 So we can maintain that. plan. 21 Now, as far as his testimony on it, you 22 know, we'd like to exclude the reference to the 23 part 620 of the regulations. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm going to

Page 13 1 take that as administrative notice, judicial 2 notice. The Board is well aware of part 620. 3 MR. GRANT: Okay. 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: So I quess 5 your objection is overruled. 6 MR. GRANT: Okay. I just want to make 7 sure I made it clear in the record because in 8 our post-hearing brief we'll --9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm just a 10 little confused, and it is on the record, what 11 you're objecting to. 12 But this whole packet of Mr. Huff's 13 resume -- and, Mr. Harsch, could you expound on 14 I mean, what -- I'm not sure why this that? 15 was altogether sent to me. 16 MR. HARSCH: It's the prefiled 17 testimony. 18 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: But it's 19 also -- it has a bunch of other stuff attached 20 to it. 21 MR. HARSCH: It has the exhibits that 22 Mr. Huff references in his testimony that we 23 intend to introduce when the witness reads 24 their testimony today.

Page 14 1 MR. GRANT: I think, you know, if 2 there's something that's particularly egregious that he's using -- if he's going to 3 4 read the testimony, I think that takes away a 5 lot of the -- a lot of the problem I'd have. 6 I was -- you know, we were putting an 7 objection out with the idea that this would 8 just be all of the sudden in the record as 9 evidence. We could cross-examine on it. But 10 if he's going to actually read the testimony 11 in, then -- if we needed to have a question and 12 we have the opportunity to do that, that's 13 fine. 14 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Huff is 15 going to read the testimony in? 16 My intention was to MR. HARSCH: Yes. 17 have all three witnesses read their testimony. 18 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We had 19 talked about in our conference call having it 20 admitted. This is the first I've heard of 21 that. 22 MR. HARSCH: I think given the State's 23 objection to portions of Mr. Carroll's 24 testimony and Mr. Huff's testimony, it was just

more reasonable to have them read it.

1

24

In brief response, if I could, I guess we disagree with Mr. Grant about what this case is about. The reference to water pollution, that's a term that's defined, and we'll go over that in our case.

7 We did have a number -- the District 8 did have a number of meetings with the Agency, 9 as shown in the record, and we were told what 10 the Agency's concerns were, and they clearly 11 have been that we would have to show that 12 groundwater would not be impacted by the 13 proposed project. And that was listed as the 14 principal thing we had to show and we believe 15 that's the water pollution that the Agency's 16 referring to in their denial.

And it's clear. The testimony will be -- will support that, that that is the underlying basis of the Agency's decision. We think it is relevant. And we've already noted on the record that -- how you're going to handle the motion. So that's enough said, I think.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah.

Page 16 1 Regarding this, I am going to mark it 2 Petitioner's Exhibit A. I'm overruling the 3 State's motion. I'm taking judicial 4 administrative notice. And that was James E. 5 Huff's written testimony and attachments. 6 And then Dana Carroll, Mr. Grant, or 7 Mr. Petti --8 MR. HARSCH: What did you mark that? 9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Exhibit A, 10 Petitioner's Exhibit A, Mr. Huff's written 11 testimony. 12 MR. PETTI: The written testimony and 13 the exhibits together as Exhibit A or each 14 individual attachment is going to be dealt with 15 separate? 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: No. Ι 17 admitted the whole. If we part and parcel it 18 out, I think it --19 MR. PETTI: I understand. 20 MR. GRANT: It's very similar to 21 Mr. Huff's testimony. If he's going to read 22 it, then we don't have any objection to it at 23 this point. 24 MR. PETTI: The objections are the

Page 17 1 I would say, you know, that with regard same. 2 to the 620 regs being discussed that you've 3 taken notice of that. And I think we've kind 4 of moved past it. There's nothing specifically 5 glaring that we really want to cull out for 6 argument. I think your ruling on Mr. Huff 7 would apply in the same manner as Mr. Carroll. 8 And I -- we didn't raise the objection 9 in the motion to Mr. Droessler. I think the 10 only reason we didn't do that was because --11 and I can't recall exactly, but I don't think 12 we had it at the time. 13 I would presume that we would want to 14 put the same objections on the record to his 15 testimony as regarding the 620 regs and any new 16 information. But I don't believe there was 17 anything new in there. I just put that out 18 there now as opposed to doing it while he's 19 testifying. 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okav. 21 Mr. Harsch, any --22 MR. HARSCH: I mean, they were all 23 submitted at the same time electronically to 24 the counsels.

1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. 2 I'm taking the testimony of Dana Carroll and 3 the attachments, take it as Petitioner's 4 Exhibit B. I'm taking particular 5 administrative notice of regulation 620. 6 You know, I guess you could also 7 argue -- there's a Joliet case. There's a 8 sentence in here that says, "Additionally, if 9 there was information in the Agency's 10 possession upon which it reasonably should have 11 relied, the applicant may also submit such 12 information to the Board for its 13 consideration." 14 MR. GRANT: And I agree that we're not 15 totally limited to the record. Again, my 16 concern in filing the motion -- and I wrote it 17 in an hour, so I don't know if Mr. Harsch saw 18 it, but I had some typos in mine, too. 19 It really had to do with defining what the relevance, the scope of the hearing was 20 21 going to be, whether it was the Agency's letter 22 or something else. So I made my point on that. 23 So that's fine. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any

¹ response, Mr. Harsch?

MR. HARSCH: Are you going to receive then --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'll mark it
Exhibit C, also administrative notice, the
testimony of Gregory Droessler and the
attachments.

MR. HARSCH: I believe the specific document that was objected to in Mr. Carroll's testimony was, in fact, the document he references that he obtained from the Agency's own website. So we clearly have a document that was available to the Agency.

MR. GRANT: Well, I don't agree with that.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: There are
some others -- I'm not sure where these go,
Mr. Harsch. You filed Larry McFall, plant
manager resume.

MR. HARSCH: It was included as part of Mr. Carroll's attachments along with his resume. There's a question that he feels Mr. McFall is better qualified to answer. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: And Dana

Page 20 1 Carroll's resume, that should go with his 2 written testimony. 3 MR. HARSCH: Mr. Carroll's. We can 4 hold out Mr. McFall's resume because I intend 5 to call him as a witness. 6 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. 7 We'll clean this up a little when we take a 8 break. I think that's about it. 9 MR. GRANT: I have one -- just for 10 clarification, Mr. Harsch and I spoke about it, 11 but I'm wondering do I need to move the record into evidence or is the record already in 12 13 evidence? If not, I'd like to move that the 14 record be put into evidence. 15 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. 16 MR. HARSCH: There's only one document 17 that I have no idea what it is, where it came 18 from, and that's the Washington, Indiana 19 PowerPoint regarding the Washington, Indiana 20 CSO project. 21 MR. GRANT: For the record, we're 22 talking about Bates stamps number 848 through 23 866. 24 MR. HARSCH: In the electric number

Page 21 1 that I got, it did not bear an Agency exhibit 2 number. 3 MR. GRANT: It's not? I'm sorry? MR. HARSCH: It did not bear an Agency 4 5 exhibit number. 6 MR. GRANT: I don't -- we didn't put 7 those Agency exhibit numbers on it. It was 8 included because it was a document that 9 Illinois EPA included among those that it 10 relied on in making its final decision. 11 My understanding is that it was part of 12 a USEPA online educational thing. We included 13 this as an example. 14 MR. HARSCH: So I would have no problem 15 with the introduction of everything in the 16 record with the exception of that document. We 17 might have some questions of the Agency 18 witnesses regarding it. 19 MR. GRANT: It may or may not come in. So that's fine. If we're going to use it, 20 we'll move it at that time. 21 22 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okav. So as 23 it stands, the record is admitted into evidence 24 except for Exhibit 9, and we'll address that

1 later.

MR. HARSCH: Yeah. That would be -excuse me. That would be Respondent's Exhibit 9, Hearing Exhibit 9 might be more specific.

Some of the things in the record are
marked with an IEPA exhibit number. That's not
something that this did not have. This is
probably appropriately Respondent's Hearing
Exhibit No. 9.

11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. 12 Respondent's Exhibit 1 through 8 are admitted. 13 MR. GRANT: Actually, the entire record 14 is here. We only took some excerpts from the 15 records for the exhibits that you have in front 16 of you. So the record would be -- has been 17 filed with the Board. They have --18 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Right. You 19 said is the record into evidence. 20 MR. GRANT: Yeah. I wasn't sure 21 whether I need to move it in. It is in? 22 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes. 23 MR. GRANT: In its entirety? 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let me bring

Page 23 1 back Respondent's Exhibit 9. Is this in the 2 record? 3 MR. GRANT: Yes. 4 MR. PETTI: It's all stuff that's in 5 the record. We just pulled things out for 6 clarity, for expedience, instead of flipping to 7 page 700 and back to page 100. 8 MR. GRANT: We'll try to clarify when 9 we use it. This is in the record. This is 10 not. If we use this, we'll refer to it again 11 and then move it in separately if we need to. 12 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Was 13 that all? 14 MR. GRANT: Also, I spoke to 15 Mr. Harsch. There's two other things that are 16 not currently in the record that we would like 17 to move in. 18 One is Respondent's Hearing Exhibit 19 No. 3. It's the NPDES permit for the facility. 20 We'd like to move that in. I don't think 21 Mr. Harsch objects. 22 MR. HARSCH: No, I do not. 23 MR. GRANT: And just to save time, the 24 second one we have is I have the curriculum

vitae of William Buscher who will be a witness
for us today. And that's Respondent's Hearing
Exhibit No. 7.

Page 24

MR. HARSCH: Again, I have no objections to any of the exhibits I was provided this morning, 1 through 8. 9 is the only one I have --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. As I
earlier stated then, Exhibits 1 through 8 are
admitted into evidence. We're going to address
Respondent's Exhibit 9 at a later date.

¹² Mr. Harsch, do you want to give an ¹³ opening?

14 MR. HARSCH: Very brief. This case is 15 a -- regards a denial of a construction permit 16 that the Rockford Water Reclamation District 17 had applied for as part of its efforts at eliminating sewer overflows during wet weather 18 19 events, something that they have been dealing 20 with the Agency for some period of time and 21 which, in fact, is the subject of a complaint, 22 a commitment agreement between the Agency and 23 the District.

24

The basin as proposed, it was intended

to be a sustainable or green infrastructure as opposed to a concrete basin or synthetic lined basin.

4 It would be used under worst case model 5 assumed conditions using a 10-year storm event, which in and of itself was conservative, once 6 7 per year where flows would be directed to that 8 basin when flows exceeded the amount that the 9 treatment plant was capable of accepting, and 10 those flows would be retained in the basin 11 until those flows reduced where the flows then 12 would be pumped back to the treatment plant for 13 full treatment.

Under worst case models, some assumed conditions, the filling and emptying would occur within a 48-hour period once per year. In actuality, as you'll hear today, the likelihood of the use of that basin for that long a time or even in a given year is probably much less than once per year.

The District proposed construction of the basin which is really a retention basin or a flow equalization basin to be constructed in a manner that it would be aesthetically pleasing to the area and that it would have a use during the time period when it was not being used for the storage of storm water.

4 And that use would be the proposed --5 in a manner that it would be used as a 6 polishing wetland where they would irrigate 7 part of the treated effluent that they 8 discharge currently into the Rock River into 9 the basin where the wetland plants would take 10 up nutrients from the discharge for their 11 polishing and prior to discharge to the Rock 12 River, a portion of the treatment plant 13 effluent.

The District as normal sought to obtain The initial comments and reactions of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Preliminary reports were submitted.

¹⁸ Preliminary meetings were held.

The District was told what the problems were that the Agency had. They clearly centered around the concept that Mr. Grant has referred to earlier as the anti-degradation provisions of the groundwater rules with basically a requirement to show that the basin

Page 26

Page 27 1 as proposed when it's storing untreated 2 wastewater would not result in an increase in 3 contaminants in the groundwater. 4 Mr. Huff on behalf of the District 5 responded to those points, submitted detailed 6 It's in -- will be -- it's in the information. 7 permit record and it will be, I quess, 8 introduced individually. 9 And when it became evident that the 10 Agency -- we couldn't convince the Agency to 11 accept our position, we -- the District 12 proceeded to file a permit application. 13 The Agency then included all of the 14 historical information it had provided the 15 Agency, so to make sure that would be in the

¹⁷ proceeded ultimately to issue the denial which ¹⁸ is the present permit appeal.

record and be considered, and the Agency

16

We think that the project as proposed will not result in water pollution, as that's a defined term in Illinois, and that the project is not subject to the specific rules cited by the Agency as having operability and a basis for the denial, as set forth in the denial.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,
Mr. Harsch. Mr. Grant.

3 MR. GRANT: Sure. Just real quickly. 4 This case is really very simple. It's -- the 5 information presented to Illinois EPA along 6 with the permit application indicated that a 7 substantial amount of raw untreated sewage 8 would be discharged on a regular basis by the 9 District into groundwater at the location in 10 question which is owned by the petitioner and 11 subsequently discharged directly into the Rock 12 River without any treatment, without any 13 measures taken to prevent what we consider to 14 be, per se, water pollution.

15 The Agency worked hard and tried to 16 cooperate with the District and suggested that they install a liner to prevent this. 17 At one time an installation of a liner would have 18 19 prevented migration of raw sewage and 20 contaminants associated therein into the 21 groundwater into the Rock River. However, 22 despite a really very small expense compared to 23 the expense of operating the facility, the 24 petitioner refused to do that.

Page 29 1 And without the installation of a liner 2 and other appropriate permit conditions, the 3 law required that Illinois EPA deny this permit 4 on the basis this it would result in water 5 pollution. 6 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, 7 Mr. Grant. 8 Before we proceed, I'm looking at the 9 exhibits. And since the Agency had marked 10 their exhibits numerically, I think that's what 11 we'll do with petitioner's, Mr. Harsch. 12 So Mr. Huff's testimony and attachments will be exhibit -- Petitioner's Exhibit 1, the 13 testimony of Carroll Petitioner's Exhibit, 2, 14 and then the testimony of Gregory Droessler 15 Exhibit 3, Petitioner's Exhibit 3. Thank you. 16 17 Mr. Harsch, you can call your first 18 witness. 19 MR. HARSCH: My first witness will be 20 Mr. Carroll. 21 (Whereupon, the witness was 22 duly sworn.) 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may 24 proceed, Mr. Harsch.

	Page 30
1	DANA CARROLL,
2	called as a witness herein, having been first
3	duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. HARSCH:
6	Q. I'm going to provide Mr. Carroll with a
7	copy of your prefiled testimony, what has been
8	marked and accepted into evidence as
9	Petitioner's Exhibit 2.
10	Is that a copy of the prefiled
11	testimony that you've prepared?
12	A. Yes, it is.
13	MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I'd
14	request that Mr. Carroll read his prefiled
15	testimony.
16	MR. PETTI: No objection.
17	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm sorry,
18	Mr. Harsch?
19	MR. HARSCH: That he read his
20	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure. Go
21	ahead. I'm sorry.
22	THE WITNESS: My name is Dana L.
23	Carroll. I am an engineering manager of the
24	Rock River Water Reclamation District,

Rockford, Illinois. I received a bachelor of science in civil engineering in 1976 from the University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois. I'm a registered professional engineer in Illinois.

My work experience includes four years at the District in my current capacity as engineering manager and seven years at the District as engineering supervisor in the 1980s.

I ran my own consulting firm Carroll Engineering & Associates for 13 years prior to rejoining the District. Carroll Engineering served many municipal clients including the City of Elgin as their permit compliance consultant, for their combined sewer overflow or CSO program.

Prior to that I spent eight years with a consulting firm in the Chicago suburbs named Rust Environment and infrastructure at the time. At Rust I worked on many combined sewer separation and wet weather flow control programs. I also worked on many treatment plant upgrade projects.

Additionally, I have worked on several 1 2 professional publications including as principal author for the Control of 3 4 Infiltration and Inflow in Private Building 5 Sewer Connections published by the Water 6 Environment Federation in 1999 and as a 7 technical reviewer of the Wastewater Collection 8 Systems Management, Manual of Practice Number 9 Seven, published by the Water Environment Federation in 1999. A complete resume is 10 11 attached as Attachment A.

Page 32

12 My current responsibilities at the 13 Water Reclamation District are as manager of an 14 18-person engineering department involved in 15 collection system and treatment plant upgrades 16 and expansion engineering as well as overseeing the District's service connection program. 17 The District's annual capital improvement program 18 19 budget is approximately \$15 million.

Due to the critical nature of this project and its unique circumstances, I have functioned as the District's representative and project manager over the history of this project.

Page 33 1 The project team includes as prime 2 consultant Clark Dietz & Associates represented 3 by Mr. Greg Droessler, project manager, for 4 civil engineering design and permitting. 5 Significant sub-consultants include 6 Huff & Huff, Incorporated, represented by 7 Mr. James Huff for environmental impact, 8 wetland design, and permitting assistance and 9 Orchard, Hiltz & McCliment, Inc., OHM, for hydraulic modeling, not testifying at this 10 11 hearing. 12 I will be testifying to the District's 13 general policies and practice for the 14 development of this project, the others to their individual areas of expertise. 15 Specific 16 testimony related to treatment plant operations 17 can be provided by Mr. Larry McFall, plant 18 operations manager, upon request or in response 19 to questions where he is better suited to 20 respond. My resume has been provided in 21 attachment A. 22 The project is briefly described as an 23 excess wet weather flow pump station that will

intercept excess flows at the headworks of the

and the second sec

24

treatment plant and pump those flows into an earthen, vegetated basin for temporary storage until they can be returned to the plant for processing.

The District's treatment plant is currently rated at 40 million gallons per day for secondary treatment and 80 million gallons per day for hydraulic capacity.

9 Our experience has shown that we can 10 successfully manage flows greater than that 11 with the current facilities. However, by the 12 2002 Compliant Commitment Agreement, attachment 13 B, with IEP, we are obligated to control and 14 treat up to a 10-year, 24-hour rainfall event.

The project's operational plan is that once headworks flow has reached a rate of 80 mgd, the proposed excess flow facilities would be utilized. Upon headworks flow rates decreasing below 80 mgd, stored flows would be redirected to the plant until the basin is empty.

Based on the historical record and the hydraulic modeling, we anticipate that influent flow rates will begin to decrease to or below

Page 35 1 the 80 mgd threshold within four to six hours 2 in a major event and we will be able to empty the basin within 48 hours of first flow being 3 4 diverted to the basin. A project location map 5 is included in the permit record as page 263 6 and is attached for reference as attachment C. 7 Rock River Water Reclamation District 8 is a regional wastewater collection and 9 treatment agency organized under the 1917 10 Sanitary District Act. The District currently 11 serves about 230,000 people in seven 12 municipalities plus unincorporated areas 13 totalling 85,000 service accounts. 14 The District owns and operates the 15 entire collection system including local 16 lateral sewers. The system consists of approximately 1,100 miles of sewer, 24,000 17 18 manholes, 31 pump stations, and two wastewater 19 treatment plants. 20 A significant portion of the collection system is over 80 years old. The project is 21 22 located at the Kishwaukee Street treatment 23 plant. Therefore, the entire system is 24 tributary to it, thus it would benefit all the

1 rate payers of the District.

2	The United States Protection Agency and
3	the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in
4	a conjunctive effort have made excess wet
5	weather flow within separate sanitary sewer
6	systems a priority issue for several years.
7	There has been an active effort at the
8	federal level to propagate a separate sewer
9	overflow control policy for several years.
10	This effort is ongoing. USEPA held a workshop
11	with stakeholders in July 2011 to continue the
12	discussion and express its concern on this
13	issue.
14	IEPA's biennial report published in
15	September 2011 highlights their efforts. A
16	copy of this report is attached as attachment
17	D. The District has found that IEPA
18	aggressively enforces environmental regulations
19	relative to SSOs including issuing notices of
20	violation.
21	The District, like all older
22	communities, has excess wet weather flow issues
23	given the age of the infrastructure and the
24	manner in which it was designed and
1 constructed.

However, collection system backup or sanitary sewer overflows can be caused by root intrusion or grease buildup regardless of the age of the infrastructure.

6 Of the District's 1100 miles of sewer, 7 we believe upwards of 200 miles is in need of 8 rehabilitation to reduce excess wet weather 9 flows. The District has budgeted and executed 10 an excess wet weather flow or I & I reduction program since the 1980s. The current program 11 12 consists annually of mainline and service lateral lining, mainline point repairs, manhole 13 14 replacement, cleaning, and televising.

The current annual system The current annual system rehabilitation budget including contracted and force account work is about \$6.3 million or approximately 40 percent of our annual capital improvement program project budget.

From my experience, most collection results system owners do not expend this portion of their budget on system rehabilitation without a compliance order. Based on current rate of work, the District expects to maintain or ¹ increase its collection system rehabilitation
² budget for at least the next 50 years.

3 Under the District's program to address wet weather flow issues, we have completed the 4 5 following work: 93 miles of mainline sewer 6 lining, 16 miles of mainline sewer repair or 7 replacement, 17,000 feet of private services 8 line, 77,000 feet of private services repaired or replaced, 1,170 manholes given major rehab 9 or replaced, and 50 miles of sewer cleaned and 10 11 televised annually.

12 The District entered into a Compliance 13 Commitment Agreement with IEPA in 2002 and 14 referenced as attachment B. That agreement 15 required that the District evaluate its 16 interceptor system and treatment plant ability 17 to handle a 10-year storm event and to make any 18 improvements necessary to achieve that goal.

The evaluation study performed by Black Veatch, published October 2006, and in the record as pages 105 to 114, identified the need for the proposed excess flow basin.

The project consists of a
 65.4-million-gallon-per-day maximum flow rate

Page 38

pump station and a 25-million-gallon vegetated retention basin to ensure 10-year, 24-hour storm event hydraulic treatment capacity in the collection system and treatment plant.

The pump station would draw off flow in excess of the wastewater treatment plant hydraulic capacity and hold those flows in the basin until the treatment plant can receive them.

Based on modeling with 38 years of rainfall data, it was determined that the 10-year, 24-hour event would produce a peak flow rate at the treatment plant of 145 mgd. The treatment plant's current hydraulic capacity is 80 mgd.

16 The operational plan is to temporarily 17 transfer flow to the excess flow basin if the 18 influent flow rate exceeds 80 mgd and return 19 flows to the treatment plant as soon as 20 influent rate decreases below 80 mgd. The 21 District estimated the time from beginning of 22 transfer to complete draining of the basin to 23 be no more than 48 hours in a 10-year, 24-hour 24 event.

Page 39

The design approach to the pump station had to recognize high flow rates at low head; therefore, an axial flow pump station approach is proposed. This approach is also conducive to the type of occasional use this station will witness.

7 This station is typical of storm water 8 pumping stations that function only during 9 heavy wet weather. The storage basin likewise 10 will see only occasional use during wet weather 11 flows estimated at once per year.

12 Therefore, the District looked at 13 design solutions that would be flexible and 14 conducive to such occasional use. One typical 15 design element that seemed nonefficent nor 16 practical was concrete. In this case the 17 concrete in the basin will sit exposed to the 18 elements of heat and cold extremes. This will 19 promote cracking in a material that is 20 inherently inclined to crack and, therefore, 21 cause excessive routine maintenance for it to 22 perform its intended function -- intended 23 purpose.

A flexible liner geo-textile was

24

considered. However, these materials also suffer from deterioration from exposure to sunlight. Worst of all, a flexible liner, either clay or geo-textile, is very difficult if not impossible to design against flotation pressures from below as is the case here even if protected by a layer of soil.

8 It was estimated during the design 9 process that a flexible liner basin may have to 10 be elevated six to seven feet to avoid the 11 flotation pressures during river flooding. 12 This approach would have required 13 significant offsite fill material at great 14cost. At this point the constructed wetland 15 concept was proposed.

16 The District is working to implement 17 green or sustainable features in all of its 18 current and future projects. This is good 19 public policy, good environmental policy, and 20 cost effective. Additionally, it is published 21 USEPA policy to promote green solutions, please 22 see Strategic Agenda to Protect Waters and 23 Build More Livable Communities Through Green 24 Infrastructure, published April 2011,

1 attachment E.

Since the ARRA Stimulus program, USEPA
has required states to set aside a portion of
their state revolving loan funds for green
projects, again attachment E. IEPA's biennial
report published in 2011 gives significant
detail as to IEPA's commitment to these green
solutions.

9 Even the White House is pushing the 10 issue. On September 20th this year, the White 11 House Council on Environmental Quality and the 12 USEPA held a joint conference on this topic. 13 The following is a quote from the IEPA's 14 June 5, 2010 letter to the general assembly 15 concerning Public Act 96-26, Illinois Green 16 Infrastructure For Clean Water Act of 2009:

17 Chapter five: Recommendations, 18 Performance Standards. IEPA should adopt at 19 the very least a set of storm water volume 20 retention performance standards that varies 21 according to the conditions at a particular 22 site.

Such performance standards are becoming
 standard around the country and are seen as the

Page 43 1 best method of improving water quality while at 2 the same time recharging groundwater, 3 conserving energy and other resources, and 4 helping to reduce flooding and sewer overflows. 5 This quote tells us that IEPA 6 understands that sewer overflows and storm 7 water are intermingled, that green solutions 8 should be applied, and that groundwater 9 interaction is to be expected. 10 This recommendation recognizes what 11 every septic system designer and installer 12 understands, which is that soil provides 13 natural water treatment processes for raw 14 wastewater that are beneficial and cost 15 effective. Please see record page 40. 16 The District for its part requires all 17 new or upgraded pumping stations to have an 18 energy audit of the design. The District has 19 implemented cogeneration to produce its own 20 electricity from treatment by-products and is 21 working to expand its production of bio-gas. 22 Finally, the District has implemented a 23 native landscape plan within the storm water 24 pollution prevention plan at the treatment

plant.

1

Specific to the proposed project, the District believes that the constructed wetland approach is appropriate because, A, it is cost effective. The benefit is \$1 million in reduced construction costs. This comes from avoidance of an expensive liner solution like concrete;

Page 44

⁹ B, it is more sustainable than a ¹⁰ concrete lined basin that will crack and need ¹¹ routine repairs. Also, it mitigates the ¹² concern of hydraulic pressure under the liner ¹³ caused by river flooding;

14 C, the location of the proposed project 15 is already a natural setting. The District has 16 reclaimed the area from a blighted urban 17 condition and performed land reclamation work; 18 D, the constructed wetland will provide 19 greater environmental benefit over a traditional basin. For example, it will 20 21 provide habitat for waterfowl using the Rock 22 River and it will increase vegetated area in an 23 urban environment. These are all in addition 24 to the use for final polishing and infiltration

of a portion of the District wastewater effluent.

As the permit record shows, the District or its consultants held numerous discussions and meetings with IEPA staff prior to submittal of the permit application to explain the approach and the design basis of the project. This can be seen in the record as follows:

One: Record page 12, IEPA Exhibit 2, transmittal of the preliminary design report on March 3rd, 2011;

Number two: Record page 22, meeting agenda for the March 10, 2011 meeting with IEPA staff to discuss the project, including the preliminary design report and meeting minutes, page 152, IEPA Exhibit 5;

Record page 183, IEPA Exhibit 16,
attendee list for the June 6th, 2011 meeting;
Number four, Huff & Huff response
letter of June 28th, 2011 to June 6th questions
from IEPA, on page 189 of the permit record.
The District has offered to accept
specific operational restrictions within the

permit and routine groundwater monitoring to demonstrate our goodwill and allow for verifiable evaluation of the design claims that this project will comply with class one groundwater regulations.

Page 46

6 The groundwater section has obstinately 7 refused to negotiate reasonable operational 8 controls. This can be documented by the 9 following pages from the permit record and the 10 denial of the permit without a specific 11 response to the June 28, 2011 Huff letter. 12 That letter responded in detail to IEPA's draft 13 questions. RRWRD awaits a response.

14One: Huff & Huff response letter of15June 28 on page 189 of the record.

Permit plan set, which was left out of
 the record, sheet number C4.1 shows existing
 monitoring wells and proposed new additional
 monitoring wells. See attachment F.

Number three: Telephone conversation of June 22, 2011 between Dana Carroll and Allen Keller in which RRWRD reenforced our desire to negotiate a mutually agreeable solution with operational controls as discussed in the

¹ June 28th letter.

2 The IEPA has denied this permit based 3 on inconsistent policy and bias by the 4 groundwater section. I support this statement 5 as follows. 6 MR. GRANT: I'm going to object at this 7 point. I mean, these aren't facts. He's here 8 to testify to facts. As far as opinions about 9 how bad the Agency is, I don't know that that's 10 appropriate. 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch.

MR. HARSCH: I think it's appropriate for the witness to respond to the -- what it believes to be the unreasonableness of the Agency's decision.

16 It's more like final MR. GRANT: 17 argument. It's something he can put in his post-hearing brief. I don't see the point of 18 19 having the witness testify to it under oath. 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, he's 21 almost done, Mr. Grant. 22 MR. GRANT: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: May the
 record reflect your objection.

MR. GRANT: Thank you.

1

24

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Go ahead,
 sir.

THE WITNESS: The IEPA's standards, Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works, recognize that sanitary sewers will exfiltrate some raw wastewater and accepts that limited amounts of that are not detrimental to the environment or public health.

Within RRWRD's system, that could be as much as 2 million gallons per day based on an eight-inch pipe and the 240 gallons per inch diameter per mile per day standard.

As discussed above, the IEPA is promoting storm water management practices that induce infiltration of contaminants in storm water into the ground with no limitation nor control on soil type or groundwater exposure.

None of the proposed standards cited in the Agency's June 2010 letter to the general assembly discusses limiting infiltration rates from storm water based on soil or groundwater condition.

However, it does make point that there

are contaminants in storm water. The
 wastewater storm water professional community
 has accepted that storm water contains
 significant potential contaminants such as BOD,
 suspended solids, and fecal coliform.

The District can demonstrate that the Rock River and neighboring drainage ways are very elevated in fecal coliform during any rainfall event to levels of 25,000 CFU, yet the IEPA refuses to acknowledge the relationship between these facts.

We believe that this refusal to acknowledge what is common professional knowledge comes from bias. We believe that this bias is demonstrated by the groundwater section's absolute refusal to negotiate reasonable operational controls for our proposed project.

Mr. Droessler and Mr. Huff's testimony will explain that the two cited provisions of the Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works do not apply to the proposed project and that the permit record shows that we have shown that water pollution will not result from this

Page 50 project. MR. HARSCH: I have a few additional follow-up questions. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may. BY MR. HARSCH: Ο. You referenced the Compliance Commitment Agreement that the District has entered into with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency which is found as attachment B to your testimony accepted as Petitioner's Exhibit 2. Were you with the District at the time that that Compliance Commitment Agreement was negotiated? Α. No. Is Mr. McFall -- was he present at the Ο. District at the time? Α. Yes, he was. 0. Would he be a better witness then for me to --Α. Yes. You've described in some detail all of 0. the projects that the District has carried out to rehab or rebuild its sewage collection

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 51 1 system. 2 Will that have an impact on the amount 3 of flows reaching the treatment plant during 4 wet weather events in the future? 5 Α. We expect it to have a significant 6 impact over time. 7 Would you explain what that impact Ο. 8 would be? 9 Α. The impact would be reduced rate at 10 which these wet weather flows would come to us 11 and then also reduced volume in the longer 12 term. 13 The modeling that was performed that 0. 14 you've testified to was based on historical 15 flow rates, was it not? 16 And historical flow data to the Α. 17 treatment plant and historical rainfall, all 18 from record. 19 0. Do I understand correctly then as 20 you -- as the District continues to make these 21 improvements, then the amount of flow from a 22 specific storm that the treatment plant would 23 receive should be less? 24 Α. Yes.

Page 52 1 Objection. Speculative. MR. PETTI: 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. 3 MR. HARSCH: I'm sorry. I didn't hear 4 the basis. 5 MR. PETTI: Speculation. And also this is not information that was presented to the 6 7 Agency that is part of the record. 8 MR. HARSCH: I will withdraw the 9 question and start over again. 10 BY MR. HARSCH: 11 Based on your professional engineering Ο. 12 opinion and experience that you've testified 13 to, will the sewage treatment plant receive 14 less flows as the collection system is lined, 15 manholes rebuilt, and the other types of 16 projects --17 Α. That is our expectation, yes. 18 Q. That's your professional opinion? 19 Α. Yes. 20 That would occur? 0. 21 Α. Yes. In my opinion that will occur. 22 Q. And is that an accepted professional 23 opinion in your -- in the environmental 24 engineering professional community?

Page 53 1 Yes, I believe it to be accepted Α. 2 generally. 3 If such improvements would result in 0. 4 less flow from a given storm event, does that 5 translate to the likelihood of the use of the 6 basin being reduced in your professional 7 opinion? 8 Α. Correct. Over the long term, we would 9 expect the need for the basin to be 10 dramatically reduced. 11 0. Can you describe in greater detail the efforts that the District and -- both the park 12 13 District have done in the area that this basin 14 is being located? 15 Α. Well, the area was originally 16 developed. It was a very low income area. It 17 had fallen on really hard times over time. 18 Many houses were abandoned. Some had burned. 19 The neighborhood has had serious crime issues. 20 So the District in recognizing its need 21 for land as the demands on us grow for 22 processes that we must perform, we've acquired 23 the land, we've cleaned it up, removed the old 24 debris, the old houses, and isolated it from

Page 54 certain bad elements that exist in the area. 1 2 Ο. Had the District proposed this project 3 based on a five-year storm event, would there be any changes in the project? 4 5 MR. PETTI: Objection. Relevance. It 6 wasn't proposed on a five-year storm event. 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. 8 Could you keep your voice up, too, please? 9 I'll withdraw the MR. HARSCH: Sure. 10 question and start over. 11 BY MR. HARSCH: The preliminary plan that was prepared 12 0. 13 for this project was part of a facility plan 14 that was prepared by the District? 15 Α. By a consultant for the District, yes. 16 And was that facility plan provided to Ο. 17 the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency? 18 Α. The section of it relating to this 19 excess flow basin was put in the record, yes. 20 And it's contained in the permit Ο. 21 record? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Does that facility plan, portion of the Q. facility plan show differences in design that 24

Page 55 1 would be required based on a five-year and a 2 10-year storm event? It does briefly discuss that, yes. 3 Α. 4 Q. What would be the size of the project 5 if it would have been designed on a five-year 6 storm water --7 MR. GRANT: Let me just object for a 8 second, but I really just want to ask Roy can 9 you refer us to a document? I'm not saying 10 that it wasn't provided. 11 THE WITNESS: It's in my testimony. I'll find it. Record pages 105 through 114. 12 13 MR. GRANT: Thank you. Sorry. I lost 14 track. 15 BY MR. HARSCH: 16 What would be the impact on the size of Ο. the basin had it been designed on a five-year 17 18 storm event? 19 I don't specifically remember the Α. 20 values stated in that, but I recall it being 21 approximately one-quarter or one-fifth of what 22 we were proposing. I think Mr. Droessler can testify to that. 23 24 Ο. And currently the basin was proposed

Page 56 for approximately 2.3 million gallons? 1 2 25. Α. 3 Q. Excuse me. 25. Sorry. 4 Would Mr. McFall be a better witness to 5 ask questions regarding how the District would 6 make a decision when to utilize the basin? 7 Α. Yes. 8 MR. HARSCH: That's all the questions 9 that I have. 10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, 11 Mr. Harsch. Agency. 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PETTI: 14 0. Mr. Carroll, my name is Robert Petti. 15 I'm with the Attorney General's office. I'm going to ask you some questions. 16 17 Α. Sure. 18 If I accidently call you Mr. Beck, Q. 19 forgive me. That's the nameplate that's in 20 front of you. My eyes just might go to that. 21 I've done it a couple times already in my head. 22 In your -- the written testimony that 23 was read into the record, if we could refer 24 quickly to page 3 at the bottom. You discuss a

Page 57 1 separate sanitary sewer system. 2 Can you describe what that is for me? 3 Α. A separate sanitary sewer system is one 4 that would have no known direct storm water 5 connections. 6 Q. Direct connections to what, if I may? 7 Α. Storm sewer, inlets in the street, 8 recognized storm water intakes. 9 0. And that is what the system is at the 10 Rock River? 11 Ours is classified as a separate sewer Α. 12 system, yes. 13 0. And similarly, could you describe for 14 me what a separate sewer outflow system or 15 outflow control would be? 16 A separate sewer overflow control Α. 17 policy, the SSO policy. 18 0. What is separate sewer overflow here? 19 Α. Okay. Separate sewer overflow would be a backup in the system that might come out of a 20 21 manhole top, might back up in someone's 22 basement. 23 And those backups would occur due to Q. 24 storm water?

Q. And could you describe for me the difference in your opinion between storm water and wastewater, if there is one? Α. The probably recognized definition difference is wastewater includes waste discharges from occupied buildings. Storm water doesn't necessarily include direct wastewater from occupied buildings. Ο. Now, your facility -- when I say "the facility," I'm referring to the District's treatment facility, just so we're clear -operates under an NPDES permit, correct? Α. Correct. Q. And that is for treatment of wastewater, correct? Α. Correct. And, to your knowledge, can a facility 0. or a person or anybody in the industry get a separate permit that would be classified as a storm water treatment permit? Α. Yes.

Q. At your facility, do the storm water
 and wastewater comingle in the influent to the

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

¹ facility?

8

A. It comes to us commingled from the
 ³ collection system.

Q. And when it arrives at the system commingled, is it -- it is then considered wastewater; it's no longer considered storm water; is that correct?

A. It's classified as wastewater.

9 Q. So what we're dealing with in the
 10 proposed overflow basin is wastewater, correct?
 11 A. It's wastewater.

12 I want to turn to page 4 of your Q. 13 testimony. At the bottom, you have a listing, 14 a number of steps that have been taken by the 15 District to address the wet weather flow 16 including 93 miles of mainline sewer lining, 16 17 miles of mainline sewer repair replacement, 18 1700 feet of private services line, 77,000 feet 19 of private services repaired or replaced, and 20 1,170 manholes given major rehab or replaced, 21 and there's one more, 50 miles of sewer cleaned 22 and televised annually.

Am I reading that accurately?
A. Yes.

Page 60 1 Q. How much did all of that cost? 2 Α. Total expenditure over the life of the 3 program, I'm sorry, I don't have that number. 4 0. Could you make an estimate? 5 Α. Not one that I would have a good level 6 of confidence. Would Mr. McFall know that number, to 7 Ο. 8 your knowledge? I don't know. You'd have to ask him. 9 Α. 10 I ask because you've deferred some Ο. 11 items to him. I thought I'd ask. 12 So you've done all this stuff, these 13 six different items, at least these six 14 different items that are culled out in the 15 testimony. I'm sure there was more that was 16 done as well --17 Α. Probably. 18 Q. -- to address wet weather flow, but you don't want to build a liner on this basin, 19 20 correct? 21 Α. Correct. 22 And why don't you want to build a 0. 23 liner? 24 It's not cost effective. It's not Α.

Page 61 money well spent. We believe every one of 1 2 those dollars should be put into lining the 3 system and trying to get excess wet weather 4 flow out of the system rather than put into a 5 basin that would function once a year. 6 0. Now, in this -- I may have the issue 7 confused here. So help me out. 8 Α. Okay. 9 0. On page 5 under the project description 10 and approach, you state that this type of 11 station -- I would assume you're referring to 12 the pumping station for the overflow basin --13 is typical of storm water pumping stations, 14 correct? 15 Α. Uh-huh. 16 Q. That's in there? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Is a storm water pumping station Q. 19 different than a wastewater pumping station? 20 Α. Well, normally there are different 21 parameter -- different hydraulic physical conditions to be met. This station happens to 22 23 share some of those particular conditions as 24 far as high volume and low head, low total

1 dynamic head.

2	And the other similarity is, as I
3	stated here in my testimony, this station's
4	going to be used one day a year, which is very
5	similar to the storm water pump station.
6	Q. But it's going to be used for pumping
7	wastewater, correct?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And, again, dealing with the storm
10	water wastewater issue, at the bottom of
11	page 6, you discuss a number of initiatives
12	that have been pushed in the last few years,
13	and included in that is IEPA's June 5, 2010
14	letter to the general assembly concerning
15	Public Act 96-26.
16	Do you see where I'm at?
17	A. Uh-huh.
18	Q. And you have a quote, I assume pulled
19	from that regarding performance standards?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Addressing storm water?
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q. Are performance standards of the nature
24	referenced here different than performance

Page 63 1 standards that may be referenced for 2 wastewater? 3 Α. I guess not really when you're talking 4 about the concept of performance standards, 5 okay. 6 Q. What type of performance standards are we referring to here, just so that we're clear? 7 8 Performance of pumps, performance of 9 retention basin? 10 Α. We're talking about performance 11 standards for green projects. That's what this 12 is talking about. 13 Ο. Okay. What --14 Α. Green sustainable whatever term you 15 like there projects. That's what this 16 performance standard is talking about. It's 17 not talking specifically about storm water 18 projects. It's talking about policy statements 19 being made by the Agency to promote and 20 consider all the benefits of green sustainable 21 practices. 22 0. So we're not discussing a specific set 23 of parameters like a numerical standard? 24 We're not discussing a numerical

Page 64 1 standard? 2 Α. No. It's a performance standard which 3 is far broader than a numerical standard. 4 That's kind of what I was guessing. Q. 5 And you said that those performance 6 standards are for green or sustainable 7 projects? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Ο. What's a description of a green project 10 in your mind? 11 What does that encompass? 12 As you recognize, Counselor, it's a Α. 13 very broad concept in our society today and has 14 a lot of definitions by a lot of people. 15 I think in my mind what it means is it 16 is a project that utilizes all the 17 technological knowledge available to try to 18 find the most long lasting and durable, reduced 19 maintenance, reduced capital expenditure 20 approach to the solution needed for that 21 project. And I guess I want to emphasize and 22 using all the technical knowledge available, 23 not some of it. 24 0. Does that complete your answer?

1 A. I think so.

5

Q. You state that reduction of capital expense is a component of green infrastructure and green construction?

A. It's one component of it.

6 Q. Moving outside of your -- the written 7 testimony, you were asked some questions 8 regarding future performance of the District's 9 pipelines and the overall performance of the 10 District system and how your expectation is 11 through some of the repairs and improvements 12 made to the piping and other components you 13 expect there to be less of a need for or 14 perhaps less of a need is misstating it, but 15 there will be less volume of overflow that 16 would reach the facility.

17 Am I stating that at all correctly? 18 Α. What we expect to happen as we improve 19 the collection system and work to eliminate 20 extra flow out of that system is that the peak 21 rates coming to us will be reduced. So we will 22 see fewer and fewer events over time where we 23 would exceed that 80 mgd number that I talk 24 about in here.

Page 66 1 As you make those improvements 0. Okay. 2 to some of the -- I assume the older parts of 3 the system, the system as a whole, are there 4 other parts that may fail? 5 Α. May fail? I mean, there's lots of 6 influences out there in the world we have no 7 control over, construction by other parties, 8 you know, grease through intrusions. So when 9 you say fail, I need, I guess, a clarification. 10 0. Sure. I'll try to ask some more 11 specific questions. That's fine. 12 Pipes may collapse? 13 Α. I would say that our current and the 14 designs and construction standards that have been in place for at least the last 30 years 15 16 for most of the duration of my career are 17 focused around and really strive to provide systems that are good for 100 years. 18 19 Ο. But it does happen? 20 Α. It can happen. 21 And there are breaks in lines other 0. 22 than just collapses? 23 Α. There are. 24 Q. There are other -- they get dirty.

Page 67 1 They get gunked up. You need to constantly 2 keep them clean. 3 That's something that is chased over 4 time? 5 Α. Correct. Jumping back to your testimony at 6 Q. 7 page 9, your written testimony -- I'm sorry --8 at the bottom, the last line -- I'm sorry. I 9 think it's at the top. Well, in any event, I 10 don't know specifically where it was at this 11 point. I'm sorry. 12 You stated that there was no response to Mr. Huff's June letter. Do you recall that 13 14 testimony? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. Would it be fair to say that the 17 response to Mr. -- in your opinion, would it be 18 fair to say that the response to Mr. Huff's 19 letter was the denial of the application? 20 Α. No. 21 Why not? Q. 22 Because it did not address the issues Α. 23 that were put to us and the responses that 24 Mr. Huff gave as to why those responses were

Page 68 1 not adequate in the eyes of the Agency. 2 Ο. Did the Agency ask for a liner to be 3 included in this project? 4 Α. It did. 5 Q. Were you going to put a liner in? 6 It depends on the circumstances. Α. 7 0. Describe the circumstances in which you 8 would have put a liner into the project. 9 Where it made sense to prevent Α. 10 groundwater pollution. 11 0. Define groundwater pollution for me, 12 please. 13 Α. I'll pass that definition to Mr. Huff. 14 Q. Okay. As proposed to the Agency and 15 the application that is on appeal today, was a 16 liner part of that proposal? 17 Α. No. 18 At the beginning of the examination, we Q. discussed briefly that your facility operates 19 20 under an NPDES permit. 21 Do you recall that testimony? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Q. As part of -- pursuant to your permit, 24 is it permissible for you to shut that facility

Page 69 1 and allow a million gallons untreated 2 wastewater to discharge through your effluent 3 pipes? 4 MR. HARSCH: Object to that question. 5 MR. PETTI: Basis? 6 MR. HARSCH: It asks for a legal 7 conclusion of the witness. 8 MR. PETTI: I'll ask it again. 9 BY MR. PETTI: 10 Q. In your professional opinion, having knowledge of the permit in this case as an 11 operator of the facility, is it permissible to 12 13 shut down the facility and allow a million 14 gallons of untreated wastewater to discharge 15 through the effluent pipes? 16 MR. HARSCH: Object to the question 17 unless you want to define what facility you're 18 referring to. 19 MR. PETTI: I think I defined the 20 facility earlier as the treatment facility. And the witness agreed that that's the facility 21 22 we've been discussing. 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think 24 Mr. Carroll can answer. He's been around the

Page 70 block in his professional career. So objection 1 2 overruled. 3 THE WITNESS: Could you clarify for me, Counselor, discharge to what? 4 5 BY MR. PETTI: 6 Q. Through your effluent pipes. 7 Α. Through our effluent pipes. 8 Q. Let a million gallons of untreated wastewater run through the facility and out the 9 10 pipes. 11 Α. Out the --12 0. Effluent pipe. 13 Α. -- the treatment plant outfall? 14 0. Yes. 15 Α. Shut the treatment plant down and allow 16 a million gallons untreated to go out the 17 outflow of the treatment plant? 18 Q. Yes. Is that permissible? 19 I'd have to defer that answer to Α. Mr. McFall. 20 21 Q. Okay. Would you recommend it? 22 It would depend on what the Α. 23 circumstances are, what other damages could 24 occur if we didn't.

Q. Assume none. Assume you're just shutting it down for the day and allowing it to run through.

4 Α. Well, that's politely an unreasonable basis for making the comment and a decision. 5 Assuming there's no reason to do it, just do it 6 7 arbitrarily, I can't answer that question. I 8 don't deal, sir, in that sort of fantasy world. 9 Ο. Okay. Then we'll make it a more real 10 world. Assume there's a high rainfall event. 11 Α. Okay.

Q. Are you permitted to or would it be permissible to allow a million gallons of untreated wastewater to flow through the facility and discharge to the --

A. If that million gallons was going to
 flood 100 private homes and endanger lives,
 maybe.

19 Q. That's not part of my example.

A. But I have to base my decisions on facts and on real circumstances and what are the consequences of those actions.

MR. HARSCH: I think the witness has
 addressed the question. It's total

	Page 72
1	speculation.
2	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I totally
3	agree. Move on, please.
4	MR. PETTI: Okay. Nothing further.
5	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch.
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. HARSCH:
8	Q. When you reference in your testimony
9	the 80 million gallon per day limit, that's the
10	designed maximum flow rate set forth in the
11	permit, the rated capacity?
12	A. That's the permit rated hydraulic
13	capacity.
14	Q. That's not necessarily the maximum
15	practical flow that can be treated?
16	A. No.
17	MR. HARSCH: That's all I have.
18	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti.
19	MR. PETTI: We're good.
20	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step
21	down or aside, as the case may be.
22	(Whereupon, the witness was
23	excused.)
24	MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I
Page 73 1 call Mr. McFall. 2 (Whereupon, the witness was 3 duly sworn.) 4 LARRY McFALL, 5 called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. HARSCH: 9 Mr. McFall, would you please state your Ο. 10 full name, please? 11 Α. Larry D. McFall. 12 And did you provide Mr. Carroll a copy 0. of your resume that he included along with your 13 14 prefiled testimony? 15 Α. Yes, I did. 16 Ο. I show you this document. Tell me what 17 that document is. 18 Α. This is the resume I provided to 19 Mr. Carroll. 20 MR. HARSCH: Mr. Hearing Officer, I'd 21 like to move that this be introduced into 22 evidence. We took it out of the Petitioner's 23 Exhibit 2. I would move for it as Petitioner's 24 Exhibit 4.

Page 74 1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any 2 objection? 3 MR. PETTI: No. 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, 5 I have Exhibit 4 -- Petitioner's Exhibit 4 is 6 admitted. Thank you. 7 Will I get a clean copy of the written 8 testimony in the attachments? 9 MR. HARSCH: Yes. 10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Thank 11 you. 12 BY MR. HARSCH: 13 Is this resume true and accurate, to 0. 14 the best of your knowledge and belief? 15 Α. Yes, it is. 16 Would you please describe what Q. 17 position -- strike that. 18 What is your educational background 19 briefly? 20 Α. I have a B.S. degree in chemistry from Pittsburgh State University, Pittsburgh, 21 22 Kansas. That degree was ACS certified, 23 American Chemical Society certified. 24 And then I have several hours

Page 75 1 postgraduate work in organic analysis and 2 analytical analysis techniques. 3 0. How long have you been employed at the 4 District? 5 Α. I've been employed at the District for 6 just short of 15 years. 7 Ο. What is your present position at the 8 District? 9 Α. Plant operations manager. 10 0. What does the plant operations manager 11 do? 12 Α. The plant operations manager has 13 multiple duties, essentially overseeing the 14 operations staff, the maintenance staff for the 15 plant, and the maintenance staff for the lift 16 stations. 17 The operation manager also has 18 responsibility for oversight of the industrial 19 pretreatment program as well as oversight of 20 the industrial commercial governmental 21 building. 22 Ο. When it comes time to operating the 23 wastewater treatment plant, are you in charge 24 of that operation?

Page 76 1 I am the manager of the operation, Α. 2 correct. 3 0. Were you involved in the events that 4 led to the issuance of the Compliance 5 Commitment Agreement Mr. Carroll testified to? 6 Α. Yes, I was. 7 Ο. And was that Compliance Commitment 8 Agreement issued in response to a notice of - 9 violation? 10 Α. That would be correct. 11 0. And what did that notice of violation 12 cover? 13 Α. There were storm events that occurred 14 in June of -- I'm sorry, I don't have the 15 documents in front of me -- I believe 2002. 16 The storm events occurred June 4th and 5th, 17 2002. 18 Did you prepare a response to that Q. 19 notice of violation in a proposed plan to deal 20 with it after a meeting with the Agency? 21 That would be correct. Α. 22 0. Do you have a copy of that? 23 Α. Yes, sir. 24 This would be the standard letter. Q.

Page 77 This is the violation list. 1 2 Do you have a copy of the letter that 3 you sent to the Agency? 4 Α. Yes. 5 Ο. I'm sorry. I misspoke. This is 6 actually that letter. 7 You were involved with the meetings 8 with the Agency that gave rise --9 Α. Yes. 10 That are referenced in this letter? 0. 11 And it's your understanding that the 12 plant's Commitment Agreement in W2002-00140 was 13 based upon the agreed-upon plan that you 14 submitted to the Agency in your letter of 15 November 27, 2002? 16 Α. That would be my understanding. 17 MR. HARSCH: I'd mark this as 18 Petitioner --19 MR. GRANT: Do you know if that's in 20 the record? 21 THE WITNESS: It is not in the record. 22 MR. GRANT: Do you have a copy of it? 23 MR. HARSCH: I'm in the process of 24 providing one. This is Petitioner's Exhibit 4.

Page 78 1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think 2 Petitioner's Exhibit 4 was the resume. 3 MR. HARSCH: All right. Exhibit 5. 4 I'd move for the admission of Petitioner's 5 Exhibit 5. It sets forth the basis upon which 6 the Compliance Commitment Agreement was issued, 7 and the Compliance Commitment Agreement is in 8 the record. 9 MR. PETTI: No objection. 10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. 11 Petitioner's Exhibit 5 is admitted. 12 BY MR. HARSCH: 13 0. Mr. McFall, is it your understanding 14 based on the meeting and discussions that you 15 had with the Illinois Environmental Protection 16 Agency that it would have been allowable at the 17 time to base the improvements that you were 18 agreeing to on a five-year similar event? 19 Α. That would be correct. 20 0. Why did the District choose not to use 21 a five-year event and instead use a 10-year 22 event? 23 Α. To the best of my memory, the District 24 had been striving for some period of time to

¹ achieve compliance with 10-year storm events.

As a matter of what we viewed as the best service we could give to our community without significant expenditures, really vastly significant expenditures, I would defer that question to others for a more broad background of District policy before my time at the District.

9 Q. Do you agree with Mr. Carroll's opinion 10 that had you used a five-year design the basin 11 would have been much smaller?

A. Absolutely.

12

Q. Can you explain if the basin would be permitted and installed how you would decide to utilize that basin?

16 Α. The operation staff are expected to 17 give full treatment to everything that they can 18 pump into the plant and would strive to pump 19 everything into the plant not going to the 20 basin until such time as we saw other 21 occurrences that would result in either backing 22 up homes or would result in other exceedences 23 [sic] of our permit; example, washing out the 24 salts from the aeration basin such that our

1 2 It would be difficult to give a full 3 range of circumstances, but the short answer is 4 just that, that we would evaluate each 5 circumstance and utilize the treatment plant to the utmost until such time as we deem a problem 6 7 in other areas. And then we'd go to the basin 8 as the backup for the water effluent treatment 9 at that time. 10 The NPDES permit at your plant, you're Ο. 11 familiar with that? 12 Ά. Uh-huh. 13 0. Your plant's rated as design average 14 flow of 40 million gallons per year? 15 Α. 40 million gallons. 16 0. And has a design maximum flow rate of 17 80 million? 18 Α. 80 million. 19 What happens when the flow rate reaches 0. 20 81 million gallons currently? 21 Α. The design maximum of 80 million is an 22 engineering number. And based on circumstances 23 that can occur in the plant, many things may 24 happen either before that number is reached or

treatment would be hindered.

Page 81 1 on occasions that number could be exceeded 2 without causing problems. 3 However, if under the right 4 circumstances there's insufficient capacity in 5 the final clarifiers, for example, to treat the 6 flows going through, salts will be washed out 7 of the aeration basins through the final 8 clarifies into the river, which will inhibit 9 treatment. 10 Is that the number 80, 81, 82? That's 11 dependent on everyday circumstances. 12 0. So the designed maximum flow rate is an 13 engineering calculated number; it's not a hard 14 and fast number? 15 Α. It is not a hard and fast number. 16 Q. The permit contains language regarding 17 utilizing a treatment plant for the -- to treat 18 the maximum practical flow; is that correct? 19 Yes, it is. Α. 20 0. And that's the concept that allows you 21 to look at how the plant is operating and to 22 determine how much you could handle without 23 having the problems you referred to, an 24 effluent violation, for example, or a sewer,

1 something like that?

2

15

A. That would be my understanding.

Q. How much flow have you, in fact -- flow rates have you been able to handle in the past without having an effluent violation?

A. The maximum flow rate that I'm aware of
7 that we have sustained, flow rate is between
8 130 and 135 million gallon.

9 Q. If the basin, again, were to be 10 constructed, the plant was sitting there with 11 all of its units in operation, nothing had been 12 shut down for maintenance or repair, you could 13 reasonably expect to address flows greater than 14 80 million gallons for a short period of time?

A. That would be correct, yes.

Q. And this would -- would that impact the actual likelihood of the District utilizing that basin once per year as predicted by the model?

A. In my opinion, yes, it would.
Q. And how would it impact it?
A. I would expect to use the basin less
than once a year, something -- once every two,
once every five. It would depend on

Page 83 1 conditions, but we would strive to not utilize 2 the basin wherever possible. 3 Ο. And if you looked at the -- you're familiar with the flows that you've received 4 5 over the past two years? 6 Α. Yes. 7 0. And in your opinion, would you have 8 used the basin in the last two years based on 9 the flows that you actually received? 10 Α. No. 11 Q. Do you agree with Mr. Carroll's 12 assessment that long-term flows should reduce 13 as continued improvements are made to the 14 collection system that you've testified about? 15 Α. In my opinion, yes. 16 0. And do you agree with its assessment 17 that that would impact the likelihood and 18 frequency of utilizing the basin? 19 Α. It's my expectation as time goes 20 forward and continues improving the system, we 21 would use -- we would use the basin less and 22 less. 23 MR. HARSCH: I have no additional 24 questions at this time.

	Page 84
1	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant or
2	Mr. Petti.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. PETTI:
5	Q. Mr. McFall, my name is Rob Petti. You
6	may have heard me introduce myself before.
7	You stated that you are the operations
8	manager for the facility; is that correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And you're familiar with the NPDES
11	program for the facility, correct?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. You stated and correct me if this
14	statement is misstating your testimony in any
15	way that your staff facility expects the
16	full treatment to everything going to the
17	plant.
18	I wrote that down. I had to write it
19	down quickly. If you could correct my
20	statement.
21	A. My staff expects to strive to treat
22	everything that comes to the plant.
23	Q. Would you consider the wastewater that
24	is diverted to the retention pond at issue in

Page 85 1 this matter to have arrived at the plant? 2 I'm sorry. Would you repeat that? Α. 3 0. I'll back up a little and break it 4 down. 5 You're familiar with the design of the overflow basin that is at issue in this matter, 6 7 correct? 8 Α. Yes. 9 And as part of that design, the 0. 10 wastewater would be diverted before it enters 11 the treatment works, for lack of a better term 12 on my part, to the overflow basin, correct? 13 Α. Most of the treatment works. There 14 would be a preliminary screening. 15 0. And could you describe what that 16 screening would be? 17 Α. The screening is to take out very large debris that has been washed into the sewers. 18 19 0. So would you consider that screening 20 part of the treatment facility and part of the 21 treatment that you were striving for all water 22 or is there more treatment involved? 23 Α. There is certainly always more 24 treatment involved.

Page 86 1 0. So your staff and you as the operations 2 manager would be striving to achieve treatment 3 of all of the water that entered the wastewater 4 basin, correct? 5 Α. That would be correct. 6 0. I'm not as familiar with your permit 7 obviously as you are, so I have a couple 8 questions on the permit. 9 The permit requires you, in fact, to 10 treat all the wastewater that reaches the plant before it's discharged; is that correct? 11 12 Α. To my understanding, yes. 13 And you also testified that over time Q. 14 you expect the overflow basin to be used less 15 and less? 16 Α. Correct. 17 0. But you certainly expect that it will 18 be used in the future, correct? 19 Α. Yes, I would expect at some point in 20 the future it will be used. 21 MR. PETTI: That's all I have. Thank 22 you. 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, 24 Mr. Petti.

Page 87 1 Mr. Harsch? 2 MR. HARSCH: No further. 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step 4 down, sir. Thank you. Let's take five. 5 (Whereupon, the witness was 6 excused.) 7 (Whereupon, a recess was had.) 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Today is 9 November 28th, 2012. I'm not sure if I 10 mentioned that at the top of the hearing or 11 not. 12 (Whereupon, the witness was 13 duly sworn.) 14 GREGORY DROESSLER, 15 called as a witness herein, having been first 16 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. HARSCH: 19 Q. You have before you a copy of your 20 prefiled testimony? 21 Α. Yes. 22 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you 23 state your name, please, for the record and 24 spell it?

Page 88 1 THE WITNESS: My name is Gregory J. 2 Droessler. 3 BY MR. HARSCH: 4 You have before you a copy of what's Ο. 5 been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 3, your 6 prefiled written testimony as an exhibit? 7 Α. Yes, sir. 8 Have you prepared this testimony? Ο. 9 Α. Yes. 10 Would you please present -- read your 0. 11 testimony today? 12 Α. Sure. My name is Gregory J. 13 Droessler. I'm a senior project engineer and 14 project manager for Clark Dietz, Incorporated, 15 an engineering consulting firm founded in 1953. 16 I received a bachelor's of science 17 degree in industrial technology management in 18 1995 from the University of Wisconsin, 19 Platteville. I am a registered professional 20 engineer in Illinois and Wisconsin. 21 My work experience includes over seven 22 years with Town and Country Engineering in 23 Madison, Wisconsin serving as a design 24 technician in both the municipal and wastewater

¹ engineering departments.

2 In 2003 I joined Clark Dietz as a 3 senior technician and was promoted to staff 4 engineer upon completing my professional 5 engineering exam in 2004. And since joining 6 Clark Dietz, I've been promoted to senior 7 project engineer, project manager, and now 8 department manager for the civil/environmental 9 engineering department in the Kenosha, 10 Wisconsin office.

11 At Clark Dietz, I've been involved in a 12 significant number of wastewater projects 13 primarily focusing on renovation and expansion 14 of existing wastewater treatment and pumping facilities, but also in facility planning, 15 16 operational review, and NPDES permit applications. A copy of my resume was 17 18 attached.

I'm a project manager at Clark Dietz or of the Clark Dietz team retained by the Rock River Water Reclamation District to design a wet weather excess flow facility at the head end of the wastewater treatment plant.

I am the engineer of record for this

24

project, as I have sealed the documents submitted to the IEPA as part of the construction permit application.

4 In the fall of 2010, the District 5 solicited proposals for the design of the 6 excess flow facility. The Clark Dietz team 7 proposed a dual function wetland system to be 8 used first for a polishing filter during most 9 of the year as part of the secondary effluent 10 and, second, a short-term excess flow temporary 11 storage basin during the most intense storm 12 The District liked the approach that events. 13 our team -- liked the approach of our team and 14 was awarded the contract for the project.

The Clark Dietz team consisted The Clark Dietz team consisted primarily of the following firms: Clark Dietz, Huff & Huff; Orchard Hiltz & McCliment, OHM. And the role of each firm is as follows:

¹⁹ Clark's Dietz role for the project was ²⁰ leading the overall project design and provide ²¹ project management. Clark Dietz completed the ²² project permitting, site layout and design, ²³ site utilities, excess flow basin design, and ²⁴ excess flow pump station design.

And my specific role for the project was to provide project management and client management services, including coordinating the work performed by the sub-consultants and our internal staff. I worked closely with Mr. Dana Carroll who is the District's engineering manager.

8 Huff & Huff was a significant part of 9 our design team, as Mr. Jim Huff was tasked 10 with the design and permitting of the 11 constructed wetland to be used for the excess 12 flow basin.

Mr. Huff provided the technical Mr. Huff provided the technical background for the wetland design including the selection of the wetland plantings for their ability to thrive in the basin and to assist in the uptake of nitrate from the groundwater. He also was responsible for the coordination with the Illinois EPA.

Orchard Hiltz & McCliment, OHM, was also part of our design team, as the firm was tasked with providing the statistical model and for sizing the excess flow pump station and storage facility.

Page 92 1 OHM's model included 38 years of data 2 to predict the 10-year, 24-hour storm event and 3 that it would produce a peak flow of 4 145.4 million gallons per day at the plant. 5 The plant's rated peak capacity is 6 80 mgd. The excess flow pump station sizing 7 was established at 65.4 mgd. OHM further 8 utilized the model to predict a total of 9 25 million gallons of storage would be required 10 to store this design storm event. 11 The excess flow project consists of a 12 pump station rated for a maximum flow of 13 65.4 mgd and a 25-million gallon excess flow 14 storage constructed of native soils to 15 temporarily store the 10-year, 24-hour storm. 16 The pump station draws off flow in 17 excess of 80 mgd and temporarily transfers this 18 flow to the excess flow basin. The stored flow 19 is then returned to the front end of the 20 wastewater treatment plant within 48 hours of 21 the event for further treatment. 22 The intent of the excess flow basin's 23 design is to use a green or sustainable design 24 in an effort to control project costs and to

Page 93 minimize the environmental impact to the area. 1 2 The basin was designed without a clay 3 or synthetic liner for these very reasons and 4 the design allows us to use the native 5 groundwater along with the treated plant 6 effluent to create a thriving wetland 7 environment. This is evident by the fact that 8 the floor of the excess flow basin is 9 established at only two feet above the normal 10 groundwater level in the area. 11 The District submitted a formal 12 construction permit application on April 4th, 13 2012 for this project. In addition to the 14 normal construction permit application forms 15 and design documents, the District's 16 application also included extensive 17 documentation concerning the preliminary 18 discussions and meetings and responses to 19 various points that occurred while the project 20 was initially discussed with the IEPA prior to 21 formal application. All this material was 22 received by the IEPA and assigned log number 23 0317-12 on April 6th, 2012.

The IEPA issued a letter of denial to

24

the District for the project, again log number 0317-12. In the denial the IEPA stated that the two technical requirements -- excuse me. In the denial the IEPA stated that the two technical requirements for the Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works were not met.

Page 94

8 The first item cited was a seal is 9 required at the bottom of the embankment of the 10 excess flow storage basin per section 11 370.930 d)2D0 of the Illinois Recommended 12 Standards for Sewage Works. This seal shall 13 have a permeability of less than one to the 14 tenth power to negative seven centimeter per 15 second. Provisions shall be made in the 16 specifications for demonstrating the 17 permeability of the seal after completion of 18 the construction and prior to filling the 19 basin.

The cited rule states as follows: The cited rule states as follows: Section 370.930 is for waste stabilization ponds and aerated lagoons. Part D, the seal, the pond bottom and embankment shall be sealed such that seepage loss through the seal is as low as possible. Seals consisting of soils,
 bentonite, or synthetic liners may be used
 provided that the permeability, durability, and
 integrity of the proposed material is
 demonstrated for the anticipated conditions.

Page 95

The results of a testing program that substantiates the adequacy of the proposed seal shall be incorporated into or accompany the engineering report. Standard ASTM procedures or similar testing methods shall be used for all tests.

12 Part i, a seal consisting of soil 13 materials shall have a thickness of at least 14 24 inches and a permeability of less than one 15 to the seventh power centimeters per second. 16 Provisions shall be made in the specifications 17 for the demonstrating of the permeability of 18 the seal after completion of the construction 19 and prior to filling the pond.

For a seal consisting of a synthetic For a seal consisting of a synthetic liner, seepage loss through the liner shall not exceed a quantity equivalent to the seepage loss through a soil seal as described above. From the face of this provision, it

applies to waste stabilization ponds and
aerated lagoons. Neither of the terms are
defined in the water pollution regulations.
Section 370.110 e) references the glossary water and wastewater control engineering to
define terms used within section 370.

7 Waste stabilization is defined by this 8 document as follows: Waste stabilization is 9 the treatment of organic matter removed from a 10 waste so as to make it innocuous. A copy of 11 this definition from the glossary is included 12 in attachment two.

The excess flow basin as proposed in the permit application does not provide any level of treatment of any organic matter, nor is it aerated in any form.

17 In my professional opinion, there is no 18 way to define the proposed excess flow basin as 19 either a waste stabilization pond or an aerated 20 lagoon. The only association that it has with 21 this definition is that it could possibly be 22 considered a lagoon. Clearly section 370.930 23 design standards do not apply to either as an 24 excess flow basin or as a storage lagoon.

The second reason cited for in the IEPA's letter for denial is the appropriate groundwater monitoring system must be proposed according to Illinois Administrative Code 370.930 b)4).

6 This section defines this as follows: 7 Groundwater contamination, the requirement of 8 the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act shall 9 be taken into account in the siting of ponds. 10 Ponds shall not be located proximate to water 11 supplies and other facilities subject to 12 contamination or location in areas of porous 13 soils and fissured rock formations.

If conditions dictate using such a site, then potential for the means necessary to combat groundwater contamination shall be critically evaluated in the engineer's report. In such locations the Agency will require groundwater monitoring wells.

In the contract drawings sent to the IEPA as part of the construction permit application, drawing sheet C4.1 includes provisions for three additional groundwater monitoring wells 20-foot deep and eight-inch ¹ diameter with flanged well caps to be installed ² as part of the project.

Page 98

These wells are in addition to the three existing groundwater monitoring wells located near the southwest corner of the excess flow basin. These monitoring wells are believed to have been installed in the 1990s to monitor the groundwater management zone in that area.

As these monitoring wells were only shown on a single drawing, they may have been simply overlooked by the initial review. Additional specifications for the monitoring wells will be included in the final design documents.

16 The IEPA also stated that the District 17 has not shown that the project will result in 18 water pollution and thus they are precluded 19 from issuing the requested construction permit. 20 While Mr. Huff will address this issue, 21 I was present at the first meeting that was 22 held to discuss this project with the IEPA 23 prior to the submittal of the final 24 application, and I prepared the summary of

¹ meeting notes for the meeting.

2 Prior to summarizing -- prior to 3 finalizing this summary, I sent it to the 4 attendees for their comment and correction, if 5 needed. All of the relevant information from this meeting, my draft summaries, responses to 6 7 my e-mails from the EPA, and my final summary 8 were submitted as part of the permit 9 application. This is found in the permit 10 record at IEPA Exhibit No. 3 to No. 9. 11 And I was not aware of any actual 12 response to the information that Mr. Huff sent 13 following our last meeting with the IEPA on 14 June 28th, 2011 that responded to various points raised by Mr. Buscher as to why the 15

¹⁷ water pollution.

16

The IEPA has denied this application as not fulfilling the requirement for the Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works due to the lack of a liner and the lack of groundwater monitoring wells.

project would in his belief threaten to cause

A clay or synthetic liner is not
 suitable for this application due to the high

groundwater table in this area -- in the area reclaimed by the District adjacent to the headworks of the treatment plant where the basin is proposed to be located to receive flows from the main interceptors leading into the plant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

Page 100

A liner, if used for this application, would not only heave due to the hydraulic pressure exerted by the groundwater but would also inhibit the creation of a constructed wetland.

The IEPA and District each have established a green initiative to be more sustainable, yet a bias towards this project due to the potential exfiltration from the basin statistically used one day per year appears to exist.

The project uses all of the native materials found on site to create the basin and the wetland. This not only is the definition of a sustainable project, it also severely cuts the carbon footprint that would be associated with the project if we imported nearly 24,000 cubic yards of clay to form a liner for

¹ the basin.

2	Our approach lowers the overall
3	construction cost of the project by over
4	\$1 million due to the financial savings
5	experienced from reusing the existing material
6	in lieu of importing clay and thus saves the
7	District's customers the financial burden of
8	dealing with this seldom-seen problem.
9	The constructed wetland is an
10	innovative sustainable approach to an age-old
11	problem. It will cut the cost of the project
12	by over a million dollars and would create a
13	more natural-looking basin for storing excess
14	flow during these storm events.
15	The District and Rockford Park District
16	have each heavily invested in the area to
17	reclaim the property north of the wastewater
18	treatment plant. The area has been restored to
19	a more natural environment and plans exist to
20	continue a scenic bike path along the river
21	almost immediately alongside the project area.
22	The natural habitat that is created by
23	the wetland blends much more readily with the
24	area than a 25-million gallon clay, synthetic,

Page 102 1 or concrete lined basin. 2 0. A couple of follow-up questions. 3 You've been involved in a number of 4 projects that utilize storm water modeling for 5 predicting flows? 6 Α. My firm has done a lot of storm water 7 modeling. I myself have focused primarily on 8 wastewater treatment. 9 0. Can you describe the level of -- strike 10 that. 11 The modeling that was performed as part 12 of this project, does it involve the use of 13 conservative assumptions? 14 Α. Yeah. The modeling was established 15 using 38 years of historical data. Whenever 16 you use a model and you use it to project -- a 17 statistical model to project conditions, you 18 have choices as to how that projects through 19 limited data points. And in all cases in my opinion we projected very conservatively. 20 21 Q. And what is the result of being --22 using the conservative approach? 23 By using a conservative approach, we've Α. 24 upsized the pump station and we had trajections

Page 103 anywhere from 17 million gallons to 25 million 1 2 gallons for a storage capacity on the basin, 3 and we erred or chose the most conservative 4 option of 25 million gallons. 5 Ο. What would the annual average projected 6 volume be for this project? 7 Α. Based on our model, the annual use of 8 this would happen one day per year, and that 9 annual event would be 7.4 million gallons. And 10 that is based on the assumption that Mr. McFall 11 and our District staff would only run 80 million gallons through their plant which is 12 13 their design peak flow. 14 So once per year on an annual average 0. 15 basis, the flows would be in excess of that 16 80 million gallons by 7.5 million gallons? 17 Α. By 7.4, correct. 18 0. If Mr. McFall from the District was 19 capable of running the plant at 90 million 20 gallons per day, a rate on that day, do I 21 understand that the basin wouldn't be used? 22 MR. PETTI: Object to speculation. 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Overruled. 24 He can answer if he's able.

1	THE WITNESS: Potentially not. Again,
2	when we look at flows to the plant, we're using
3	a daily average flow. There is a possibility
4	of an instantaneous peak where they may divert
5	for an hour, for example, to shave off the peak
6	flow to the plant. But again that's a
7	case-by-case scenario, and every storm event is
8	very different.
9	BY MR. HARSCH:
10	Q. Do you agree with the testimony of
11	Mr. Carroll and Mr. McFall that you could
12	expect a lessening of the flows reaching the
13	treatment plant as a result of various
14	improvements to the wastewater collection
15	system Mr. Carroll testified about?
16	A. Yes.
17	MR. HARSCH: No further questions at
18	this time.
19	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti.
20	MR. PETTI: Thank you.
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. PETTI:
23	Q. Good morning, Mr. Droessler. If you
24	could refer to page 4 of your written

1 testimony, please.

2	In the bottom, second-to-last
3	paragraph, you state that this the excess
4	flow basin as proposed in the permit
5	application does not provide any level of
6	treatment of organic matter.
7	Am I reading that correctly?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. So any waste that were to escape this
10	basin through, you know, infiltration of the
11	groundwater would be untreated wastewater,
12	correct?
13	A. As defined, we have not designed any
14	level of treatment.
15	Q. So that would be a correct statement on
16	my behalf, that it would be untreated
17	wastewater?
18	A. In my opinion, yes.
19	Q. And you go to great length to state
20	that this is not a waste stabilization pond or
21	an aerated lagoon.
22	How would you define this pond?
23	A. In my opinion, this pond is merely a
24	wide spot in the pipe, if you will. It's

Page 106 basically allowing us to temporarily store this 1 flow and then bring it back for treatment 2 3 through the treatment facility. 4 0. Does the water flow through the pipes 5 unlined? 6 There's no pipe; it just flows through 7 the ground? 8 Α. No. Each pipe has either clay or concrete or PVC material, yet they all leak, 9 10 the same as this basin would. So you're saying this basin would leak 11 Ο. 12 at the same rate as proposed as it would if it 13 was proposed with a concrete liner? 14 Α. No, sir. 15 Or a PVC liner? 0. 16 No. I'm simply stating that each of Α. 17 those would leak. 18 Q. But not at the same rates? 19 Α. Correct. 20 If you could prevent those pipes -- let Q. 21 me rephrase this. 22 If you could design a system where 23 those pipes leaked at a lower rate or no rate, 24 would that be preferable?

Page 107 1 Α. Yes. 2 0. You stated in your testimony -- and I apologize, I don't have the specific section --3 4 that if a clay liner were required for this site -- or a clay liner is unsuitable for the 5 6 location of this site; is that accurate? 7 Α. I stated that basically a clay liner 8 would heave due to the groundwater potential. 9 0. Making the clay liner unsuitable for 10 the site? 11 Α. The clay liner, while we could compact it initially, because of the groundwater 12 13 uplift, it would leak over time. 14 But there are ways to prevent that? Ο. 15 Α. By raising the entire basin 16 potentially. 17 0. Go ahead. 18 Α. But by raising an entire basin, we also 19 could not provide a green product. 20 How does raising the basin preclude you Q. 21 from providing a green product? 22 Α. We're creating a constructed wetland. 23 Mr. Huff will expand further on that and what 24 that includes. But by creating that wetland,

Page 108 1 we need the natural groundwater there for the 2 wetland plantings to survive. 3 If we raise the entire basin the three 4 to four feet that we would be required to to 5 minimize the potential uplift, no deep-rooted 6 plants are going to be able to survive in that 7 environment nor would they survive necessarily 8 in clay. 9 0. Have you designed systems like this 10 before or been a part of a team that designed 11 systems like this before? 12 Α. No, I have not. 13 0. In your professional opinion, which is 14 more important to you as a professional, 15 facilitating the roots for the deep-rooted 16 plants or protecting the groundwater? 17 Α. As I look at it, we are doing both. We 18 are protecting the groundwater, yet we are also 19 providing a green product. 20 0. What steps are taken in this project to 21 protect the groundwater? 22 Α. Mr. Huff has shown and will testify 23 later along the lines that we're able to meet 24 the groundwater standards established by the
Page 109 1 State at the 25-foot setback mark. 2 Ο. Okay. But I'm asking a different 3 question. I understand that. 4 But what design measures, what methods 5 are being implemented to protect the 6 groundwater? 7 Α. The selection of the plantings 8 themselves have a high level of nitrate uptake. 9 They need certain nutrients that are provided 10 by wastewater, if you will, same as you would 11 put fertilizer on your lawn. 12 If we were to look at putting grass out 13 there and fertilized it to keep it green, we 14 would have the same environmental impact as we would providing a wet water or a storage basin. 15 16 Outside of your written testimony, you 0. 17 testified a little bit about the parameters 18 that were selected for the model, correct? 19 Α. Correct. 20 Q. And were those parameters selected by 21 your firm or part of the project team or were 22 those parameters given to you by Illinois EPA? 23 Α. The modeling parameters? 24 0. Yes.

Page 110 1 Those were selected by my firm in Α. 2 conjunction with our sub-consultant partner. 3 And the results of that modeling 0. 4 selected by your firm were the ones presented to the Illinois EPA, correct? 5 6 Α. Yes, sir. 7 0. And those assumed the 80 million 8 gallons a day of treatment, correct? 9 Α. Correct. 10 And under that modeling, there was a 0. 11 potential for a one-day event of 7.4 million 12 gallons exceeding the 80 million? 13 Α. Correct. 14 MR. PETTI: That's all I have. Thank 15 you. 16 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, 17 any redirect? 18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. HARSCH: 20 Your experience that the use of the 0. 21 design, the permitted values like the designed 22 maximum full rate specified in the permit are 23 normally used in designs that are presented to 24 Illinois EPA?

Page 111 1 MR. GRANT: Can we ask him to speak up? 2 BY MR. HARSCH: 3 0. Strike that. I'll restate it. 4 Is it your experience that the use of 5 the design maximum flow rate, in this case 80 million gallons, is a parameter that 6 7 normally would be used in designs presented to 8 the Illinois EPA? 9 Α. Yes, sir. 10 MR. HARSCH: That's it. 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti. 12 MR. PETTI: I'm good. Thank you. 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step 14down. Thank you. 15 (Whereupon, the witness was 16 excused.) 17 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let's go off 18 the record for a second. 19 (Whereupon, a discussion was 20 had off the record.) 21 (Whereupon, the witness was 22 duly sworn.) 23 24

	Page 112
1	JAMES E. HUFF,
2	called as a witness herein, having been first
3	duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. HARSCH:
6	Q. Mr. Huff, would you please state your
7	full name for the record?
8	A. James E. Huff, H-u-f-f.
9	Q. And do you have a copy of your prefiled
10	testimony in front of you?
11	A. Yes, sir, I do.
12	Q. And that's been marked and accepted in
13	evidence as Petitioner's Exhibit 1.
14	Did you prepare this prefiled
15	testimony?
16	A. Yes, I did.
17	Q. Will you please read your testimony
18	into the record?
19	A. My name is James E. Huff, and I am
20	senior vice president and part owner of Huff &
21	Huff, Inc., an environmental consulting firm
22	founded in 1979.
23	I received a bachelor's of science in
24	chemical engineering in 1970 from Purdue

¹ University and was awarded a master of science ² in engineering from the environmental ³ engineering department at Purdue University in ⁴ 1971.

I'm a registered professional engineer
in Illinois. My work experience includes two
years with Mobil Oil as an advanced
environmental engineer during the construction
and start up of the Joliet Refinery.

10 After leaving Mobil in the fall of 11 1973, I was employed for three years at IIT 12 Research Institute in the chemical engineering 13 department working on advanced wastewater 14 treatment projects. I then spent four years 15 with the Armak Company, now called Akzo Nobel 16 Chemicals, where I was the corporate manager of environmental affairs responsible for 17 18 regulatory compliance and engineering design of 19 environmental systems at nine chemical plants 20 in the United States and Canada.

For the last 33 years at Huff & Huff, Inc., I have been involved in a significant number of wastewater and storm water projects, including environmental impact studies

1 associated with the impact of wastewater 2 discharges on receiving streams, 3 anti-degradation assessments, wastewater 4 treatment designs, and NPDES permit 5 negotiations. Much of my work for the past 6 decade has focused on sustainable wastewater 7 and storm water management. A copy of my 8 resume was included in attachment one.

Page 114

I am part of the Clark Dietz team
retained by the Rock River Water Reclamation
District to design a wet weather retention
basin at the head end of the wastewater
treatment plant. The District desired to take
a greener approach to wet weather management
than the traditional concrete-lined basin.

The design team proposed that a wetland The design team proposed that a wetland floor with prairie grasses on the banks employed successfully would not only be a greener approach but protective of the environment.

I will summarize herein the background on the design, the project impact on groundwater, the Agency's representation of the regulatory requirements, and why this design is

¹ protective of human health and the environment ² and will not cause water pollution as defined ³ in the Environmental Protection Act.

4 Background: In the summer of 2010, I 5 had an informal discussion with Al Keller, 6 permit manager of the Bureau of Water at the 7 Illinois EPA regarding the use of wetland-type 8 basin for excess flow and temporary storage. 9 Mr. Keller indicated the Agency had permitted 10 wetland previously for wastewater treatment and 11 thought this type of concept could be 12 permitted.

13 In the fall of 2010, the Rock River 14 Water Reclamation District solicited proposals 15 for design of the excess flow basin. The Clark 16 Dietz team proposed a dual function wetland 17 system, first as a polishing wetland during 18 most of the year or part of the secondary 19 effluent and, second, a short-term excess flow 20 temporary storage basin during the most intense 21 storm events. The District liked the approach, 22 and our team was awarded a contract to fast 23 track the design.

The District had been acquiring lots

24

adjacent to the treatment plant which are also
adjacent to the Rock River that was to be used
for the basin. Under an agreement with the
Agency, the excess flow basin is to prevent
backups in the sewer system for up to a 10-year
storm event.

While the hydrologic modeling was being developed by others on our team, Huff & Huff installed a datalogger in a monitoring well in the vicinity of the proposed basin to monitor the groundwater elevation.

Not surprisingly, the groundwater
elevation tracked very closely to the Rock
River elevation. There is no question that the
groundwater is hydraulically connected to the
river.

17 Under normal conditions, groundwater 18 flows towards the river, but at high river 19 levels, the groundwater flows from the river. 20 This was important to verify, as any liner, 21 synthetic or clay, would be in jeopardy of 22 serious damage when the river elevation 23 increases rapidly and the basin does not have 24 water near the same level or higher than the

river.

1

A clay liner would not be conducive to the establishment of a viable wetland community because of the inability of the roots to penetrate a compacted clay soil. In addition, clay is not available in the Rockford area, so the cost of securing clay adds significantly to the cost.

9 When the river elevation is higher than 10 the level in the excess flow basin, the 11 hydraulic pressure on the low permeable soils 12 across the 7.27 acre floor would cause the 13 floor to literally float and eventually buckle. 14 To avoid this potential, a series of pressure 15 relief valves to allow groundwater to enter the 16 basin would be necessary across the floor of 17 the basin.

Based on the hydraulic modeling which modeled the last 50 years of storm events, excess flow would be diverted an average of only once per year and from 50 years of storm events, an average diversion would be 7.4 million gallons per event.

A 10-year event would result in the

diversion of 25 million gallons, and this value was selected for the design capacity. The floor elevation was set at 690.0 feet above mean sea level, three feet above the normal level in the Rock River and two feet above the normal groundwater elevation.

Page 118

Based on nine soil borings, the soil encountered were fine grained sand consisting of silt and clay with 35 percent sand ranging from 1.5 to nine feet in thickness.

11 Below this initial zone, sandy soils 12 were encountered. After excavation for the 13 basin, the predominant soil type would be the 14 sandy soils. 12 inches of topsoil would be 15 placed on the floor of the basin for supporting 16 the wetland plants. This topsoil and the leaf litter that will rapidly develop will be the 17 18 limiting layer for infiltration.

From the hydraulic modeling and assuming a very conservative average wet weather biochemical oxygen demand, BOD5, of 125 milligrams per liter in the diverted influent flow, the organic loading on the diverted water would be an average of 7,700 pounds per event which would occur once
per year. The 125 milligram per liter BOD five
assumption for the excess flow concentration is
a conservative assumption. My experience with
excess flow BOD five concentrations is
typically in the 30 to 50 milligram per liter
range.

Page 119

8 The basin floor will occupy 7.27 acres. 9 So a single diversion will load the wetland 10 with 1,060 pounds of BOD five per acre per 11 event or effectively 1,060 pounds per acre per 12 year.

13 The excess flow was also assumed to 14 have a conservative eight milligrams per liter 15 of ammonia nitrogen plus organic nitrogen. 16 There will be no measurable nitrites or 17 nitrates in the diverted flow. The nitrogen 18 loading translates into 493 pounds per event or 19 68 pounds per acre per year, a very low 20 loading.

However, the District's desire to also utilize the wetlands for tertiary treatment was also an important design consideration. Applying an average two inches per week to the 7.27 acres is equivalent 56,000 gallons per day
containing an average BOD five of 15 milligrams
per liter equates to a loading of one pound of
BOD five per acre per day and total nitrogen
loading of 239 pounds per acre per year.

Page 120

Organic loadings is measured by BOD five in excess of 500 pounds per acre per day are common for land application systems while achieving 95 percent removal efficiency, and I provide a reference for that.

The nitrogen loading is within agronomic loading rates and can be adjusted by reducing the dry water application rate in the unlikely event the nitrates in the groundwater approach 10 milligrams per liter, class one standard.

17 On March 10, 2011, the District and its 18 design team met with the Illinois EPA to 19 present the preliminary engineering report. 20 The Agency's initial response to the design 21 seemed positive based on the initial meeting. 22 Al Keller asked about nitrates and 23 suggested that these be specifically addressed 24 in the engineering report as the Agency's

groundwater section will be reviewing any construction permit application.

The District indicated the ammonia concentration during these high-flow events is in the five to eight-milligram per liter range and no nitrates are present. So even if all of the ammonia is oxidized to nitrates, the concentration of the infiltrated water would be below 10 milligrams per liter.

¹⁰ Mr. Keller was not concerned about ¹¹ fecal coliform because there is no groundwater ¹² standard. Francis Burba, the permit engineer, ¹³ verbally simplified the project at the initial ¹⁴ meeting as just an equalization basin.

15 After our meeting, the groundwater 16 section was asked by the permit section to 17 review and comment on the preliminary 18 engineering report. An April 2011 draft memo 19 from Bill Buscher to Al Keller was provided to 20 the District. A copy of this memo is attached 21 as attachment two and also is in the record 22 Bates stamped 168. This memo contains a number 23 of problematic comments as summarized below. 24 One, the plan did not include any

1 consideration of wetland design criteria for 2 meeting the non-degradation requirements of 35 3 IL Adm. Code Part 620.301 at a distance of 4 25 feet from the edge of the impoundment. It's 5 noted in 35 IL Adm. Code Part 620.505; 6 Two, based upon the information that is 7 provided, it is expected that a liner to the 8 wetland may be necessary in order to not exceed 9 existing background concentrations in 10 groundwater; 11 And, three, six rounds of sampling from 12 the proposed monitoring wells would be required 13 for a list of inorganic parameters prior to 14 putting the wetlands in service. 15 A subsequent meeting requested by the 16 District was held with the Agency on June 6th, 17 2011 to discuss the April 2011 draft memo from 18 Mr. Buscher. At that meeting Bill Buscher 19 explained that this project would have to 20 demonstrate it meets the groundwater standards for more than nitrates and fecal coliform. 21 It 22 would have to show the down gradient monitoring 23 wells achieve background, or non-degradation.

²⁴ This would apply to all 620 parameters

Page 122

including chlorides, sulfates, and total
 dissolved solids.

3 Mr. Buscher provided a copy of Richard 4 Cobb's testimony and R08-18 from May 2008 and 5 explained that this testimony would provide an 6 understanding of the non-degradation standard 7 the District would be held to on this project. 8 A copy of what was provided by 9 Mr. Buscher is included in attachment three. 10 Mr. Buscher did not offer that the Board 11 rejected this same argument in R89-14 or that 12 this was still a pending regulation before the 13 Board. 14 The District asked whether a 15 groundwater management zone could be

established, and Mr. Buscher explained the Agency would never allow such a classification prior to discovering impacts.

At this meeting I provided the At this meeting I provided the attendees with a 2006 permit issued by the Illinois EPA that was similar to what the District was hoping to secure and have included as attachment four. This is in the record at Bates stamped pages 299 and 300.

1 This Agency-issued construction and 2 operating permit for a truck washing facility 3 utilizing percolation ponds for the treatment 4 of truck washing water and storm water and the 5 permit required installation of monitoring 6 wells after the operation began and limits the 7 parameters to be tested to the pollutants 8 associated with the operation which were only 9 three parameters.

More interesting, this permit goes on to state, quote, should groundwater quality standards be exceeded in the down gradient wells due to percolation pond discharge, the permit team must pursue one or a combination of the following choices:

One, provide treatment prior to the percolation pond discharge or perform in-house reductions prior to the wastewater generation to reduce groundwater impacts below groundwater quality criteria;

Two, apply to the Agency for a groundwater management zone or class four groundwater designation pursuant to 35 Il Adm. Code Section 620.240(e) or 620.250;

1 And, three, petition the Board for an 2 adjusted standard as provided in 35 Il Adm. 3 Code Section 620.260 or section 28.1 of the 4 Illinois Environmental Protection Act. 5 The above permit conditions are what I 6 expected the District permit would contain for 7 the proposed wetlands prior -- wetlands 8 approach based upon my experience in working 9 with the Agency. 10 There were no permit conditions 11 regarding non-degradation, and the Agency 12 provided reasonable options should the 13 groundwater become impacted. 14 The denial of the District's 15 application and the record in these proceedings 16 are clearly inconsistent with the Agency's 17 historical approach. 18 The non-degradation stance that the groundwater section is taking is particularly 19 20 troublesome. No storm water basin, cattle 21 grazing area, fertilizer application,

22 wastewater spray irrigation, or sludge

23 application can meet the non-degradation

24 standard that was being imposed on the

1 District.

Sec. 1

-

2	On June 28th, 2011, I submitted a memo
3	to the Agency responding to the six comments in
4	the draft April 2011 memo from Bill Buscher
5	Bates stamped 168 as promised in our meeting
6	with the Agency in June.
7	A number of key elements from the
8	June 28, 2011 letter are summarized below:
9	One, fecal coliform upstream on the
10	Rock River exceeds the water quality standard
11	during wet weather. The river's recharge under
12	high flow is contributing fecal coliform to the
13	groundwater;
14	Two, the proposed wetland basin is
15	located within the southeast Rockford
16	contaminated plume for chlorinated solvents, so
17	groundwater is not suitable for water supply;
18	Three, the annual BOD five loading from
19	this wetland basin is equivalent to the amount
20	of BOD five excreted by one cow in Illinois
21	onto the ground;
22	Four, the requested expensive testing
23	is far more excessive than the District
24	monitors for on its effluent, and most of the

parameters are not associated with domestic wastewater. Monitoring six times prior to placing the basin into service is not practical.

5 Development of a statistical approach 6 for establishing background was requested by 7 the Agency to allow it to apply its 8 non-degradation interpretation. It is clear 9 from Mr. Cobb's testimony in R08-18 that he 10 disagrees with the Board's interpretation on 11 non-degradation.

12 However, if Mr. Cobb's interpretation 13 would be uniformly applied in Illinois, then 14 all storm water detention basins would be 15 prohibited if they contributed chlorides to the 16 groundwater. All agricultural practices in 17 Illinois would be prohibited, contributing 18 nitrates to the groundwater along with the 19 herbicides such as Alachlor and Atrazine. 20 Cattle and poultry would not be allowed, and 21 land application of wastewater would be 22 prohibited. In the footnote to that, the 23 Illinois EPA last month held a series of public 24 meetings to present its --

Page 128 1 I'm going to object. MR. PETTI: Last 2 month. That's not possibly something that 3 could have been considered as part of the --4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We'll grant 5 it, but this is already let in. 6 MR. PETTI: Yeah, I know. I think we 7 forgot about this. 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We'll note 9 your objection. There was also something in 10 there as recent as September as well. In anv 11 event, your objection is noted. 12 You may proceed, Mr. Huff. 13 THE WITNESS: The Illinois EPA last 14 month held a series of public meetings to 15 present its concept of requiring the 16 infiltration from the first 1.3 inches of 17 precipitation without surface discharge for all 18 construction activities greater than one acre. 19 This requirement would then apply to the 20 operation phase after construction is 21 completed. 22 Storm water from urban development 23 contains many pollutants. The impact this will 24 have on the chloride level in our groundwater

Page 129 will be significant, and how the Agency can 1 2 support this while raising the non-degradation 3 issue on this matter seems totally 4 inconsistent. See attachment six. 5 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I do want to 6 note for the record that, yeah, this was 7 post-permit appeal denial letter to the Board. 8 You may proceed. 9 THE WITNESS: As noted in the June 28, 10 2011 letter, groundwater standards will be 11 achieved and no use impairment will occur. The 12 key issue is the Agency's interpretation of the 13 Board's non-degradation regulations; 14 Wetland plants by their nature have 15 long roots. And requiring a two-foot clay 16 liner, the plants will not penetrate this 17 layer. There is no clay in the Rockford area, 18 so importing clay will result in considerable 19 greenhouse gas emissions from the trucks. 20 As the groundwater and the Rock River 21 are hydraulically connected, when the river 22 rises and no excess flow is being diverted, the 23 hydraulic pressure on the 7.27-acre floor will 24 be very significant. To prevent this, massive

¹ groundwater pumps and/or relief valves across ² the floor will be needed to prevent the floor ³ from literally floating.

Simple modeling was completed that
showed that a monitoring well 25 feet down
gradient will see an increase in chloride
concentration but not above the groundwater
standard.

9 And finally, the Agency requested a 10 contingency plan in case groundwater impacts 11 The June 28, 2011 letter proposes a occur. 12 groundwater management zone as the contingency, 13 noting that the Agency routinely grants 14 groundwater use restrictions in both the Site 15 Remediation Program and the Leaking Underground 16 Storage Tank Programs.

The District never received the written The District never received the written response from the Agency, so the District verbally informed the Agency that it would formally apply for a permit which the Agency would have to formally act upon.

The District completed the detailed design and applied for a construction permit in April 2012, which included all the previously

provided documents submitted as part of the preliminary engineering discussions and meetings.

4 The Agency issued a denial letter, Bates stamped 846, on August 1st, 2012, citing 5 6 sections 12 and 39 of the Environmental 7 Protection Act and 415 ILCS 5/12 and 39, which 8 prohibit the Agency from issuing a permit for 9 any facility which would threaten, cause, or 10 allow discharge of contaminants which might 11 cause or tend to cause water pollution.

Specifically, the denial letter notes, one, a seal in accordance with section 370.932(d)(2)(D) of the Illinois Recommended Standards; and, two, an appropriate groundwater monitoring system for 35 Il Adm. Code 370.930(b)(4). This permit denial is the subject of the permit appeal before the Board.

Discussion: There are a number of technical points that I would like to make with respect to the permit denial and the Agency's position. First, a specific comment citing the Illinois Recommended Standard For Sewage Work. Those specific comments are from section 370.930 which is entitled waste stabilization
 ponds and aerated lagoons.

The proposed wetland basin is certainly not an aerated lagoon. There is no aeration devices proposed, and the intent is not to reduce the biochemical oxygen demand which the Agency presumably readily understood.

8 Therefore, the Agency must have 9 concluded that the proposed wetland basin fixed 10 the definition of a waste stabilization pond. 11 The definition of waste stabilization pond from the USEPA is as follows: Stabilization pond, 12 13 quote, receive raw, untreated wastes and usually consists of two or more cells. 14 Most 15 stabilization and oxidation ponds stabilize 16 organic waste through a complex natural process 17 involving sunlight, oxygen, water currents, algae, and bacteria action, end quote. 18 And 19 this is from the operations manual 20 stabilization ponds USEPA document 21 430-9-77-012.

As Mr. Burba noted in one of our meetings, the wetland basin is an equalization basin. It clearly does not have two or more

Page 132

cells, and it's not intended to treat the wastewater.

3 Under section 390.930(c)(2), criteria 4 for stabilization ponds, the ponds must have a 5 minimum of two feet of liquid and a maximum of 6 five feet of liquid. The proposed wetland 7 basin will have a normal liquid level of zero 8 feet and on an average once per ten years it 9 will have a maximum of ten feet for less than 10 48 hours.

It's not clear why the Agency did not cite this apparent inconsistently unless the Agency fully understood this requirement makes no sense for the proposed wetland basin.

As to the groundwater monitoring requirements, such monitoring was included in the design, see preliminary engineering report page 16, Bates stamped 41. And as Mr. Carroll noted, it's on the design drawings as well.

The Agency is apparently referring to The sentence, quote, if conditions dictate using such a site, then the potential for and the means necessary to combat groundwater contamination shall be critically evaluated in

Page 133

the engineering report, end quote.

1

2 The preliminary engineering report, the 3 June 28th, 2011 letter, and the permit 4 submitted did address these issues with respect 5 to achieving the groundwater numerical 6 standards, but also noted that the 7 non-degradation requirement the Agency believes 8 is necessary could not be achieved here or at 9 any other basin in the state. 10 When Illinois adopted the Recommended 11 Standards for Sewage Works, it recognized that 12 emerging technologies would be developed after

the document was prepared. Section 370.110 notes that the standards contained in this document apply to conventional design concepts for wastewater treatment facilities.

17 Section 370.110(b) goes on to say that for new processes the Agency will consider the 18 19 specific information submitted in accordance 20 with Section 370.520(b). Section 520(b) notes 21 that the Agency policy is to, quote, encourage 22 rather than obstruct the development of any 23 methods for treatment of wastewater. The lack 24 of inclusion in these standards of some types

of wastewater treatment processes should not be
 construed as precluding their use, emphasis
 added in quotes. Unfortunately, this section
 was not relied upon by the Agency based on its
 denial letter.

Page 135

Because the two cited regulatory
 requirements are clearly in error, the only
 remaining basis for the denial is the
 recitation of failure to show that the project
 will not result in water pollution.

11 This sole underlying issue in this 12 permit denial appears to be based on the 13 non-degradation position of the groundwater section at the Illinois EPA presented by 14 15 Mr. Buscher in the June 2011 meeting and set 16 forth in the Agency's draft letter dated 17 April 2011, attachment two and Bates stamped 18 pages 168 to 174.

Any increase in concentration above background under the Agency's interpretation of non-degradation is water pollution. Water pollution, however, is defined under the Act as, quote, is such alteration of a physical, thermal, chemical, biological, or radioactive

Page 136 properties of any waters of the State or such 1 2 discharge of any contaminant into the water of 3 the State as will or is likely to create a 4 nuisance or render such water harmful or 5 detrimental or injurious to public health, 6 safety, or welfare or to domestic, commercial, 7 industrial, agricultural, recreational, or 8 other legitimate uses or to livestock, wild animals, birds, fish, or other aquatic life, 9 10 end quote. 11 MR. GRANT: Excuse me. Can I interpret 12 and ask him to give us a citation for that, 13 please? 14 THE WITNESS: That's right out of the 15 Environment Protection definition. 16 MR. GRANT: Can you read it again, 17 please? 18 THE WITNESS: Is such alteration of a 19 physical, thermal, chemical, biological, or 20 radioactive properties of any waters of the 21 State or such discharge of any contaminant into 22 any waters of the State as will or is likely to

²⁴ or detrimental or injurious to public health,

create a nuisance or render such waters harmful

23

	Page 137
1	safety, or welfare or to domestic, commercial,
2	industrial, agricultural, recreational, or
3	other legitimate uses or to livestock, wild
4	animals, birds, fish, or other aquatic life.
5	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant,
6	next time you can ask me, and I'll decide
7	whether or not the witness will read it back.
8	MR. GRANT: Okay.
9	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsh.
10	MR. HARSCH: If you want the specific
11	cite, it's in my reply to your motion of
12	section 3.545.
13	MR. GRANT: Okay. I have it. Thank
14	you.
15	THE WITNESS: What the Act does not say
16	is that any increase in pollutant is deemed
17	water pollution. The Agency's position on this
18	permit application seems to be consistent with
19	its desire to define non-degradation as any
20	increase in pollutant concentration independent
21	of whether this will create a nuisance or
22	render such waters harmful or detrimental or
23	injurious.
24	The Agency's groundwater section

1 disagrees with the current Board's groundwater 2 regulation. See attachment three. What is 3 interesting is that this same Agency 4 groundwater section took a very different 5 approach when proposing the groundwater 6 monitoring and compliance in the Clean 7 Construction or Demolition Debris or CCDD fill 8 operation proceedings in R2012-09 which was ongoing at the exact same time the District was 9 10 trying to secure a construction permit.

Page 138

In R2012-09 the Agency proposed that CCDD facilities would have to meet either the class one groundwater standards or the background groundwater quality, whichever is higher, noting that the CCDD material would be placed directly in contact with the groundwater.

The Agency then proposed that the non-degradation provisions of Part 620 would only apply beyond the fill operation's boundaries. See R2012-009 hearing transcript from September 26, 2011, Exhibit 1 prefiled testimony of Steven F. Nightingale, Illinois EPA.

However, with only monitoring wells required on the CCDD properties, the non-degradation provisions would never kick in under the Agency's proposal.

5 And then footnote two just notes the 6 Board elected not to require the CCDD 7 facilities to install monitoring wells in the 8 final rule. However, the Board has opened up 9 an additional docket to review this issue in 10 R2012-009b.

11 The District committed to achieving the 12 class one groundwater standards 25 feet from 13 the wetland basin on the District's property. 14 See my June 28, 2011 letter to IEPA, page 4, 15 Bates stamped 268 which is totally consistent 16 with what the Agency proposed in the CCDD proceeding, but the Agency's position of 17 18 achieving non-degradation made this commitment 19 moot.

Focusing on the creating a nuisance or rendering such waters harmful or detrimental or injurious section specifically related to this permit application, the Agency is fully aware that the groundwater beneath the proposed wetland basin is impacted with chlorinated solvents by the southeast Rockford Superfund sites, and the water is not usable for potable use. See attachment five.

5 This area was proposed for a 6 groundwater management zone under the selected 7 remedy in the record of decision. To the 8 extent the proposed wetland basin will have any 9 impact on groundwater, the groundwater will be 10 limited to the RRWRD property adjacent to the 11 Rock River, and no drinking water supplies are 12 located in this area.

13 There will be no nuisance or render such waters harmful or detrimental or injurious 14 15 from this project. It should be further noted 16 the City of Rockford has routinely adopted 17 groundwater use restriction ordinances under 18 the Leaking Underground Storage Tank and Site 19 Remediation Program. And footnote three notes 20 that the Illinois EPA website lists 21 15 groundwater use restrictions approved 22 ordinances in the City of Rockford. 23 Closing: The Illinois EPA denied this

23 Closing: The Illinois EPA denied this
 24 construction permit based on criteria in the

Page 140

Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works that is clearly inappropriate for the proposed wetland basin.

The only document in the record that The only document in the record that cites any reason for denial is the draft Buscher memo of April 2011, which is attachment two to my testimony and Bates stamped 168.

8 The permit application adequately 9 addressed the concern over impacted groundwater 10 using very conservative assumptions and 11 concluded that the class one groundwater 12 standards will be achieved 25 feet from the 13 proposed excess flow basin.

14 The Agency's decision to deny the 15 application based upon alleged failure to show 16 that the project will not result in -- will 17 result in water pollution is based on the 18 groundwater section's belief that this project 19 should be denied because it cannot demonstrate 20 it will achieve of non-degradation criteria of 21 no net increase in any pollutant, the criteria 22 that the same Agency groundwater section 23 elected not to apply to the CCDD facilities in 24 the Agency's proposed regulations and certainly the Agency does not apply consistently on other projects.

Page 142

3 Agriculture including crops, cattle, and poultry operate septic systems, land 4 5 application systems, storm water retention and 6 infiltration systems, constructed wetlands used 7 for wastewater effluent polishing, and sanitary 8 sewers all contribute pollutants to the 9 groundwater and are routinely permitted by the 10 Illinois EPA.

11 For example, the District has 12 1,000 miles of sanitary lateral mains which are 13 installed relatively shallow in elevation. For new pipe the Illinois Recommended Standards for 14 Sewage Works specifies the acceptable leakage 15 16 rate of 240 gallons per mile per day per inch 17 diameter. Assuming an average lateral diameter in Rockford is 10 inches, this equates to an 18 19 acceptable leakage rate from these sewers of 20 2,400 gallons per day per mile. With 1,000 21 miles of such laterals, again assuming an 22 ex-filtration rate of new pipe, this equates to 23 a leakage rate of 2.4 million gallons per day or 876 million gallons per year. This can be 24

¹ compared to the expected infiltration rate from ² the wetland basin from the excess water ³ diversion infiltration of 2.4 million gallons ⁴ per year.

5 And I footnote that. That's assuming 6 six inches per day for two days or one foot of 7 infiltration over 7.67 acres which yields 8 2.4 million gallons. Of course, the 9 infiltration rate is a function of the 10 hydraulic head, and in this case that will be 11 the difference between the Rock River elevation 12 and the level in the basin.

13 If the basin empties, the Rock River 14 will become higher than the elevation and the 15 basin, and a significant fraction of the water 16 infiltrated out of the basin will reverse 17 direction and leach back into the basin or 18 basically the 2.4 million gallons, the same as 19 what leaks out of the sewers in one day in the 20 City of Rockford.

This concludes my prepared testimony.
 I will be happy to answer any questions.
 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,
 Mr. Huff. I think at this time we're going to

	Page 144
1	take a lunch break. What we're going to do is
2	be back at 1:20 sharp. It will take us a few
3	minutes to move over to conference room B when
4	we return.
5	(Whereupon, a recess was had.)
6	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're back
7	on the record. It's approximately 1:25,
8	November 28th, 2012. Mr. Harsch is continuing
9	his direct with Mr. Huff, his fourth witness.
10	You may proceed, Mr. Harsch.
11	MR. HARSCH: Thank you.
12	BY MR. HARSCH:
13	Q. Mr. Huff, can you explain in a little
14	more detail and maybe less technical terms how
15	the introduction of the pumped flow from the
16	interceptor to the basin will occur relative to
17	the that portion that you've estimated will
18	infiltrate and how that relates to the
19	elevation in the Rock River?
20	A. I'd be happy to. So there's the
21	flow comes into an influent sump, and complete
22	treatment is provided for everything up to
23	whatever the maximum flow is that they can
24	handle on that day.
There's then going to be, as part of the design, an overflow, so if the level rises above what they can pump through the treatment plan, that will overflow into a second sump that will then have pumps that will pump to the wetland equalization basin.

As soon as that overflow subsides that was going to the second lift station and the flows begin to subside in the incoming flow, then they would gravity drain backflow to work the basin back.

During the time that the water's in the basin, there will be some infiltration and that infiltration is a function of one -- the most confining layer which will be the first foot of topsoil which is a silty loam soil with some clay in there, and it's also a function of the elevation in the Rock River.

When the Rock River is down at normal elevations, groundwater flow is toward the river. But when this basin is going to be used, you're truly talking these once-a-year-type events, then that Rock River's qoing to quickly come up in elevation.

And so the infiltration rate is a function, as I said, of the most -- the restrictive layer which would be the top foot of soil and also the relative head which is the difference between what's in the Rock River and what's in the basin.

And so when you -- my belief is that the basin is likely to respond sooner so that water would go into this basin ahead of when we see the elevation in the Rock River, but within hours that Rock River will come up in elevation. And so that infiltration rate will begin to wean as that river elevation comes up.

And if the river elevation gets higher than what's in the basin which will happen on a fairly regular basis, then basically instead of infiltrating into the groundwater, the groundwater is going to basically reverse direction and come back up into that basin.

And then that would all be worked back through the treatment plant where it will be given complete treatment through the wastewater treatment plant.

Q. The bottom of the proposed basin, how

24

Page 147 does that relate to the -- some assumed 1 2 elevation in the Rock River? 3 Α. Well, that's a good question. So the 4 Rock River under normal flows approximately 5 three feet below the Rock River. And so until 6 that Rock River comes up at least three feet, 7 they're not dependent on one another. 8 The top of the operating level in that 9 basin, which is at approximately 700 feet mean 10 sea level, is basically at the 100-year flood 11 off the Rock River. So the highest we'd get in 12 that basin is equivalent to the 100-year flood. 13 I'll point out there's also a 14 three-foot curb or dike above the flood stage 15 so that the Rock River is not going to overflow 16 back into this basin unless you have probably a 17 once in 500-year type of integrator. 18 And these -- this elevation is an Ο. 19 interrelationship in the data and reports that 20 you submitted to the Agency? 21 Α. Yes, sir, it was. 22 0. So for those periods of time when the 23 Rock River elevation is below the bottom of the 24 basin, is that when it would be -- the basin

through infiltration would drain some portion of its contents?

A. Into the groundwater, that's correct, assuming that the basin had freestanding water in it.

Q. And if the Rock River level then increases and you've used the basin and you've had infiltration of so many inches that you've calculated and presented, where is that -where does that infiltrated water go?

A. So the water is going to go down in what's called a plug-flow fashion toward the groundwater. It's going to go down as a block.

And then as that elevation comes up, it's basically going to be to a large extent that same water that's going to come -- that infiltrated that would come back into that basin.

The only mixing that you're going to get as it goes down to the groundwater is through diffusion. And then once it's hit the groundwater, there would be also whatever lateral velocity. Both of those, in a short term period of a day or two, would be

Page 149 1 negligible compared to the hydraulic pushback. 2 And once that water had gotten back Ο. 3 into the basin, is there -- why would the 4 District continue to pump or drain that back 5 into the treatment plant? 6 Α. The design calls for wetland plants, 7 and we specified wetland plants that can stand 8 a short-term 48 hours of submergence. 9 So the design concept would be that to 10 the extent when that Rock River is at flood 11 stage condition where you have infiltration 12 coming into the basin, they will need to drain 13 that water out to basically maintain the 14 viability of the wetland plants. 15 It's your opinion that there's no doubt Ο. 16 this basin would function in a manner that the 17 groundwater quality standards would always be 18 met through the monitoring wells 25 feet from 19 the basin? 20 Α. The groundwater standards, yes, that is 21 my opinion. 22 You're familiar with the e-mail that 0. Marcia Wilhite sent to me in May regarding the 23 24 recitation of their concerns over this project?

	Page 150
1	A. I've read that e-mail, yes.
2	Q. I'll show you what's in the Agency
3	record as 179. That's that e-mail.
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. That e-mail refers to the Agency's
6	concerns over degrading the groundwater,
7	correct?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And can you explain they list a
10	Marcia lists a number of parameters where the
11	Agency has concerns.
12	Did you address those specific
13	parameters in your written submittals to the
14	Agency?
15	A. Yes, I did. And those specific
16	parameters that are referenced in here
17	specifically are nitrates and chlorides, which
18	were specifically addressed in both the
19	preliminary engineering report and in the
20	permit application and the June 11th memo.
21	Q. And can you summarize briefly what the
22	response was to the nitrates?
23	A. Sure. So under high-flow conditions,
24	the influent to the wastewater treatment plant,

the nitrogen is in a reduced form. So that would be either ammonia nitrogen or organic nitrogen.

So -- and our estimate, again, So -- and our estimate, again, conservative is that the concentration of the total nitrogen would be on the order of five to eight milligrams per liter. That would be in that basin for up to two days until it drained back.

10 There's going to be no change in the 11 state of those nitrogen compounds in that short 12 period of time. So to the extent that it 13 infiltrated into the ground, it would be in the 14 form of ammonia and organic nitrogen. But even 15 if it all converted to nitrates, if you only 16 start with five to eight milligrams per liter, 17 that's what you would end up with from a 18 complete conversion.

So Marcia noted that the -- these sewage constituents may act differently than the volatile organic compound contamination from the Superfund site, and she's exactly right.

24

The volatile organic compounds migrate

at a much higher velocity. There's no retardation, and the degradation of those compounds is a fraction of the degradation rates on the ammonia compounds.

Q. And the other parameter of concerns was
 ⁶ chlorides?

A. Chlorides. Chlorides are what you
 would call a conservative pollutant. There is
 basically no degradation. They're for all
 practical purposes, no retardation.

¹¹ So if you put 100 pounds of chlorides ¹² into the groundwater, it would be diluted, but ¹³ those 100 pounds are then going to migrate to ¹⁴ wherever the outlet is for that groundwater ¹⁵ whether -- in this case the Rock River or it ¹⁶ would come back up.

Q. And that would be true whether it was chlorides in this dilute wastewater stream at the time of high rainfall events or storm water in an urban area?

A. Well, any highway project, sodium chloride is the primary deicing compound. And so you always have elevated chlorides in storm water runoff that starts out frankly in the

Page 153 winter months, and then that actually will 1 2 continue to contribute significant chlorides 3 based on recent work done on the DuPage River and Salt Creek through much of the summer. 4 5 So, yeah, chlorides is an issue statewide. It's an issue nationally because 6 7 we're going to have safe roads, and we don't 8 really have a viable alternative to the sodium 9 chloride use. 10 And just -- and to add to that, the 11 chlorides that we identified here are those 12 exact same chlorides during the winter deicing. 13 To the extent that that's infiltrating into the 14 sewers, there is a potential in the heavy 15 spring rain that there could be higher

¹⁶ chlorides than what the background levels would ¹⁷ be.

I don't think that would be an issue at all under a rain in the summer or the fall, but in the spring where there's a lot of salt that's been deposited before that rain, it could be an issue.

Q. Do you agree with the previous responses by the witnesses that the basin was

not designed to provide any treatment? 1 2 If I could expound on that, it's just Α. 3 like the maximum wet weather flow. The facility was designed for maximum wet weather 4 5 flow of 80 million gallons a day, but that doesn't mean that's the maximum they can put 6 7 through the plant. That was the design. 8 And Mr. Droessler was exactly right 9 when he said that this equalization basin was not designed for treatment. It was designed as 10 11 an equalization basin. 12 If your question is will there be 13 treatment associated with the water that's put 14 in there, then there is, indeed, treatment that's associated with it. It was just not 15 16 contemplated as part of the design. 17 And that treatment would -- is it Ο. 18 treatment or is it simply that less pollutants 19 reach the groundwater because of the natural 20 conditions? 21 Well, it would be treatment in my mind. Α. 22 I mean, we need to get pollutant specific. As I said, chlorides, there really would be no 23

²⁴ treatment there.

Page 154

Ammonia nitrogen would be taken up originally by the cationic exchange capacity of the soils, and, ultimately, it would be either taken up by the plants, possibly nitrified, the nitrates under dry conditions only.

Typically, with wetlands you have a lot of saturated groundwater. And so to the extent that you have nitrates present, they denitrify and produce nitrogen gas. So you'd get a very high degree reduction of nitrogen.

And then if you talk about fecal coliform, the fecal coliform -- wetland plants' efficiency in removing bacteria and reducing bacteria is very high and then the ground itself.

16 And this is why we have so many -septic systems are very effective in reducing 17 18 fecal coliform matter primarily, initially 19 through filtration phenomenas [sic]. The 20 bacteria tend to grow in clumps, and they're 21 filtered out. But then they have a pretty short half life actually in the groundwater. 22 23 So you get a very dramatic reduction just 24 through the death of fecal coliform in

1 groundwater as well.

Q. Is it -- when you're sending a design to the Illinois EPA, is it normal to present worst case assumptions?

A. Absolutely. And that's exactly what I believe we did here. If we go back to the recommended design standards on the specifications in their example, the identifier surface overflow rate, those are very conservative designed standards by the Illinois EPA.

And I believe any practitioner will tell you -- and Rockford is a case in point -they can successfully operate under most conditions at considerably higher rates than what's in the recommended design standard. They're conservative by nature.

Q. Do you -- so was the infiltration rate that you used a conservative rate?

A. We assumed, for calculation purposes, six inches per day for 48 hours. So that would be the maximum that water would be in the basin.

24

And, again, it's the -- once that river

had -- exceeds what's in that basin, that infiltration rate would go to zero. And as I indicated earlier, typically, the infiltration rate is controlled by the least permeable zone.

5 In this case, that topsoil will be the topsoil that's on the site. And there's enough 6 7 clay in there and enough silt that if you go back and design this as septic systems are, 8 9 this would be classified as what's called a class five or six soil. And the percolation 10 11 rate that would be used on a septic field with 12 this type soil would be 1.2 inches per day.

And so I think my six inches was a very And so I think my six inches was a very liberal estimate, which I did intentionally just so that we didn't get in a question of what that number should be.

Q. And the result of using that larger more liberal number versus what you actually think will occur would result in what?

A. Well, there would be approximately only 21 20 percent of what we have predicted in the way 22 of infiltration would be infiltrated into the 23 groundwater.

Q. And the soil types in this information

24

Page 157

¹ was provided in the documentation provided to ² the Agency?

A. Yes, sir. The design and also the preliminary engineering report and the filed one all included the boring logs that showed the types of soil that were there and the topsoil, and the description indicated we were going to use that topsoil in the wetland basin as the topsoil bore in there.

Q. Is it normal, in your opinion based on your experience, to meet with the Agency and seek their comments on projects before you submit applications?

A. Well, before today I would have said absolutely yes, but then when I heard that the only thing that counts is their final letter, I'm sitting here, frankly, in shock.

Clearly, what we were proposing was a new technology. I would never propose a new technology without getting early concurrence from the Agency.

And I think here it was particularly important because we were trying to avoid incurring the cost for the detailed engineering

Page 159 and trying to get approval or a denial which, 1 2 frankly, we never got. And we had to go 3 through the cost of putting together the 4 detailed design to force the Agency to give us 5 the denial that was apparently coming. 6 MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I 7 don't have any further questions. 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 9 Mr. Petti? 10 CROSS-EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. PETTI: 12 The six inches per day, the 48 hours Q. 13 that you were discussing, that's the leakage 14 rate of the basin, for lack of a better term, 15 correct? 16 Worst case. Α. 17 Ο. Yeah. 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 0. Well, it's also the case that you 20 presented at your June -- the June 28th, 2011 21 letter; is that correct? 22 Α. Yes, sir. 23 Q. Okay. 24 Α. So, again, a design type of number.

Page 160 1 0. Yeah. Well, that's the number you 2 presented to the Agency as your -- as you said, 3 the worst case estimate of what the leakage 4 rate would be, correct? 5 Α. Yes, sir. 6 Okay. And that led to or based on the Ο. 7 estimation would lead to, according to your 8 letter, two million gallons of wastewater from 9 the basin entering the groundwater, correct? 10 Α. Two million gallons of wastewater that 11 also includes a high percentage of storm waters 12 that's in there. Okay. That's not pure 13 domestic sewage. 14 Well, it's the wastewater that was Ο. 15 pumped to the facility and then up into the 16 overflow basin, correct? 17 Α. Gravity flows into the wastewater 18 treatment plant and -- but what comes in also 19 includes a significant amount of infiltration 20 and likely some sources of inflow that's 21 directly attributed to a significant storm 22 event. 23 Sure. But once it's entered the stream 0. 24 of wastewater, it's wastewater; it's no

Page 161 1 longer -- it's not -- you don't have two 2 separate pipes feeding the basin, correct? 3 There's not a wastewater pipe and a 4 storm water pipe? 5 Α. There is not two separate pipes. 6 Q. Okay. Thank you. 7 And that two million gallons receives 8 no treatment from that -- that doesn't receive 9 pretreatment from the facility of any form, 10 correct? 11 No, sir, you're not correct. Α. 12 Ο. I'm not correct? 13 You're not correct. Α. 14 Q. Please correct me. 15 It goes through a bar screen as Α. 16 pretreatment ahead of the wetland basin. 17 And I believe that's the bar screen Ο. 18 that we discussed earlier today with, I think, 19 it was Mr. Droessler? 20 Α. Correct. 21 Okay. And that's the only treatment 0. that is received by the water before it enters 22 23 the basin? 24 Α. Before it enters the basin, you are

Page 162 1 correct. 2 Q. Yes. And then your testimony now, I 3 just want to try to understand it a little bit 4 more while it's fresh in my mind. 5 You're saying that the wastewater that is held in the basin for up to 48 hours, it 6 7 will also be treated by the basin through 8 natural --9 Α. No, that's not accurate. 10 Yeah. 0. I may have misunderstood that 11 then. 12 Α. So the rain events will typically last 13 about a 24-hour period of time. 14 0. Uh-huh. 15 Α. So the second 24 hours is really 16 dewatering of that basin, meaning that you're 17 gravity flowing that water back into the headworks of the plant to provide complete 18 19 treatment. 20 So that then says that you have this 21 leakage rate theoretically of a million gallons that is basically infiltrated into the top part 22 23 of the topsoil where the wetland plants are, 24 and that will receive significant treatment.

Q. How? Α. Well, a variety of things. You have a lot of root zones of all these plants. They have a pretty good root zone. So you have a lot of uptake in the nitrogen compounds. There's some indication that wetland plants, they don't fully understand the biology behind it, but they clearly get a very significant die off of fecal coliform through any kind of wetland area. And then you get very significant filtration by the soil itself. And a significant component of the BOD is in a particulate form. You have both soluble and particulate, and you've got a very viable bacterial population that exists on the base of that wetland that's going to continue to reduce the BOD as well. Q. So you don't agree with the testimony -- and I think I may be repeating what we just went over. But you don't agree with the testimony earlier from Mr. Carroll that there's no

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

treatment that will go on in the basin?

A. I think the testimony, the intent was that we didn't design this wetland equalization basin to provide treatment. Our intent was to bring back that water through and get complete treatment through the wastewater treatment facility.

Page 164

So you'd have to read me the transcript where Mr. Carroll said that there was no treatment in the wetland. I don't believe he said that. We didn't design it for that. We designed it as an equalization basin.

Q. On page four of Mr. Droessler's testimony -- and I'll show you -- it says, "The excess flow basin as proposed in the permit application does not provide any level of treatment of organic material nor is it aerated in any form."

A. I agree with that statement with respect to the intent was to put the water in there, hold it until the flow subsides, and to then bring it back into the basin.

Q. So this does not provide any treatment?
A. Well, the basin will clearly provide
treatment of the water that was infiltrated.

Page 165 1 You asked me to show you the testimony, Ο. 2 and I --3 Α. Fine. So then I don't agree with that 4 blanket statement. I was trying to clarify 5 what he was referring to. 6 Okay. In your own testimony -- and Ο. 7 this may be just because it's written and I 8 need to understand it better -- on page 9 right in the middle before -- right after the part 9 10 you've pulled out of stabilization, it says, "As Mr. Burba noted in one of our meetings, the 11 12 wetland basin is an equalization basin. It 13 clearly does not have two or more cells, and it 14 is not intended to treat wastewater." 15 Was that a statement you attributed to 16 Mr. Burba or is that your statement, that it is 17 not intended to treat wastewater? 18 That was mine. Α. The --19 Q. Okay. 20 Mr. Burba's -- I attributed that he Α. simplified after our meeting that, well, 21 22 basically what you're proposing is an 23 equalization. 24 Okay. Thank you. Now, you're -- I've Q.

Page 166 asked this question of pretty much everybody, 1 2 and I'll ask it of you. 3 You're aware that the treatment 4 facility operates under an NPDES permit, 5 correct? 6 Α. The Rockford wastewater treatment 7 plant, yes, sir. 8 0. Yes. That's -- and have you reviewed 9 that permit in your preparation of materials 10 for the application and the discussions you had 11 with Illinois EPA prior to the application --12 Α. No, sir, on both accounts. 13 Were you involved at all in the Ο. 14 discussions for the cost of the overall plan 15 for implementation of the basin and 16 installation of the basin and the wetland? 17 Α. To the extent we provided the cost for 18 the wetland planting, that would be the sum 19 extent of our involvement. 20 Ο. Okay. When you set out to put together 21 the overall plan for the overflow basin, was 22 the goal at the outset to create the overflow 23 basin or was it to create the wetland? 24 Which was the ultimate goal?

Page 167 1 Α. Well, I think that's really a question 2 more appropriate for the client. 3 0. What was your goal? 4 Α. Our goal was to design what we felt was 5 a greener sustainable approach to the 6 traditional equalization basin by maximum use 7 of a wetland as part of that. 8 Ο. Thank you. In doing that -- and 9 there's been a lot of discussion already about 10 the installation of a liner and how that was 11 not really feasible according to some of the testimony because the hydrologic pressure would 12 13 push it up or bow it, and I think it was in 14 your testimony as well that it would damage any liner that may be put in; is that accurate? 15 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 And it's your belief that a liner of Ο. 18 any kind that would be placed under this basin 19 is not feasible for this location; is that 20 correct? 21 Α. Not feasible, I'm not sure I agree with 22 that statement. 23 Ο. Could you explain? 24 Α. Well, sure. I think it's a question of

Page 168 1 how one would do that and the associated cost 2 for that versus the benefits that you get. Ι 3 mean, could we put a clay liner in there? 4 Absolutely. Would it fail? That's a second 5 question. What would be the life of that? 6 But we may have to put in massive 7 dewatering pumps underneath that to keep that 8 groundwater from heaving that -- the floor on 9 there which would just absolutely make this 10 project cost prohibitive. 11 Was that ever -- was a cost analysis of Ο. 12 a system like that ever performed, to your 13 knowledge? 14 Α. My understanding is that Mr. Droessler 15 looked at what it would cost to add in a clay 16 liner of two feet in here. So it's my 17 understanding he did look at that. 18 0.

Q. And to your understanding, that's -have you seen that number or heard that number in any of the testimony today to be 800,000 to \$1 million for a clay liner?

A. I believe around \$1 million from what I
 recall.

Q. And if you were to put just a basin out

Page 169 1 there with a clay liner in it assuming one that 2 would function, as, you know, the two-foot clay 3 liner that's been proposed by Illinois EPA, if 4 you were to eliminate the wetland qualities of 5 this proposed facility, would that 6 significantly reduce the costs? 7 Α. To put in a clay liner --8 0. But eliminate --9 -- but eliminate the plants. So you're Α. 10 looking at --11 Eliminate the plants and eliminate the 0. 12 need to reroute some of the effluent to water 13 the plants. 14 You know, rerouting that water, the Α. 15 effluent is a very green positive thing. That's an environmental good. We're taking 16 17 water out --18 Q. That's not my question, though. I'm 19 asking --20 Well, I just want to make sure that you Α. 21 understand it. 22 I understand. I understand. 0. I'm 23 asking about costs. 24 I don't believe those costs are Α.

Page 170 1 significant. And the overall -- the -- your 2 other question on the wetland plants, I believe we had a budget on the order of \$30,000 per 3 4 acre. 5 0. And I understand that about the plants. Okay. So I think that answers your 6 Α. 7 question. 8 0. Yes. 9 Α. Okay. If I could just clarify that as 10 well. If you don't have plants in there, are 11 you just going to have a bare earthen clay liner? And if you are going to do that, how 12 13 are you going to keep it from cracking during 14 dry period? 15 Ο. That question is better asked to people 16 smarter than me. 17 Well, my point is that it's not as Α. simple as what you're alluding to, that you 18 19 just put in a clay liner. 20 Well, okay. Okay. Obviously, this 0. 21 facility is a wastewater treatment facility, 22 correct? 23 Α. This facility, again, is the Rock 24 River --

		Page 171
1	Q.	Yes.
2	Α.	wastewater treatment plant.
3	Q.	Yes. And it's the District that runs
4	that fa	cility
5	Α.	Yes.
6	Q.	that's seeking to install this
7	overflo	w basin and the constructed wetland?
8	Α.	Correct.
9	Q.	And it's not a CCDD disposal site,
10	correct	?
11	Α.	It's not a CCDD?
12	Q.	Disposal síte, correct?
13	Α.	Disposal site, it is not.
14	Q.	And it's not a truck wash?
15	Α.	It is not.
16	Q.	And it's not a leaking underground
17	storage	tank property?
18	Α.	It is not.
19	Q.	Not a feed lot?
20	Α.	Nope.
21	Q.	Okay. You know, and I just wanted to
22	briefly	touch on the permit that you cited in
23	your tes	stimony for the truck wash.
24		You're familiar with what I'm talking

Page 172 1 about? 2 Α. Yes, sir. 3 Okay. Was that -- that truck wash was 0. an existing facility, was it not? 4 5 Before that permit -- the permit section that you cited in your testimony was 6 7 included in the facility's permit? That facility already existed, correct? 8 9 Α. I can't answer that question. I don't 10 know. 11 Q. You don't know? Okay. 12 I don't know. Α. 13 Q. Clearly, the overflow basin here is not 14 an already existing site; this would be a new 15 construction? 16 The overflow basin? Α. 17 The overflow basin that we're talking 0. 18 about for the Districts. 19 Α. But not the existing excess flow that 20 they're trying to remediate. 21 Q. Well, no. 22 Α. That exists today. 23 Yeah. I understand that. Ο. 24 Α. Okay.

Page 173 1 Ο. I'm talking about the construction of the facility, the basin; that would be new 2 3 construction? 4 Right. Α. 5 0. Okay. So am I correct? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Okay. And you talked a little bit in Ο. 8 your testimony about livestock waste, correct? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Ο. That was discussed. 11 And those lagoons are lined pursuant to 12 regulations, correct? 13 Which lagoons? I'm talking about the Α. 14 cattle that are just out grazing. 15 0. You're not talking about the waste 16 lagoons? 17 Α. Nope. I'm talking about the cattle 18 themselves. 19 Okay. Then I think possibly we're Ο. 20 talking about different things. 21 You testified that the facility -- and 22 there's been other testimony on this -- that 23 the facility already leaks 2.4 million gallons 24 a day of untreated wastewater, correct?

Page 174 1 Α. The facility, no. 2 Ο. The District itself, the entire system. 3 Α. The sewer system of the laterals, not 4 the mains, but just the laterals. 5 Q. Okay. 6 Α. I just -- I put that in to give you a relative perspective of the volume we're 7 8 talking about. 9 0. Okay. And would you say that the 10 maintenance goal of the District on all the 11 sewer lines are to reduce the amount of 12 leakage? 13 That leakage rate I gave you is what Α. 14 IEPA expects from new pipe. So they would be 15 thrilled if they could probably get down to 16 that level throughout their system. That's new 17 piping. 18 Q. Is the goal to increase leakage? 19 Α. No. 20 Q. Okay. 21 Α. So if they can get down to that level, 22 they would be better off. 23 0. Also, in your testimony you discussed 24 or expressed disappointment that section

Page 175 1 370.520(b), it's on page 9 of 10 of your 2 testimony, you were critical that the Agency 3 did not rely on this section. But that section 4 addresses treatment. 5 And am I wrong in the reading of that? 6 I mean, I assume you've quoted it 7 accurately here. I don't have it in front of 8 me, but I'm assuming you quoted it accurately 9 saying that "It encourages rather than obstructs the development of any methods for 10 11 treatment of wastewaters." 12 That's accurate, correct? 13 To my knowledge, that's accurate, yes, Α. 14 sir. 15 But there is -- this basin isn't for Ο. 16 treatment, correct? 17 Α. I think you're dead wrong on that, sir. Well, there's testimony from yourself 18 0. 19 in here that says it wasn't treatment, and 20 there's testimony that we heard earlier today that says it -- treatment -- this isn't part of 21 22 treatment. 23 I'd be happy to clarify. Α. 24 Q. Please.

1 Α. So what you're citing here are the 2 Illinois Recommended Standards for treatment, 3 correct? 4 0. I'm citing what you're citing. 5 Α. Well, that's what this is from. 6 Ο. Okay. 7 Α. And what you're implying is that if I 8 put in an equalization basin I don't need to 9 get a construction permit from EPA because it's 10 not treatment and I'm not -- with all due 11 respect, you can ask the Agency permit group

12 whether they concur that we could put in an 13 equalization basin at the front end and that 14 not be deemed treatment under the Illinois 15 Recommended Standards.

16 It's absolutely treatment under the 17 Illinois Recommended Design Standards.

18 Ο. The overflow basin is considered --19 Α. It's part of a wastewater treatment 20 system. It has to be permitted and the same 21 regulations on the Illinois Recommended Design 22 Standards.

23 0. So as part of the treatment process, 24 does this basin fall under the NPDES standards?

Page 177 1 Α. So NPDES relates to the discharge and 2 the limits on that. What you're really talking about -- in Illinois, we have a separate set 3 4 where you have to get a construction permit. 5 Ο. Sure. 6 Α. And this absolutely falls, I believe, 7 under a construction permit or we wouldn't be 8 here. 9 You also have in your testimony -- and 0. I apologize, I don't know where it was, and if 10 11 I misstate, feel free to correct me, of 12 course -- that there were three components that 13 you -- this may have been in your June 14 letter -- that you were looking to monitor, and 15 they were based on the effluent that's 16 monitored from the facility, correct, the BOD, 17 fecal coliform, and pH, I believe? 18 Α. I'm having trouble. 19 Q. All right. 20 Α. I'm sorry. That's fine. Just so we're looking at 21 Q. 22 the same thing. 23 It says, "Bates 187." It's the June 28th, 2011 letter, is that accurate, your 24

Page 178 letter to --Α. Yes, that's my letter. Okay. The letter to Alan Keller. Q. On page 3 of that letter, Bates 189 under section two, test for host of inorganics and for six times before start up, in that paragraph, you discuss that the Rock River Water Reclamation District discharges about 30 million gallons a day to the Rock River, and it is not required to monitor this intensively for any of these parameters except BOD, fecal coliform, pH. And you're referring back to parameters that were listed in a draft memo from Mr. Buscher? Α. That's absolutely correct. Okay. And later on in here, it says --0. Okay. I'm confusing this with the testimony at this point. How did -- let me ask it this way: How did you determine that those three parameters you did not have a problem testing for? Α. Well, I think you're misreading that statement. There was a list from Mr. Buscher,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 179 1 and those were the only three that are even 2 remotely related to municipal wastewater. 3 Ο. At the end you state that the -- "has 4 no problem monitoring for the parameters associated with municipal wastewater but 5 6 believe this requested list is excessive." 7 In your testimony you also stated that 8 there -- I believe the number was 620 --9 additional -- on page 5 right near the middle. 10 Α. That was referring to section 620 of 11 the 35 Il Adm. Code. 12 Ο. Got it. All 620 parameters, not 600 13 and --14 Correct. Α. 15 Section 620 parameters, not 620 0. 16 parameters? 17 Α. Correct. 18 Okay. That's what I needed to clarify. Q. 19 Have you reviewed the denial letter in 20 this matter? 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 And can you show me where -- can you Q. 23 point out where in the denial letter you 24 believe that the non-degradation is discussed

Page 180 1 where there is a mention of the 620 regs? 2 Α. I think that was covered in my 3 testimony. If you want to give me a copy of 4 that letter or show me, I'll walk you through. 5 Ο. Sure. It's number one, under tab number one. It's Bates number 846 of the 6 7 record, August 1, 2012 letter to Steve 8 G-r-a-c-e-f-f-a, District director. 9 Α. Well, I believe it's in the second 10 paragraph. Sections 12 and 39 of the 11 Environmental Protection Act 415 ILCS 5/12 and 12 39 prohibit the Agency from issuing a permit 13 from a facility which would threaten, cause, or 14 allow the discharge of contaminants which might 15 cause or tend to cause water pollution in 16 Illinois. 17 I believe that is the issue right there 18 on the non-degradation. 19 Ο. So it's your testimony that that's 20 referring to the 620 regs? 21 Α. I think that's a key part of it. 22 MR. PETTI: Thank you. I don't have 23 anything further. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?
	Page 181
1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. HARSCH:
3	Q. Mr. Huff, throughout this project that
4	you've been involved in, you understand that
5	you do not that the District is striving to
6	comply with the Compliance Commitment Agreement
7	and eliminate existing sanitary sewer
8	overflows?
9	A. Yes, sir.
10	Q. Where do those sanitary sewer overflows
11	occur now; do you know?
12	A. Only in general terms. My
13	understanding is that they have adequate
14	transport capacity to the wastewater treatment
15	plant.
16	So when the pumps can't keep up, they
17	have two choices. They can allow it to back up
18	through the main interceptor resulting in
19	street flooding as well as basement backups,
20	and they also have the capabilities to bypass
21	the plant in order to protect it.
22	And so they would have raw sewage
23	basically bypassing the treatment plant
24	discharging to the Rock River under those

Page 182 1 extreme conditions. 2 Or an overflow from a manhole --0. 3 Α. Right. 4 Q. -- an interceptor at the treatment 5 plant? 6 Α. Right. 7 And the use of an interceptor to --0. 8 excuse me. 9 The use of a basin, full equalization 10 basin to temporarily store excess flows, is 11 that a common means of addressing overflows, 12 sewer overflows? 13 Α. Both in sanitary and combined sewer 14 communities, yes. 15 Q. And the purpose of that is to hold the 16 material so that you can get it to the treatment plant for treatment? 17 18 Α. Your alternative would be to greatly increase the size, the capacity of each of the 19 20 unit operations at the treatment plant that you 21 would use one or two days a year in the case of 22 Rockford. 23 So it's a much more cost effective way

than to try to expand the treatment plant to a

24

Page 183 1 145 or 155-million-gallon-a-day capacity. 2 MR. HARSCH: I have no further 3 questions. 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti? 5 MR. PETTI: Briefly. 6 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. PETTI: 8 0. In holding that wastewater before it 9 gets to the treatment plant, you're not trying 10 to discharge that material that's being held though; you want it to all get to the treatment 11 12 plant, don't you? You're talking specifically about our 13 Α. 14proposed wetland? 15 I'm talking about in an overflow basin, 0. 16 the goal is to still get all of the wastewater 17 treated by the treatment plant? 18 I guess I would say your goal is to Α. 19 maximize how much you can get treated through 20 the treatment plant. 21 And minimize the amount of wastewater Ο. 22 that's lost to groundwater or backup overflow, 23 correct? 24 Α. Or bypass, sure.

Page 184 1 MR. PETTI: Okay. Nothing further. 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any 3 reredirect, Mr. Harsch? 4 MR. HARSCH: Nope. 5 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, 6 Mr. Huff. 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 8 (Whereupon, the witness was 9 excused.) 10 (Whereupon, the witness was 11 duly sworn.) 12 FRANCIS ROBERT BURBA, 13 called as a witness herein, having been first 14 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. HARSCH: 17 Q. Mr. Burba, would you please state your full name for the record? 18 19 Α. My name is Francis Robert Burba. 20 Can you explain your role with regard 0. to the application that was submitted by the 21 22 Rock River Water Reclamation District and the 23 ultimate denial by the Agency of that 24 application?

Page 185 1 Α. I was assigned as the permit review 2 engineer for the construction permit. 3 Ο. And what does a permit review engineer 4 do when they review a permit? 5 Basically, we review the project Α. 6 against the standards -- the Illinois 7 standards, recommended standards for sewage 8 works. 9 0. And when you -- do you have a work 10 product or something that -- when you review 11 it, do you prepare anything? 12 No. I review what's been submitted to Α. 13 me. I don't try to do anything independent of 14 that. 15 Q. How do you communicate the results of 16 your review? 17 Α. If there's no deviations found, I draft 18 a permit. It's later reviewed and approved 19 through my unit manager to our permit section 20 manager. Anything to do with sewage treatment plants requires the permit section manager. 21 22 0. You participated in the initial 23 meetings between the District and the Agency 24 before the permit was filed; is that correct?

Page 186 1 Α. One meeting, yes. 2 Q. The very first one? 3 I don't know that. All I know is the Α. 4 one that I attended. 5 You were here when Mr. Huff testified 0. 6 earlier. I believe that you had characterized 7 this as a flow equalization basin? 8 Α. Correct. 9 Do you agree with that, his 0. recollection of your statement? 10 11 Α. Correct. 12 In your mind, what's a flow 0. 13 equalization basin? 14 Flow equalization means that you take Α. above the maximum flow that the treatment plant 15 16 can handle, divert it, and later bring it back 17 online to the treatment plant for full 18 treatment. 19 Did you prepare the denial letter? 0. 20 Α. Correct. 21 When did you determine that this Ο. 22 project as proposed was either an extended 23 aeration basin or a waste stabilization 24 project?

Page 187 I didn't. The project is not designed 1 Α. 2 as that. 3 So in your opinion it's neither one of Q. 4 those two? 5 Α. Correct. 6 This is Respondent's Exhibit 1. That's Q. 7 the denial letter? 8 Α. Uh-huh. 9 0. In the denial letter, what is cited as being the deficiency in terms of what 10 11 provisions of the design standards are not 12 being met? 13 Part 370.930(d)(2)(D) of the Illinois Α. 14 Recommended Standards for Sewage Works, and it 15 specifically indicates the seal shall have a 16 permeability less than one times ten to the 17 minus seventh power centimeters per second. 18 Do you know what this -- offhand Q. without looking what this -- what portion of 19 20 the rules that citation is to? 21 Α. This is in our standards. Rules? 22 0. Yes. What portion of the standards, 23 what type of unit it applies to? 24 Α. It's under sewage works. The heading

Page 188 probably -- the broad heading is waste 1 2 stabilization aerated lagoons. I think that's 3 the broad topic. I can see it. 4 0. I can show you a copy. 5 Α. Yeah. 6 Is that the rule that's basically 0. 7 cited? 8 Α. Right. That's out of that section. 9 Q. If I understand your prior answer, this 10 is not a waste stabilization pond or an aerated 11 lagoon; is that correct? 12 Α. That is correct. 13 Q. In your opinion, is what is proposed 14 actually subject to this rule? 15 Α. Yes. That's the most ample technology 16 for this basin. 17 0. Can you explain that? 18 Α. The purpose is to build a basin large 19 enough for the hydraulic flow and to contain 20 that flow. 21 So you're applying this rule by Q. 22 analogy? 23 Α. By direct examination. I looked at the 24 plans, and they don't provide for a seal.

Page 189 And it's your opinion that despite the 1 Ο. 2 rule being entitled waste stabilization pond or 3 aerated lagoons and it's neither of those that 4 this rule is applicable? 5 Α. Correct. 6 MR. HARSCH: I'd like to mark a copy of 7 the rule as Petitioner's Exhibit 6, I believe, 8 since we've referred to it and have it 9 introduced into evidence. 10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 11 Any objection? 12 MR. GRANT: None. 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Petitioner's 14 Exhibit 6 is admitted into evidence. 15 BY MR. HARSCH: 16 If this would have been a project for a Ο. 17 clarifier, for example, and it was proposed 18 with an overflow rate double the rate in the 19 rule --20 Α. I wouldn't approve it. 21 -- how would the denial letter read? 0. 22 Α. It exceeded the standards. 23 Would the denial letter also reference 0. 24 the other provisions that are contained in this

Page 190 1 denial letter in terms of the Act? 2 Α. Those are pretty much stock language. 3 Q. So, again, if we're looking at 4 Exhibit 1, this is potentially a form in which 5 you'd fill in then where the specific 6 provisions does not meet or fulfill the 7 requirements of 309.241 and then you'd list the 8 specific rule that you believe was not being 9 met? 10 Α. That's correct. 11 0. Did you attend any of the meetings with 12 Marcia Wilhite and Sanjay Sofat where this 13 permit application was discussed? 14 Α. No. 15 Would you normally have seen all of the Q. 16 materials that the Agency relied upon in making 17 its decision at some point, you know, during 18 your review of the application? 19 Anything that probably took place prior Α. 20 to the actual construction permit I probably 21 would have. 22 I'm going to show you what has been put Ο. 23 in the Agency's permit record at Bates stamped 24 848.

Page 191 1 Can you tell me what this document is? 2 Α. This page or this page (indicating)? 3 Q. All of them. The subsequent pages. 4 Α. Okay. The top page says, "Washington, 5 Indiana combined sewer overflow (CSO) system 6 using green technology to stay green," and then 7 four dollar signs. 8 Mr. Burba, are you -- you've seen that 0. 9 document before? 10 Α. No. 11 0. So you clearly didn't rely on it in 12 writing the denial? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Q. Besides yourself, was anybody else 15 involved in the Agency determination to rely 16 upon the cited sections from the Illinois 17 standards? 18 Α. The second page, the first paragraph 19 reads, "Also an appropriate groundwater 20 monitoring system must be proposed according to 21 Illinois administrative code 370.930(b)(4)." 22 That comes right out of the same section in the 23 standards. 24 Q. And who else at the Agency, if anyone,

Page 192 1 was involved in that determination that this -that the cited rules apply? 2 3 Α. The groundwater section. 4 0. Is it your opinion that a liner is 5 necessary for this project? 6 Α. Can you say it again? 7 Ο. Was it your opinion that a liner is 8 necessary to be installed for this project? 9 Α. I qualify it as a seal because there's 10 a synthetic liner, that's another way, or a clay seal. So you have your options. 11 12 Ο. In the permit unit, what concerns does 13 the Agency have -- feel that were not addressed 14 in terms of the project's impact to the 15 environment in terms of constituting -- causing 16 water pollution? 17 Α. I can't speak about the overall concept 18 other than the fact that it doesn't meet the 19 standard. 20 Ο. So as far as you're concerned, you 21 don't believe -- you don't have an opinion as 22 to whether it constitutes water pollution or 23 causes a nuisance other than not meeting the 24 standard?

Page 193 1 I feel that it will qualify as water Α. 2 pollution. 3 Ο. On what basis? Anything that leaks that's untreated. 4 Α. 5 And what would -- is that then any 0. 6 increase above background in the groundwater? 7 Α. I don't look at it as a background. Ι know that it's not incidental. It's designed 8 9 not to leak. 10 MR. HARSCH: I have no further 11 questions at this time. Thank you very much. 12 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant? 13 MR. GRANT: I was going to call 14 Mr. Burba as a witness. 15 Do you want to go through your case and do it separately or do you want to open up the 16 17 lines of inquiry? 18 MR. HARSCH: Let's just quickly get 19 through our side. 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Thank 21 you, sir. 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. GRANT: 24 Q. Mr. Burba, who do you report to?

	Page 194
1	A. I report to Amy Dragovich.
2	Q. Okay. And before you send out a denial
3	letter, do you consult with her?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Okay. Do you know if Ms. Dragovich saw
6	that PowerPoint presentation printed out
7	regarding Washington, Indiana?
8	A. I don't know. I've heard, but that's
9	hearsay.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. I mean, she didn't directly tell me
12	that.
13	Q. Okay. That's fine. All right.
14	If the Agency based on your
15	knowledge of the Agency well, first off, let
16	me say is it your understanding that the Agency
17	can't grant a permit if it constitutes a
18	violation of the Act or the regulations?
19	A. That is correct.
20	Q. Okay. If the Agency was denying a
21	permit that based simply on water pollution,
22	somebody was seeking a permit that would result
23	in water pollution, would they need to say
24	anything more than section 12 of the Act?

Page 195 1 In other words, if the liner standards 2 weren't implicated, but it simply -- the denial 3 was based just on that it was going to cause water pollution, would it be necessary to put 4 5 anything besides section 12 and 39 of the Act? 6 Α. I don't think so. 7 MR. GRANT: That's all I've got. 8 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, 9 anything further? 10 MR. HARSCH: No. 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 12 (Whereupon, the witness was 13 excused.) 14 (Whereupon, the witness was 15 duly sworn.) 16 AMY DRAGOVICH, 17 called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. HARSCH: 21 Would you please state your entire name 0. for the record? 22 23 Α. Amy Louise Dragovich, 24 D-r-a-g-o-v-i-c-h.

Page 196 1 Q. And since we all know what your 2 position is at the Agency, would you very 3 briefly explain what involvement you had with 4 this permit application? 5 Α. I am Francis's supervisor, so I oversaw 6 the -- his review of the permit application and 7 the denial letter. 8 Ο. Did you participate in the series of 9 meetings that the District had with the Agency? 10 Α. I did. 11 Q. And that participation and e-mails were 12 shown throughout the permit, right? 13 Α. Right. 14 0. How would you characterize the project 15 that the District proposed -- excuse me. 16 Strike that. 17 Mr. Burba testified that he 18 characterized this project as a, quote, 19 equalization basin. 20 Do you agree with that assessment? 21 Α. It is, but it is also untreated 22 wastewater that is going to infiltrate into the 23 groundwater. 24 And was the Agency's concerns about Q.

Page 197 1 that untreated wastewater which Marcia Wilhite 2 put in a memo to me, e-mail to me that gave 3 rise to the June 2011 meeting; do you recall? 4 Α. What was the question? 5 0. Is that concern from the water that 6 would leak out, as you put it, was the basis 7 for her concern that she expressed to me in 8 that e-mail? 9 You met with Marcia Wilhite before 10 that -- she sent that e-mail to me, did you 11 not? 12 Α. I was included in discussions with --13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you 14 speak up, please? Thank you. 15 THE WITNESS: I was included in discussions, but I don't know if I actually met 16 17 with Marcia. 18 BY MR. HARSCH: 19 Those were discussions with the 0. 20 groundwater folks, Bill Buscher and --21 Α. And Al. 22 So when you reference the Agency's 0. 23 concerns over the leaking, that's the concern 24 she's addressing here?

		Page 198
1	Α.	It is.
2	Q.	Do you agree with the previous
3	testimo	ny that this is not a as proposed, it
4	is not	a waste stabilization pond or aerated
5	lagoon?	
6	Α.	I do.
7	Q.	Who made the determination that that
8	section	of the Agency's design standards apply?
9	Α.	I think it was a group decision.
10	Q.	I'll ask you the same question.
11		Are you familiar with what was included
12	in the .	Agency record starting at Bates stamped
13	480	440?
14	Α.	I am.
15	Q.	And can you explain what it is?
16	Α.	It was a webinar that USEPA put
17	togethe	r for green infrastructure showing how a
18	wetland	could have a liner system.
19	Q.	And did you attend that webinar or
20	watch i	t?
21	Α.	I did.
22	Q.	And when was that webinar?
23	Α.	I think in June.
24	Q.	Of this year?

Page 199

A. Yes.

Q. I don't mean to put you on the spot,
but you watched the webinar and you had this
document.

Is the design and use of the wetland by
Washington, Indiana the same as the intended
use of the wetland in this proposed project?
A. The wetland for Washington, Indiana was
for a combined sewer overflow system capturing
combined sewer overflows.

Q. Does it function in the same manner?
A. It would be similar.

Q. Again, looking at Respondent's Exhibit 1, Mr. Burba, I think, testified in my hypothetical, we're talking about building a -proposing to a build a clarifier that would double the allowable overflow rate.

The letter would look just the same except instead of citing the two provisions that it cites, it would cite the rule for -the appropriate section for clarifier

22 overflows?

24

A. Correct.

Q. So that is basically the boilerplate

1

	Page 200
1	denial?
2	A. Right.
3	MR. HARSCH: Thank you.
4	Mr. Grant?
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. GRANT:
7	Q. If the basis for denial was water
8	pollution, just water pollution, just putting
9	in contaminated water and causing water
10	pollution, would it be necessary to put
11	anything besides section 12 and 39 in the
12	denial letter?
13	A. No.
14	Q. Okay. And why don't you turn to the
15	last exhibit? This is the webinar.
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. Is it your understanding this was an
18	overflow capture system that was actually
19	constructed?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Okay. And was it built with a liner?
22	A. It was.
23	Q. Okay. Let me ask you to turn to page
24	861 down at the bottom.

Page 201 1 And does it also contain wetland 2 plants? 3 Α. It does. 4 Q. Embedded in the soil layer? 5 Α. Right. 6 Q. Is that correct? 7 And then underneath it it mentions here a 45 mill EP -- actually, it just spells it 8 9 out, ethylene propylene diene monomer liner, 10 which I'll refer to as a EPDM liner; is that 11 correct? 12 A. That's correct. 13 Okay. Would a liner like that be 0. 14 acceptable to Illinois EPA in a situation such 15 as what Rockford proposed? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Okay. At this point I'm MR. GRANT: 18 going to move that this -- any sort of 19 restriction I'm using -- and it's already in the record -- any sort of restriction be 20 21 removed from it. 22 MR. HARSCH: I don't have an objection. 23 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So to 24 clean it up, Respondent's Exhibits 1 through 9

Page 202 1 are admitted into evidence. 2 MR. GRANT: Thank you. 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. MR. GRANT: 4 That's all I have. 5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. HARSCH: 7 To the best of your knowledge, that Ο. 8 document was never provided to Rock River Water 9 Reclamation District, was it? 10 Α. I don't know that. 11 0. What was the date of the denial? 12 Α. August 1st, 2012. 13 Ο. That document did not exist at the time 14 we met with the Agency in 2011; is that 15 correct? 16 Α. Correct. 17 MR. HARSCH: Are you intending to call 18 this witness? 19 MR. GRANT: No. Actually, all I wanted 20 to do was to authenticate that document and 21 then get the fact that there was a liner and 22 that the liner, if it was used, it would have 23 been acceptable to Illinois EPA because it 24 wasn't it vinyl or clay or anything we talked

Page 203

1 about. It was EPDM rubber.

2 BY MR. HARSCH:

"Handhole"

3	Q. Are you aware of any response to Rock
4	River Water Reclamation District regarding the
5	Agency's decision that this project would
6	actually result in water pollution following
7	the Agency's review of the June 2011 submittal?
8	A. The Agency denial letter is the
9	response.
10	Q. Are you aware of any documents,
11	memorandums, e-mails regarding the
12	anti-degradation issue that Jim Huff has
13	testified to that he addressed in the June
14	in his June 2011 submittal letter?
15	A. Are you referring to the groundwater
16	memo?
17	Q. Anything to do with the degradation
18	issue.
19	Are there documents back and forth at
20	the Agency regarding
21	A. Not that I'm aware of.
22	MR. HARSCH: No further.
23	
24	

	Page 204
1	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. GRANT:
3	Q. We've been referring to the material
4	that you stored in this basin as wastewater,
5	but you could equally call it untreated sewage,
6	couldn't you?
7	A. Yep.
8	Q. Okay. Does the Agency believe that the
9	direct discharge of untreated sewage in the
10	groundwater flowing into the Rock River
11	constitutes water pollution?
12	A. Yes.
13	MR. GRANT: Okay. Thank you.
14	REDIRECT-EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. HARSCH:
16	Q. What is the basis for that
17	determination?
18	A. Untreated wastewater contains
19	pathogens, contaminants that are known to
20	contribute to pollution.
21	Q. Is water pollution a defined term in
22	the Environmental Protection Act?
23	A. I don't have a copy.
24	MR. HARSCH: No further.

Page 205 1 MR. GRANT: Thanks. 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 3 Thank you, Ms. Dragovich. 4 Do you intend to call Mr. Buscher? 5 MR. GRANT: Yeah. 6 MR. HARSCH: I have no further. 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. 8 (Whereupon, the witness was 9 excused.) 10 MR. GRANT: I'll call Mr. Huff back as 11 a rebuttal witness to Amy Dragovich. 12 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure. 13 You're still under oath, Mr. Huff. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 15 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 16 JAMES E. HUFF, 17 called as a witness herein, having been first 18 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 19 EXAMINATION 20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. HARSCH: 22 Mr. Huff, have you reviewed the Q. 23 PowerPoint presentation of Washington, Indiana? 24 Α. Yes, I have.

Page 206 1 0. Do you agree that it's a similar 2 project to that proposed by Rock River? 3 Well, I believe it's different. Α. 4 Q. And why? 5 Α. In our case, as it's been discussed, 6 it's really an equalization basin. That's 7 really a treatment basin with discharge into 8 the receiving stream. So they are discharging 9 combined sewer overflows through that basin and 10 then discharging that water. 11 So it's not getting complete treatment 12 at the wastewater treatment plant. That's the 13 only treatment that's being provided by the 14 constructed wetland. 15 Q. And is the flow linearly through the 16 wetland also -- is there a difference? 17 Α. It is. That's correct. It flows 18 through the wetland from the beginning and then 19 exits at the end. It's a plug flow type 20 wetland. 21 0. Were you ever provided as the point 22 person for the District with any rebuttal to 23 your June 11th submittal? 24 Α. I was not.

Page 207 1 Ο. Are you -- at any of the meetings, were 2 you ever provided any information where anybody 3 at the Agency had a basis for including that 4 the discharge would, in fact, result in a 5 problem in the groundwater? 6 Α. I believe the June 2011 meeting was 7 prepared as a direct response to concerns 8 raised by the Agency regarding the 9 non-degradation term which I've interpreted as 10 meaning water pollution. 11 0. Are you aware of any other instance 12 where the Agency applies a rule by analogy? 13 Α. This is the first time that I have ever 14 experienced this. 15 MR. HARSCH: No further questions. 16 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. GRANT: 18 Q. Mr. Huff, in your June 28th letter, you 19 state that the outside limit based on your 20 estimate of direct discharge to the groundwater was 2 million gallons during a 48-hour period; 21 22 isn't that correct? 23 I believe that's correct, yes. Α. 24 Q. And we're talking about untreated raw

Page 208

¹ sewage, correct?

A. We're talking about highly diluted raw
 ³ sewage.

Q. Okay. When you say, "Highly diluted,"
the -- let's see, I think that the normal flow
is 30 million gallons per day?

A. Dry weather flow is about 25 million
gallons a day, I believe.

9 Q. Okay. And the numbers that I heard --10 and correct me if I'm wrong, let's find the 11 right one -- during periods of expected heavy 12 flow, maybe 8/ million gallons a day?

A. Well, north of 80 million gallons a
 day, potentially up to size 150 million gallons
 a day.

Q. Okay. Let's say -- let's use a number that was used, 80.

If it was 87 million gallons a day, we're talking about diluted maybe two to one with water; is that correct?

A. 25 to 87 is over three to one, sir.
 Q. Okay. Well, I was using 30. Would you
 agree with 30 since that's the number that's in
 the permit?

Page 209

A. Thirty -- so if it's two to one, you'd have 60 million gallons a day. So you're still closer to three to one. 90 million gallons would be three to one though.

Q. Yeah. If it was -- well, no. It would
be three to one. It'd be one-third regular
sewage flow and it'd be two-thirds water. That
would add up to 90 million. That's correct.
A. That's correct.

Q. So it's a two-to-one dilution or one-third of it would be -- say 33 percent of it would be normal sewage; is that correct?

A. We can agree that it's one-third sewage and two-thirds infiltration inflow.

Q. Okay. Based on your knowledge of the contents of human sewage and industrial flow from the industrial discharges in this plant, does it surprise you that Illinois EPA believes that that constitutes water pollution?

A. Under the definition in the
 Environmental Protection Act, it surprises me,
 yes.

Q. So it's your professional opinion that
 the discharge of human sewage directly into

Page 210 1 groundwater with groundwater flow toward the Rock River, it surprises you the Agency 2 3 believes that that's water pollution? 4 I believe it's inconsistent with the Α. 5 Environmental Protection Act. 6 MR. GRANT: Okay. Thank you. 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch? 8 MR. HARSCH: No further. 9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step down, Mr. Huff. Thank you. 10 11 (Whereupon, the witness was 12 excused.) 13 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any further witnesses then, Mr. Harsch? 14 15 MR. HARSCH: No, sir. 16 MR. GRANT: Okay. I'm going to -- he 17 can -- I'll allow him latitude for outside the 18 scope on Mr. Buscher since he's going to do 19 that. 20 MR. HARSCH: Can you give me five 21 minutes? 22 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah. Let's 23 take five minutes, guys. Thanks. 24 (Whereupon, a recess was had.)

Page 211 1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. 2 We're back on the record. The petitioner has 3 rested in his case in chief. 4 And respondent, first witness up. 5 Please raise your hand, and she'll swear you 6 in. 7 (Whereupon, the witness was 8 duly sworn.) 9 WILLIAM BUSCHER, 10 called as a witness herein, having been first 11 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. GRANT: 14 0. Can you state your name for the record, 15 please? 16 Α. William Edward Buscher. That's 17 B-u-s-c-h-e-r. 18 Ο. Mr. Buscher, your CV is in the record 19 as Exhibit No. 7, and I assume it's accurate; 20 is that correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. Okay. Just tell me a little bit about 23 your educational experience, what your top 24 level of education is.

A. I graduated with a bachelor's of science degree in geological engineering from the University of Missouri-Rolla and since that point in time have been doing -- when I first got out of school, did geotechnical work and then went to work for the Illinois EPA doing groundwater work.

Page 212

Q. Okay. And can you just generally
 describe what your current position is?

A. I'm the manager of the hydrogeology and compliance unit in the Division of Public Water Supplies. We provide groundwater expertise to the Bureau of Water programs which include the permit section and the Mine Pollution Control program.

Q. Okay. And can you describe your involvement in this -- in the permit that's the basis for this case?

A. Yes. Mr. Keller requested that I
 review the project. At that point in time, it
 was preliminary design documents.

Q. And if you can -- well, actually if
you'd open to Exhibit No. 1.

24 A. Yes.

Page 213 1 And if you could review it. Q. 2 Does this accurately represent the 3 basis for denial of the permit application? 4 Yes, it does. Α. 5 Q. Okay. And was it denied on the basis 6 of water pollution? 7 Yes, it was. Α. 8 0. Okay. As far as -- can you describe 9 which waters would be affected by it, by this 10 project? 11 Α. Waters that would be affected by this 12 project include groundwater, and I suppose 13 that's it. 14 Okay. How about the river that would 0. 15 accept the groundwater? 16 Α. The groundwater and then where it would 17 eventually flow to, the Rock River. 18 Q. Okay. What would cause the pollution? 19 Α. The deposition of raw sewage in the 20 basin and it's not being contained in that 21 basin. 22 Ο. Okay. Is there any doubt on the behalf 23 of Illinois EPA that the discharge of raw 24 sewage into groundwater and into the Rock River

Page 214

¹ would cause water pollution?

A. No.

2

7

Q. Is there any question on the part of Illinois EPA that the deposit of sewage solids into the wetland would create a water pollution hazard?

A. No.

MR. HARSCH: I object to that question. There's been no -- absolutely no foundation for the deposit of sewage solids to that level.

11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant? 12 Okay. Well, I don't -- as MR. GRANT: 13 far as if there's no basis for it -- I think 14 that there is -- one of the things we're 15 dealing with here more so than just the 16 testimony we're having is all the record that's 17 in evidence, and to save time I'm not going 18 through each document.

But the denial letter was on the basis of section 12 and 39. 12 contains both 12A which is water pollution and 12D which is creating a water pollution hazard so . . .

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Objection
 overruled.

Page 215

1 MR. HARSCH: I might make a statement. 2 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure. For 3 the record. 4 MR. HARSCH: There was no response to 5 my comment that there's nothing in this record 6 that discusses the deposit of sewage solids in 7 that basin, and Mr. Grant didn't respond to 8 that. 9 MR. GRANT: Well, we disagree. I'm not 10 going to go through the record right now. It's 11 800 and some pages, but it's in there. 12 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Who 13 didn't respond? 14 MR. HARSCH: Mr. Grant did not. 15 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. 16 MR. GRANT: My response is it is in the 17 record. 18 MR. HARSCH: When he responded to my 19 motion. 20 MR. GRANT: And, you know, this is 21 testimony and, you know, I will have to prove 22 that it is in the record in my post -- if we're 23 going to say that's the problem. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Your

Page 216 1 objections are noted on the record, Mr. Harsch. 2 You may proceed. 3 BY MR. GRANT: 4 Are you familiar with the constituents Ο. 5 of untreated sewage? 6 Α. Yes. 7 What constituents in particular would Ο. 8 threaten water pollution or cause water 9 pollution? 10 Well, there's human waste, both liquid Α. 11 and solid and pathogens, that can potentially 12 cause infections as well as other waste that 13 could be in the stream from nonhuman sources. 14 Ο. Okay. Let me turn to -- have you turn 15 to Exhibit No. 2. And why don't you go to page 16 number 4? This is in the record. You can take 17 a look at it. 18 Yes, sir. Α. 19 Okay. Do you know what this is? Ο. 20 This is information on the water Α. 21 quality coming into the sewage treatment plant, 22 I believe, influent. 23 0. Okay. And if you look to the right 24 where it says influent, do you see those?
		Page 217
1	Α.	Yes, sir.
2	Q.	Okay. And do you see the parameters
3	well, f	irst, let me ask you was this prepared
4	by Rock	River Water Reclamation District?
5	Α.	I believe it was and turned into the
6	Agency.	
7	Q.	Okay. And do you see the constituents
8	up at t	he top?
9	Α.	Yes, sir.
10	Q.	Okay. Grease, BOD, TSS, ammonia-N.
11		Do you recognize all those
12	Α.	Yes, sir.
13	Q.	those things in there?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	Would you consider them to if
16	dischar	ged in the groundwater to create water
17	polluti	on?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit No. 4?
20	Exhibit	No. 4 is in the record.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	If you can take a quick look at that.
23	Α.	Okay. Yes, sir.
24	Q.	Okay. Did you prepare this memo?

Page 218 1 Α. Yes, sir. 2 Okay. Please look to the second page Q. 3 which is record page 169. 4 And you see under paragraph four? 5 Yes, sir. Α. 6 Q. Okay. You proposed a liner? 7 Α. Yes, sir. 8 Q. Why did you propose a liner? 9 To prohibit the movement of the Α. contaminants in the basin into groundwater and 10 11 into the Rock River. 12 Okay. How did you come up with a Q. 13 two-foot-ten-to-the-minus-seven-centimeters-per 14 -second liner? 15 Α. That's in the regulations of the 16 Agency's. 17 0. Okay. Are those the regulations that 18 Mr. Burba applied; do you know? 19 Α. Yes, I believe so. 20 Okay. Do you believe that this is the Q. 21 minimum required to prevent migration of the 22 untreated sewage in the groundwater? 23 Α. I agree that it's appropriate, yes. 24 Q. Okay. Did the Agency ever ask for a

Page 219 1 concrete liner? 2 Α. No, sir. 3 0. And would you have asked for a concrete 4 liner? 5 Α. No, sir. 6 Q. Why not? 7 Α. Because concrete is prone to crack, and 8 it would, therefore, not sufficiently contain 9 the material in the basin. 10 0. Okay. Are you familiar with the 11 District's claims that the groundwater would 12 rise and float the liner? 13 I am. Α. 14 What's your reaction to this issue? Q. 15 Α. It's a concern that needs to be taken 16 into consideration in the design of the 17 facility. 18 Ο. Okay. Do you believe based on your experience with the Agency and as an engineer 19 20 that there are engineering solutions to this 21 problem? 22 Α. Yes, sir. 23 Okay. Has the District refused to Q. 24 install a liner?

Page 220 1 Α. Yes, sir. 2 Q. Okay. I think you heard the testimony 3 today. 4 There was some testimony regarding the 5 groundwater management zone; do you recall? 6 Α. Yes, sir. 7 Okay. Can you explain what a 0. 8 groundwater management zone is? 9 Α. Groundwater management zone is 10 contained in the 620 regulations of the Agency's, and it's designed to provide an 11 12 opportunity when a facility is out of 13 compliance to mitigate the problem that they 14 have through an approved corrective action to 15 bring the facility back into compliance. 16 Do you consider it to be part of Q. Okay. 17 a remedial program? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 Okay. Does Illinois EPA consider Ο. 20 creating new groundwater management zones to be 21 desired? 22 Where appropriate, you know, they -- if Α. 23 they're addressing an environmental problem, it 24 would be appropriate.

Page 221 When you're talking about environmental 1 Ο. 2 problem, you mean a preexisting environmental 3 problem? 4 Α. A preexisting environmental problem. 5 Would Illinois EPA normally consider Ο. 6 granting a groundwater management zone as part 7 of a new problem; in other words, as a 8 condition of creating new contamination and a 9 groundwater management zone? 10 Α. No, sir, it would not. 11 0. Okay. Based on your education, experience, and review of the District's ± 2 13 proposal, would granting the permit in question in this place have resulted in an increase in 14 15 human pathogens, industrial waste, and other 16 constituents of untreated sewage into the 17 groundwater under the basin? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 MR. GRANT: That's all I've got. 20 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thanks, 21 Mr. Grant. 22 Mr. Harsch. 23 24

Ρ	а	q	е	2	2	2
-	u.	9	\sim	_	_	_

CROSS-EXAMINATION

² BY MR. HARSCH:

1

5

Q. Looking, again, at Exhibit 4, paragraph
4 five on 159.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are you referring to in terms of
 the non-degradation water quality standards?
 A. Groundwater when contaminated needs to
 be treated, and the purpose of protecting
 groundwater is to provide -- have it usable by
 the public.

And private wells have very little And private wells have very little treatment. And the purpose of non -- of not degrading the water is to provide them the opportunity to have the water that's in the ground that has not been affected by adjacent activities.

Q. In essence, you were espousing or stating the Agency would require a demonstration that this project would not result in any increase above background; is that not correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And in your view, is any increase above

Page 223

1 background water pollution?

A. Well, it would have to be a
 statistically significant increase above
 background.

Q. What's a statistically significant
 increase in your opinion?

A. You would have to establish existing
water quality of the site or any particular
parameters that you might expect to show up in
the basin. The area where this basin is
located is known to have groundwater
contamination in the vicinity.

13 It's always important when you do this 14 type of work to make sure that you know what 15 the existing conditions are before you begin 16 the operation of your basin as to make certain 17 that if an environmental problem arises you can 18 positively identify whether it came from the operation of the facility or whether it may 19 20 have been previously existing.

Q. Again, how large -- what is a
 statistically significant increase?
 A. A statistically significant increase,
 there are many methods by which that is

determined, but in very general terms you would determine water quality at a -- over a period of one year taking six samples at each monitor well.

Page 224

⁵ Q. The question I'm trying to -- it's
⁶ fairly simple.

How much of an increase? If you can't
 address it on -- generally, then maybe we can
 do it on specific --

10 Well, it would determine -- it would be Α. 11 based upon the background water quality at the 12 particular facility. So you would need to have 13 that information to appropriately assess the situation. That's why we requested the six --14 15 0. Is one milligram per liter of chloride 16 enough?

A. That would really be based upon the
 water quality at the site, sir.

Q. What level of statistic -- what level
 of chloride increase have you determined
 previously to constitute water pollution, what
 level of chloride increase at any other site?
 A. I would have to look at specifically
 the site to make that determination.

	Page 225
1	Q. You can't recall any?
2	A. No.
3	Q. Mr. Huff, I believe, provided
4	information to the Agency in response to this
5	memo that it would not be statistically
6	possible to show the chloride was not
7	increased; is that correct?
8	A. I believe that's what he said, yes.
9	Q. And you agree with his statement?
10	A. I did not take issue with it.
11	Q. And that's irrespective in your opinion
12	of what water quality standards would be met
13	25 feet from the basin?
14	A. Could you repeat the question?
15	Q. And the increase in chlorides, they're
16	going to constitute water pollution because you
17	can't show there's going to be no increase
18	in
19	A. Well, it would depend, once again, upon
20	what your background water quality was there,
21	and if, indeed, based upon the statistical
22	analysis it exceeded the value, that that would
23	be correct, but it's a site specific call.
24	Q. What is a statistically significant

Page 226

1 increase?

2 Α. A statistically significant increase in 3 groundwater is based upon having taken six 4 samples over the period of a year which would 5 take into consideration seasonal variation in 6 your particular parameter. 7 Once that information has been 8 provided -- and I'm speaking in general 9 terms -- I don't have the methodology in front 10 of me -- an average value for a particular well would be determined. 11 12 There then would be a factor provided 13 there that would increase that value based on statistics of what you could expect to find in 14 15 that well. It would be natural variation. 16 If it exceeded what is expected, the 17 statistically significant increase would be if 18 the value you came up with based on the 19 information you had at the particular location 20 was exceeded. 21 0. And if you increase -- if your 22 value was greater than that, in your mind 23 that's water -- in the Agency's view, that's

24 water pollution?

Page 227 1 That would be a violation of the water Α. 2 quality standards, yes. 3 That's a violation -- that's water 0. 4 pollution? 5 MR. GRANT: Okay. We're talking two 6 different things. He didn't answer your -- he 7 didn't -- you know, he's saying groundwater 8 monitors standards and he's saying water 9 pollution. I wonder if we can --10 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, you 11 can redirect if you'd like. 12 MR. GRANT: Okay. All right. 13 BY MR. HARSCH: 14 0. The statistical significant increase, if that's shown, would that be water pollution? 15 16 Groundwater is the water of the state, Α. 17 yes. 18 Q. And that's irrespective of any use 19 other than groundwater? 20 Α. That is correct. 21 0. That also would be irrespective --22 your -- the conclusion that the statistically 23 significant increase is water pollution is also 24 irrespective that that increase is still below

Page 228

1 the groundwater standards?

A. Below -- well, actually the standards
 include the non-degradation provision so if - 4 yes.

Q. Mr. Huff testified earlier -- presented
in various submittals to the Agency a whole
host of activities that we carry out in
Illinois routinely have resulted in an increase
in pollutants going into the groundwater.

You were here when that testimony was presented?

12 A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you agree with his conclusions that those activities do result in an increase?

A. I don't believe that we are here to
 discuss those other things. I think we're here
 to discuss the permit at hand.

Q. Do you agree with his assumption that those other activities, in fact, do result in an increase when they're carried out?

MR. GRANT: I'm going to object also. I don't -- I think we're getting -- this is way too far afield. There's no relevance to this permit grant at all. We're talking about a

Page 229 permit for a permitted sewage treatment 1 facility versus cows in a field someplace. 2 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I sustain 4 the objection. 5 Move on, please. 6 MR. HARSCH: I'd like to note for the 7 record that the whole issue of anti-degradation 8 was a major issue as testified to by Mr. Huff 9 and others in the dialogue, and I think it was 10 a reasonable question. 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: The record 12 so notes. 13 BY MR. HARSCH: 14 0. Do you have any training or expertise 15 in wastewater? 16 Α. I provide expertise to the permit 17 sections of the Agency. I also work in 18 groundwater with Public Water Supplies, what we 19 do with bacteria and pathogens. 20 Do you have any training or expertise 0. 21 in wells? 22 Α. No. 23 0. Do you have any reason to disagree with 24 Mr. Huff regarding his testimony about the

Page 230 1 ability of the soils under the basin, the wetland plants, root zones, etcetera, in 2 3 reducing the pollutants that would be contained 4 in the water that infiltrates? 5 Α. My expectation is there's some 6 treatment for it. 7 Are you asked to review water pollution Ο. 8 permits, approvals of land application of 9 wastewater discharges? 10 Α. My section looks at those, yes. 11 0. Do you apply the same sort of analysis 12 in those reviews to those land application of 13 wastewater? 14 Α. To the best of my knowledge, yes. 15 0. Does that mean that the land 16 application of wastewater is shown not to have a statistically significant increase in 17 18 groundwater contaminants? 19 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you 20 speak up? 21 THE WITNESS: That would vary site to 22 site. 23 BY MR. HARSCH: 24 Q. Have you ever given the advice to

Page 231 1 permits that they should deny permit 2 application for land application of wastewater? 3 MR. GRANT: I'm going to object because 4 that has no relevance to this permit. This is 5 not a case where we have land application of 6 wastewater. 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you want 8 to read the question back, please, Sue? 9 (Whereupon, the record was read 10 by the reporter.) 11 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I overrule 12 the objection. You may answer if you can. 13 I don't believe I have. THE WITNESS: 14 BY MR. HARSCH: 15 Q. Are you aware that the Agency permits a land application of sewage sites? 16 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Have you ever been asked to review the 0. 19 approval of the application of sewage sites at 20 the land? 21 Α. I don't believe I've been involved with 22 that. 23 0. Have you ever been involved in the 24 permitting of the application of water supply

Page 232 1 treatment solids in land? 2 I don't recall. It's not something we Α. 3 do on a regular basis. 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you 5 please speak up, please? 6 THE WITNESS: I don't recall. It's not 7 something I do on a regular basis. 8 BY MR. HARSCH: 9 Ο. Have you ever been asked to provide any 10 review of permit application to construct a new 11 wastewater collection system? 12 Α. As in the piping? 13 O. Yes. 14 Α. No, sir. 15 Earlier today there was testimony that 0. 16 those various activities that I've just asked 17 you about all would result in some discharge to 18 groundwater. 19 Do you agree with that? 20 Α. There is that potential. 21 MR. HARSCH: No further questions. 22 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant? 23 MR. GRANT: I think I'm fine. 24 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.

Page 233 1 You may step down. Thanks. 2 (Whereupon, the witness was 3 excused.) 4 MR. GRANT: And my next witness is 5 Francis Burba. 6 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Burba, 7 you're still under oath. 8 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 9 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may 10 proceed, Mr. Grant. 11 FRANCIS BURBA, 12 called as a witness herein, having been first 13 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. GRANT: 16 0. Mr. Burba, can you state and spell your 17 record for the record, please? You already did 18 that. 19 Α. Yes, I did. 20 So I think you stated that you were a 0. 21 permit engineer with Illinois EPA Bureau of 22 Water; is that correct? 23 A. Correct. 24 Q. Okay. And you're familiar with this

¹ permit?

7

² A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And I think you described your
 involvement with the permit.

You attended a meeting early on before
the application?

A. Correct.

Q. Tell me a little bit about your
 9 experience with -- well, first off your
 10 education. I don't think we got that in.

A. I have a bachelor's of science from the School of Technology which is actually in civil engineering. It was in a transition process.

I'm a registered professional engineer in two different states, Illinois and Mississippi. I've been registered in eight

¹⁷ different states.

Q. How long have you been with IllinoisEPA?

20 A. 12 years.

Q. And has that been with the Bureau of Water all that time?

A. Correct.

Q. As part of your responsibilities, do

you review permits for wastewater treatment facilities?

³ A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the
 technology and the engineering of these types
 of facilities?

A. Correct.

7

11

Q. And you're also familiar with the standards applicable to construction of these sorts of facility?

A. Correct.

Q. How about things like groundwater migration, based on your experience and experience, are you familiar with groundwater migration?

16 Α. I guess through my hydraulics courses, 17 I've learned a little bit, but I'm not an 18 expert in hydraulics or groundwater migration. 19 I mean, I understand it, but I can't speak that 20 I was trained as a groundwater engineer. 21 Ο. Okay. Are you familiar with the 22 handling of excess flow at wastewater treatment 23 facilities? 24 Α. Yes.

Page 236 1 What is the purpose of excess flow 0. 2 facilities? 3 Α. Excess flow is designed for when it 4 exceeds the maximum flow through the treatment 5 plant for full treatment. You can divert the 6 flow, bring it back online such as flow 7 equalization, which that's what this basin was 8 intended to do. 9 In other words, as the flows reduce or 10 go down in the treatment plant, they can bring 11 a portion of that back online for full 12 treatment. 13 Ο. Is the purpose of an excess flow 14 facility to capture 100 percent of the excess 15 flow or nearly 100 percent of the excess flow 16 and then feed it back into the treatment 17 facility? 18 Α. 100 percent. 19 0. Without leaking? 20 Α. Correct. 21 And without the diversion of untreated 0. 22 wastewater to groundwater or surface water? 23 Α. Correct. 24 Are you familiar with other districts Q.

in Illinois that have excess flow facilities?
 A. Yes.

Q. I wonder if you could give me a couple of examples of other districts that have these sorts of facilities.

A. North Shore Sanitary District has three
treatment plants. Two of those have excess
flow basins. One in particular is called
Gurnee. That treatment plant has a 50-million
gallon concrete-lined basin.

They tell me that that basin has only filled one time, and it was an operator error. So the biggest swimming pool you could imagine, really deep and a long ways across, 50 million gallons concrete lined. It's intended to bring it back into the plant should it exceed the capacity of the treatment plant.

18 Ο. It sounds like an expensive facility? 19 Α. I would imagine. Long before my time. 20 You mentioned a concrete basin. Q. And 21 earlier today in one of the testimonies, one of 22 the witnesses for the District that we had 23 asked them or we had suggested a concrete 24 basin.

Page 237

Page 238 1 Would you recommend a concrete liner for an excess flow facility for this plant, for 2 3 the Rock River plant? 4 Α. You have two options there. You can 5 either use a concrete basin that has been 6 sealed or you can use a synthetic liner, and it 7 serves the same purpose. All you're doing is 8 limiting the amount of leakage. 9 So in the permit denial, I think you 0. testified about this earlier, you didn't ask 10 11 for anything specific. 12 I believe that you testified that you were just looking for a seal; is that correct? 13 14 Α. Correct. 15 And the options, there are a number of 0. 16 options that could be presented? 17 Α. Correct. 18 Q. Has the District up to today ever 19 proposed an adequate liner for this basin? 20 Α. No. 21 0. Let's see. I want to get a little bit 22 into the alternate basis that's in -- let me take you to No. 1 to we're all dealing with the 23 24 same thing. Exhibit No. 1, it's in the record.

Page 239

1 It's the denial letter.

2 Alternatively, it was denied on the 3 basis of Section 370.930(d)(2)(D), which I 4 think you described were the recommended 5 standards, construction standards. 6 First question, are those recommended 7 or mandatory? 8 Α. Mandatory. 9 Okay. Why do they say recommended; do Q. 10 you know? 11 Α. Before my time. I don't know how it arrived, but -- and that document's actually 12 13 promulgated by the Illinois Pollution Control 14 Board. Now it's our standard. 15 0. And the standard that was applied was 16 for waste stabilization ponds or aerated 17 lagoons; is that correct? 18 Α. Correct. 19 Is there a published standard for Ο. 20 overflow basins such as what was proposed here? 21 Is there a heading that says overflow 22 basin? 23 Α. No. 24 Q. And I think you said -- and correct me

Page 240 if I'm wrong -- that you applied this section 1 2 by analogy because it was the most appropriate; 3 is that correct? 4 Α. Correct. 5 Can you give me a little more Q. 6 explanation as to why you thought it was 7 appropriate? 8 Α. The purpose of the basin is to hold the 9 raw sewage prior to bringing it back to the 10 plant. The same concept holds true even though 11 you're talking in terms of waste stabilization 12 or aerated lagoons. The purpose there is to 13 contain it for the treatment. 14 So based on this -- call it temporary 15 It still has to serve the same storage. 16 It has to contain it. purpose. 17 So aside from the name of this section, Ο. 18 you believe that it's appropriate; is that an 19 accurate way to characterize your statement? 20 Α. Correct. 21 Q. You've -- I think you've been here 22 today. 23 Have you heard the District's 24 statements that a liner would be problematic

Page 241 1 because the groundwater flow to the -- the 2 liner would float when groundwater increased? 3 Did you hear that? 4 Α. Yes, I did. 5 And what's your reaction to that? Q. 6 There's other alternate constructions Α. 7 that will minimize that problem. 8 0. Can you give me just a few examples of 9 things that come to your mind? 10 Α. Raising the elevation for the bottom of 11 this basin so that you're above the normal 12 groundwater. Groundwater will seek its own 13 level. It will be running out of the surface around the lagoon and not into the lagoon if 14 15 the lagoon is high enough. 16 0. Okay. I wonder if could you look at 17 Exhibit No. 3 which is in evidence. 18 Do you recognize this permit? 19 Α. Yes, I do. 20 Q. Were you involved in the granting of 21 the permit? 22 Α. Yes. 23 0. Can I direct your attention to page 24 number 6, section C at the bottom, heading

Page 242

1 monitoring requirements?

² A. Correct.

Q. And there's a list of chemicals and
 4 compounds that are on page 6 and page 7.

Do you see those?

⁶ A. Correct.

5

Q. And does the permit require that the
 District to perform regular testing for all of
 these constituents?

A. Correct. There's 110 of them. They're
 required to monitor those and report them
 annually.

Q. And are we talking about the incoming sewage into the facility?

A. It has both influent and effluent which is the discharge as well as the sludge that's generated by the treatment plan. They're looking for the chemical composition for the metals which by our water quality standards exceed certain limits and there's very little treatment for some of these.

This is a pretreatment condition which means that Rock River is a pretreatment community. They have industrial complexes that

Page 243 1 discharge to the domestic sanitary sewers. 2 It all shows up at the treatment plant. 3 So they want to know what's coming in the 4 plant, what's going out because there's very 5 few treatment processes for some of these both 6 metals. 7 Some of them are both dissolve. Some 8 of them are solid. You can remove some of the 9 solid, but you can't remove all of the 10 dissolved unless you put in a coagulant, something that will attract that metal. 11 i2 Ο. To your knowledge, have they been in 13 compliance with this testing requirement? 14 Α. Otherwise, I wouldn't have Yes. 15 drafted this permit for the renewal without a 16 problem. Obviously, there was no objection to 17 it.

Q. Are you familiar with their objection to performing groundwater monitoring testing for these same constituents pursuant to this permit request that's the subject matter of this hearing?

A. I wasn't a party to that. I'm familiar
 with it enough that apparently they're wanting

Page 244 to limit what they will test for. 1 I don't 2 think that's acceptable. 3 Ο. Does this permit allow discharge of 4 untreated sewage from anywhere else from 5 anywhere? 6 Α. No. 7 Ο. And does it allow for other discharge 8 besides -- in other words, discharge of treated 9 effluent into the river? 10 Is there only a single point? 11 Α. There's a single discharge. 12 Ο. And is the District required to 13 disinfect prior to discharge during the summer 14 months? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. For at least some months of the year? 17 Α. It's a seasonal disinfection. 18 0. I don't know. You were, I believe --19 heard the testimony of the witnesses. We were talking about potential lining of the system to 20 21 reduce infiltration and an inflow and thereby 22 reduce the hydraulic load on the plant. 23 Did you hear that? 24 Α. Yes.

Page 245 1 Now, if new users were added to the 0. 2 system, in other words, if the District was to 3 add new users, would that actually increase the inflow? 4 5 Α. That is correct. 6 Q. Are you aware of any current 7 applications for people to -- for the District 8 to take on new users? 9 Α. They have a facility plan which I 10 reviewed to pick up Winnebago. 11 0. When you say "Winnebago," do you mean 12 the city of Winnebago? 13 The city of Winnebago. Α. 14 0. Is that still pending with the Agency? 15 Α. I've approved that. I think I'm at the very first part of the new sewer interceptors 16 17 and lift station in Rock River to potentially 18 pick this up for the future. 19 0. And based on your experience in 20 permits, would you expect that to increase the 21 amount of inflow into the Rock River sewage 22 treatment plant? 23 Α. Yes. Because it's a sewer system like 24 Rock River. It's probably aged. It's not new.

Page 246 So I would expect I & I to be in that system as 1 2 well. 3 Ο. When you say I & I, do you mean 4 infiltration and inflow? 5 Α. Correct. 6 MR. GRANT: That's it. 7 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. HARSCH: 10 Ο. You're aware that the District did 11 propose a monitoring system as part of the 12 permit application? 13 I'm aware of the location of the Α. 14 monitoring wells, but I never reviewed the 15 system. I believe you responded that the design 16 Ο. 17 standards, as they're referred to as the 18 recommended standards, are promulgated by the 19 Pollution Control Board. 20 Do you mean that they're part of the Pollution Control Board rules or actually 21 22 adopted by the Board? 23 Α. We adopted those as standards from the 24 Illinois Pollution Control Board.

Page 247 1 By "we," you mean the Illinois Q. 2 Environmental Protection Agency? 3 Α. Correct. That's part of our standards. 4 Ο. And they're part of the Pollution 5 Control Board's published rules? 6 Α. Correct. 7 0. Have you reviewed permits for CSO 8 communities, combined sewer overflow 9 communities? 10 Are you talking about a construction? Α. 11 0. NPDES permit. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Are you generally familiar with the Q. USEPA requirements on combined sewer overflows? 14 15 Α. Correct. 16 0. And under that USEPA policy or 17 regulations, those communities are allowed to 18 discharge up to four events per year? 19 Α. I don't remember that specifically. Ι 20 don't remember the number. 21 Ο. And we're talking about a discharge 22 here, a flow equalization basin to eliminate a 23 sewer overflow with a frequency of probably 24 less than once per year, correct?

Page 248 1 Α. That is correct. 2 And the current -- without the 0. 3 construction of this basin, I think you heard 4 testimony earlier today that during certain 5 size storm events, you would get an overflow 6 from basically the manhole at the headworks; is 7 that correct? 8 Α. That is correct. 9 And that would be onto the ground 0. 10 adjacent to the treatment plant? 11 Α. That may very well be. 12 0. In the general vicinity of where this 13 basin is proposed to be located? 14 Sanitary sewer overflows are Α. 15 prohibited. 16 I understand. It's an existing Ο. 17 overflow; is it not? 18 Ά. Then there has to be some remedial 19 action. 20 0. And earlier today there was testimony 21 regarding the Compliance Commitment Agreement 22 and the investment by the District to carry out 23 what they'd agreed to as part of the Compliance 24 Commitment Agreement; is that correct?

Page 249 1 Α. I don't know what was in the agreement. 2 0. If the existing overflow is at the 3 locations -- is at the headworks, then that 4 would be an existing condition, would it not? 5 Α. Correct. But it would also be a 6 violation. 7 I understand. And you understand that Ο. 8 the project that's being proposed is a project 9 that's being proposed to eliminate that 10 overflow? 11 Α. That very well may be. 12 Is the -- I believe Mr. Huff testified 0. 13 that he believed the Agency utilized a 14 five-year storm event for purposes of 15 permitting. 16 Do you agree with that? 17 Α. What? 18 0. For design purposes. 19 Α. For an excess flow basin? 20 Q. For sewage treatment plant units. 21 Α. No, I'm not aware of that. 22 0. You have to use some -- for treatment 23 units and for sewer systems, you have to use 24 some flow figure to project it?

Page 250 1 Right. But we do it on a capacity, not Α. 2 on a storm event. 3 Is it possible due to rainfall events Ο. 4 for the flows to exceed the capacity that the 5 treatment plant can handle what it's designed 6 for? 7 Α. Correct. 8 Ο. Is the permit -- do permits routinely 9 contain bypass language that allows the bypass 10 of untreated wastewater to protect the plant? 11 Α. In case of an emergency. 12 Ο. And this permit in question, special 13 condition 15 has such a condition? 14 MR. GRANT: Is that the CFR reference? 15 THE WITNESS: Right. I know the provision you're saying. 16 17 BY MR. HARSCH: 18 I don't know if it was Mr. Buscher's 0. 19 testimony or your testimony. Someone testified 20 that wastewater always gets treated. 21 That's not necessarily the case? 2.2 Α. There's a distinction between treated 23 or untreated. It's treated to a certain 24 extent.

	Page 251
1	MR. HARSCH: No further. Thank you
2	very much.
3	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
4	Mr. Grant.
5	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. GRANT:
7	Q. Does Illinois EPA have any objection to
8	the concept of a basin, an overflow basin at
9	this facility, Rock River?
10	A. No.
11	Q. Do you have any objection to the
12	concept of a wetland?
13	A. No.
14	Q. The only objection you have is to the
15	lack of a liner; isn't that correct?
16	A. Correct.
17	MR. GRANT: That's all.
18	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?
19	MR. HARSCH: No further questions.
20	HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thanks. You
21	may step down, sir.
22	(Whereupon, the witness was
23	excused.)
24	MR. GRANT: We're done. We rest.

Page 252 1 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All. Right. 2 Terrific. Mr. Harsch, any rebuttal? Let's go 3 off the record for two minutes. 4 (Whereupon, a discussion was 5 had off the record.) 6 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Back on the 7 record. Mr. Harsch would like to call a 8 rebuttal. 9 Mr. Huff, you're reminded you're still 10 under oath. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 12 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. 13 JAMES E. HUFF, 14 called as a witness herein, having been first 15 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. HARSCH: 18 0. There was testimony put on in the 19 Agency's case about the discharge of materials 20 that got into the ground under the basin 21 reaching the Rock River. 22 Do you agree with that? 23 I do not. Specifically, Mr. Buscher Α. 24 identified three pollutants in human waste that
Page 253 1 he was concerned about suspended solids, 2 grease, and ammonia. I maybe can take those 3 one of the time. The floor of that basin will 4 be very effective in filtering out the 5 suspended solids. They're not going anywhere. 6 Grease is -- I think everyone knows 7 doesn't migrate very well through very fine 8 openings. So the grease would also be filtered 9 out and basically help seal the bottom of that 10 basin more than anything else. 11 And the third one was ammonia, which I 12 had testified to earlier that ammonia exists 13 primarily -- it is a positive charge ion in the cationic exchange capacity in the first foot 14 15 below that basin would effectively remove that 16 ammonia. So none of those pollutants would get 17 to the Rock River. 18 He identified something called human 19 waste which is a generic term that I assume 20 we're identifying those three specific 21 compounds there as well as pathogenic 22 organisms, which the fecal coliform is an

²³ indicator of.

24

As I testified earlier, those organisms

Page 254 1 are very effectively filtered out. Wetlands 2 are very effective at reducing the 3 concentrations of fecal coliform and other 4 pathogenic matters. And it's no different than 5 what comes out of a septic tank and in leach 6 fields that are all associated with those. 7 Ο. During your April -- during the meeting 8 that you had with the Agency in June of 2011 --9 strike that. 10 You were provided with a copy of Mr. Buscher's 2011 draft memo; is that correct? 11 12 Yes, sir. Ά. 13 And in that memo he testified and he 0. 14 lists a number of parameters that he wanted to 15 be monitored? 16 There's actually two lists. Α. Table A 17 attached to his letter, there was a request 18 that there be six rounds of sampling over a 19 year period before we use that basin. Well. 20 that effectively, one, adds a year to the whole 21 compliance schedule because we can't put those 22 wells in until after that basin's constructed 23 because with the diking and the berming on 24 there they'd be destroyed if we put them on

¹ beforehand.

2	Second, the list is not the same list
3	that's in the NPDES permit that Mr. Burma
4	seemed to indicate they were the exact same
5	list. It's a more extensive list than what is
6	monitored on their flow which averages 25 to
7	30 million gallons a day versus what we're
8	going to put in at 7.4 gallons for the year.
9	I think the District's reservations was
10	not so much in monitoring. It wasn't so much
11	in most of the parameters on there. It was the
12	extensiveness of this, the six times prior to
13	the year and that list just seemed excessive
14	relative to domestic wastewater.
15	Q. Was the purpose of your chloride
16	modeling, you said that you performed, to show
17	that there would be a statistically significant
18	increase in chloride concentrations?
19	A. The Agency required that we model in
20	order to show that there would be no increase
21	25 feet downstream.
22	And the problem with any kind of model
23	where you have a wide width on this basin, 25
24	feet down effectively there's going to be no

dilution and attenuation or minimal dilution and attenuation.

3 So the intent of that was to really 4 show -- we did the R26 equation under TACO, 5 $T-A-C-O_{i}$ and then we also just did a simple box 6 model assuming that groundwater is flowing at 7 five feet per day and that this water 8 infiltrated through what the net increase was. 9 And the box model is a more appropriate 10 model because our 26 assumes an infinite source 11 if that basin is full forever. And so the 12 purpose of that is to show there is going to be 13 an increase, but it's certainly going to be 14 well below the groundwater standard contained 15 in 620 for chlorides. 16 0. And that would be -- that increase 17 would be in your opinion a statistically 18 significant increase? 19 Well, sure. I mean, if you monitor and Α. 20 you establish a background concentration, you 21 go out shortly after one of these events, you 22 would see an increase compared to the 23 background. I suspect it would be 24 statistically increased, certainly a very real

Page 256

Page 257 1 potential for that. 2 MR. HARSCH: No further. 3 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. GRANT: 6 Mr. Huff, fecal coliform is just an Ο. 7 indicator? 8 That's what I said. Yes, sir. Α. 9 So it's just an indicator. 0. 10 It's not -- while it may be considered 11 a human pathogen, it's not the most dangerous 12 human pathogen, is it? 13 Α. I'm not even sure it's a human 14 pathogen. It's an indicator of human waste. 15 0. Right. So the pathogens that you would 16 be worried about would be other bacteria and 17 viruses and protozoans; isn't that correct? 18 Α. Sure. But I would give you the same 19 response on the ability to filter those out and 20 the reduction that's achieved in very short 21 order. And we had that in our permit 22 application, that discussion. 23 Isn't fecal coliform extraordinarily Ο. 24 short-lived outside of a mammal's body?

Page 258 1 Α. Compared to these other organisms? 2 Q. Yes. 3 I don't believe that's a true Α. 4 statement. You have a range of organisms that 5 have a longer life and viruses, others that are 6 much shorter. 7 Viruses like hepatitis A, that would be Ο. 8 a concern, wouldn't it? 9 Α. I suppose it would, yes. 10 Q. And human sewage? 11 A. Potentially, yes. Potentially. 12 0. And protozoans like cryptosporidium and gardia, that sort of thing, that would be a big 13 14 concern, right? 15 Α. That would be a concern from a human 16 health exposure point of view, yes, sir. 17 Ο. Is it your testimony that these have 18 the same life-span as coliform bacteria does? 19 Α. No, that was not my testimony. My 20 testimony was that if we -- the industry 21 standard is to monitor fecal coliform. We do 22 it in surface water. We do it in wastewater 23 effluents as an indicator we use. 24 In the water supply side, they use

total coliform as an indicator of potential pathogenic organisms there.

Page 259

³ Q. To avoid testing for all those other ⁴ ones that we were just discussing, right?

A. Sure. It's presumed that those adequately reflect if they're not present or they're present low that there's not an unacceptable risk.

Q. But you couldn't just necessarily
assume that the life-span in the soil
underneath it was the same for the coliform
bacteria as it is for the other bacteria,
viruses, and protozoan, could you?

A. I think we answered that question. There's a range of them, so some would be shorter. Some would be longer.

Q. And we don't know what those are as we sit here?

A. I'd be more than happy to provide that
 information.

Q. Fortunately, for the purpose of the
 hearing --

A. Right. So let's take it to the second
step. So let's suppose we get down to

groundwater. Then the second part is there's got to be an exposure to that groundwater, right.

There are no water supply wells in the area. There is absolutely no evidence this is ever going to get to the Rock River in my opinion.

Q. Your own testimony. In your letter you
 9 say -- in the famous letter from June 28th - 10 A. June 28th.

Q. -- you say the groundwater flow during very heavy water is away from the proposed impoundment and as soon as the water drops, it's going right to the Rock River?

A. Towards the Rock River, correct.

Q. Along with anything that's in the groundwater at that time?

15

A. But then you also have the travel time
 and degradation and the filtering out that's
 there.

Q. Okay. I don't want to spend too much time on this, but the monitoring list that Mr. Buscher proposed in his April -- in the memorandum that you responded to with your

Page 261 1 letter really was not too dissimilar from the 2 routine tests in the NPDES permit, is it? 3 Α. There's a number of parameters -- the 4 District's objection is really two part. Six 5 rounds of sampling on all those wells for 6 pollutants that aren't associated with 7 municipal waste really seems excessive, and the 8 year delay before we could ever put that basin 9 into service doesn't make sense to me when 10 we're trying to protect raw sewage, as you keep 11 describing it, from being discharged either illegally out of manhole and basement backups 12 13 or bypassing the treatment plant under these 14 emergencies and going directly to Rock River. I guess -- well, I'm looking at the 15 0. 16 list in that subsection C of the NPDES permit 17 for the facility for the inflow, in other 18 words, for the untreated wastewater, if you 19 prefer, coming into the plant is very similar 20 to what he was asking you to test for -- where 21 you were going to be taking untreated sewage 22 into a storage basin. And I don't want to -- I 23 understand that they're not identical. 24 Α. Right.

Q. But, for example, a number of inorganic chemicals and metals are contained in both lists, aren't they?

Page 262

A. They absolutely are. Again, if I were
doing this as a permit writer, I would say
let's go back and look at the history of what's
been detected in the wastewater coming into the
Rock River Water Reclamation District.

⁹ That should form then the basis behind ¹⁰ which we ought to be sampling these monitoring ¹¹ wells instead of just blankly saying let's test ¹² for every inorganic metal known to man. But ¹³ it's not just once. It's six times over a year ¹⁴ before I can put that basin into effect.

¹⁵ So you've got to say is that money well ¹⁶ spent in that lost year when we potentially ¹⁷ will have basement backups because we have to ¹⁸ do six grounds of samplings on these wells.

Does that make any sense in protecting the environment?

Q. Wasn't your response that you refused to do any sampling whatsoever?

A. Positively no, never.

Q. In the July 28th letter, it said it

Page 263 1 would be a waste of time to do background 2 sampling. 3 Isn't that essentially what it says in 4 that June 28th, 2011? 5 Α. Could you point me to that, please? 6 0. Sure. Exhibit 5, I think page 3. Ιt 7 will save time. 8 Α. Item number two? Test for a host of 9 inorganics and for six times before start up. 10 Ο. Yes. 11 Α. It says, "The RRWRD discharges about 12 30 million gallons a day in the Rock River and 13 is not required to monitor this intensively for 14 any of these parameters except BOD, fecal 15 coliform, and pH." 16 Ο. That's treated sewage? 17 Α. That's also in the raw sewage, sir. 18 The BOD, fecal coliform, 0. Excuse me. 19 and pH, are you saying that's all that they're 20 required to test for under the permit? 21 Α. Those are the primary parameters No. 22 that they test for that frequently. 23 Ο. But there's a whole -- that frequently, 24 you mean six times a year?

A. Annually. Once a year they test for
 this inorganic list. That's what's in the
 NPDES permit.

Q. I'm just going to say that the permit will speak for itself. It was my understanding it was required more, but we can argue that later. That's all I've got. Are you through answering my question? I don't want to cut you off.

A. Your characterization as affecting the for sampling for background, that's not what we were doing. I was objecting to the number of tests that we were running and the parameter list that included a number of pollutants that we aren't associated with municipal waste.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?
MR. HARSCH: I'm done.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Thank
 you, Mr. Huff. You may step down.

Any closings or do you want to save it
for the post-hearing brief? You've going to
save it for the post-hearing brief?
MR. HARSCH: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let's go

Page 265 1 off the record. 2 (Whereupon, a discussion was 3 had off the record.) 4 HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. 5 We're back on the record. 6 I do want to note for the Board there 7 is an outstanding motion out there filed by 8 Mr. Grant and company entitled motion to 9 supplement the record. I think it was filed on 10 November 2nd, and it's directed to the Board. 11 So I assume the Board will take that up with 12 the case. 13 We're going to talk about briefing 14 schedules, but we're all going to get 15 together -- Mr. Harsch, Mr. Grant, Mr. Petti 16 and myself -- on Wednesday, December 5th via 17 telephone and talk about the briefing schedule, 18 and I'll get a written order out. I think 19 that's about it. 20 I want to take a minute to thank the 21 counselors for their professionalism. Above 22 all I want to thank everybody for their 23 civility and have a great upcoming holiday or 24 holidays.

	Page 266
1	MR. HARSCH: On behalf of the District,
2	I want to thank the Agency witnesses that made
3	the trip up. Thank you very much.
4	(Which were all the proceedings
5	had in the aforementioned
6	cause this said date and
7	time.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Page 267 1 STATE OF ILLINOIS) 2) SS: 3 COUNTY OF MCHENRY) 4 5 I, SUSAN IMHOFF, a Registered 6 Professional Reporter and a Certified Shorthand 7 Reporter of said state do hereby certify: 8 That previous to the commencement of 9 the examination of the witness, the witness was 10 duly sworn to testify the whole truth 11 concerning the matters herein; 12 That the foregoing deposition 13 transcript was reported stenographically by me, 14was thereafter reduced to typewriting under my 15 personal direction and constitutes a true 16 record of the testimony given and the 17 proceedings had; 18 That the said deposition was taken 19 before me at the time and place specified; 20 That I am not a relative or employee or 21 attorney or counsel, nor a relative or employee 22 of such attorney or counsel for any of the 23 parties hereto, nor interested directly or 24 indirectly in the outcome of this action.

-	Page 268
1	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do unto set my
2	hand of office in Illinois, this 13th day of
3	December, 2012.
4	
5	
6	Jusen Chulupp
7	Susan Imhoff, RPR
8	Illinois CSR No. 84-3956
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

[
A	achieve 38.18	93.13 98.3	78.11 189.14	130.9131819
<u>A</u> <u>\$1 44.5 101.4</u>	79:1 86:2	117:5	202.1	130.20 131.4 8
168.21 22	122:23 141:20	additional 46.18	adopt 42.18	130.20131.4,0 132.78133.11
\$15,22.10	achieved 129:11	50:2 83:23	adopted 134.10	133.13.20
\$15 52.19 \$20 000 170.2	134.8 141.12	97.23 98.13	140.16 246.22	133.13,20 134.7 18 21
\$50,000 170.5	257.20	139.9179.9	246.23	135.4 138.3 11
30.3 5/.1/	achieving 120.9	Additionally	advanced 113.7	138.18 130.16
a.m 1:15	134.5 139.11	18.8 32.1	113.13	130.10 139.10 130.23 141.22
	139.18	41.20	advice 230.24	$142 \cdot 1 \ 147 \cdot 20$
33:18 ability 29.16	acknowledge	address 21.24	acrated 94.22	150.2 11 14
ability 38:10	49·10 13	24.10 38.3	96.2 16 19	150.2,11,14 158.2,11,21
91:10 230:1	acquired 53.22	59.15 60.18	105.21132.24	150.2,11,21
257:19	acquiring	67.22 82.13	164.16 188.2	175.2 176.11
able 12:9 35:2	115·24	98.20 134.4	188.10 180.2	180.12 184.22
82:4 103:24	113.24	150.12 224.8	108.10 109.3	180.12 104.23
108:6,23	119.10 11 19	addressed 71.24	2/0.12	101.15 24
above-entitled	120.4 5 7	120.23 1/1.0	240.12 aeretion 70.24	191.13,24 102.12 104.14
	128.18 170.4	150.18 192.13	81.7 132.4	192.13 194.14
absolute 49:16	acres 110.8	203.13	186.23	194.15,10,20 106.20,108.12
absolutely 10:18	120.1 143.7	205.15 addresses 175.4	aesthetically	202.14 203.8
159.15 169.4 0	ACS 74.22	addressing	25.24	202.14 203.8
138:13 108:4,9	act 10:3 35:10	62.21 182.11	affairs 113.17	205.20 204.0
170:10 1//:0	42.15 16 62.15	197.24 220.23	afield 228.23	207.3,8,12
1/8:10 214:9	97.8 115.3	adds 117.7	afforementioned	$210.2\ 217.0$ $218.24\ 219.10$
$200.5\ 202.4$	125:4 130:21	254:20	266.5	222.10.24 215.15
45.22 212.15	131:7 135:22	adequacy 95.7	age 36:23 37:5	222:17 225.4
45.25 215.15	137:15 151:20	adequate 68:1	age-old 101.10	$231.15\ 245.14$
1/2.15 10	180:11 190:1	181:13 238:19	aged 245:24	247.2 249.13
201.14, 200.02	194:18.24	adequately	agency 1.8 5.8	254.8 255.19
201.14202.23 244.2	195:5 204:22	141:8 259:6	8:7 10:2.20.24	266:2
accented 30.8	209:21 210:5	adjacent 100:2	11:2 12:17	Agency's 9:19
49.3 50.10	action 9:19	116:1.2 140:10	15:8 19:13	10:9 15:10.15
52.22 53.1	132:18 220:14	222:16 248:10	21:1.4.7.17	15:19 18:9.21
112.12	248:19 267:24	adjusted 120:12	24:20.22 26:16	19:11 47:15
accenting 25.9	actions 71:22	125:2	26:20 27:10.10	48:20 114:23
accents 48.7	active 36:7	Adm 122:3,5	27:13.15.16.23	120:20.24
accidently 56.18	activities 128:18	124:23 125:2	28:15 29:9	125:16 129:12
accompany 95.8	222:17 228:7	131:16 179:11	35:9 36:2,3	131:21 135:16
account 37.17	228:14,19	administration	47:9 50:9 52:7	135:20 137:17
97:9	232:16	6:14	54:17 56:11	137:24 139:4
accounts 35:13	actual 82:17	administrative	63:19 68:1,2	139:17 141:14
166:12	99:11 190:20	13:1 16:4 18:5	68:14 76:20	141:24 150:5
accurate 74:13	actuality 25:17	19:5 97:4	77:3,8,14	190:23 196:24
107:6 162:9	add 153:10	191:21	78:16 97:18	197:22 198:8
167:15 175:12	168:15 209:8	admission 78:4	115:9 116:4	203:5,7 218:16
175:13 177:24	245:3	admitted 4:3,7	122:16 123:17	220:11 226:23
211:19 240:19	added 135:3	14:20 16:17	124:21 125:9	252:19
accurately 59:23	245:1	21:23 22:12	125:11 126:3,6	Agency-issued
175:7,8 213:2	addition 44:23	24:10 74:6	127:7 129:1	124:1
,				

erchebby

(

	······································			
agenda 41.22	Allen 46.21	168.11 225.22	15.6 67.10	114.10 115.21
45.14	allow 46.2 69.1	230.11	68.15 90.3	120.15 125.8
aggressively	69.13 70.15	analytical 75.7	03.12 14 16 21	120.13 123.8
36.18	71.13 117.15	and/or 130.1	96.14 97.22	123.17 127.5
ago 7·3	123.17 127.7	animals 136.9	98.74 99.9 18	annronriete
agree 18.14	131.10 180.14	137.4	99.24 100.7	10.17 20.2
19.14 72.3	181.17 210.17	annual 32.18	105.5 120.8 13	10.1729.2
79.9 83.11 16	244.3 7	37.15 18 103.5	105.5 120.0,15 121.2 125.15	07.2 131.15
104.10 153.23	allowable 78.16	103.7.9.14	121.2 123.13	167.2 101.10
163.19.22	199.17	126.18	125.21,25	107.2 191.19
164:18 165:3	allowed 127.20	annually 37.12	139.23 141.8	220.22.24
167:21 186:9	247:17	38:11 59.22	141.15 142.5	240.2718
196:20 198:2	allowing 71:2	242:12 264:1	150.20 164.15	256.9
206:1 208:23	106:1	answer 19:23	166:10.11	annronriately
209:13 218:23	allows 81:20	64:24 69:24	184:21.24	22.9 224.13
225:9 228:13	93:4 250:9	70:19 71:7	190:13.18	approval 159.1
228:18 232:19	alluding 170:18	80:3 103:24	196:4.6 213:3	231.19
249:16 252:22	alongside	143:22 172:9	230:8.12.16	approvals 230.8
agreeable 46:23	101:21	188:9 227:6	231:2.2.5.16	approve 189.20
agreed 69:21	alteration	231:12	231:19.24	approved
248:23	135:23 136:18	answered	232:10 234:6	140:21 185:18
agreed-upon	alternate 238:22	259:14	246:12 257:22	220:14 245:15
77:13	241:6	answering 264:8	applications	approximately
agreeing 78:18	alternative	answers 170:6	89:17 158:13	32:19 35:17
agreement	153:8 182:18	anti-degradati	245:7	37:18 55:21
24:22 34:12	Alternatively	9:16,21 11:19	applied 24:17	56:1 144:7
38:13,14 50:7	239:2	26:22 114:3	43:8 127:13	147:4,9 157:20
50:13 76:5,8	altogether 13:15	203:12 229:7	130:23 218:18	April 41:24
77:12 78:6,7	American 74:23	anticipate 34:23	239:15 240:1	93:12,23
116:3 181:6	ammonia	anticipated 95:5	applies 96:1	121:18 122:17
248:21,24	119:15 121:3,7	anybody 58:19	187:23 207:12	126:4 130:24
249:1	151:2,14 152:4	191:14 207:2	apply 17:7 49:22	135:17 141:6
agricultural	155:1 253:2,11	apologize 107:3	96:23 122:24	254:7 260:23
127:16 136:7	253:12,16	177:10	124:21 127:7	aquatic 136:9
137:2	ammonia-N	apparent 133:12	128:19 130:20	137:4
Agriculture	217:10	apparently	134:15 138:20	arbitrarily 71:7
142:3	amount 25:8	133:20 159:5	141:23 142:1	area 12:12 26:1
agronomic	28:7 51:2,21	243:24	192:2 198:8	44:16,22 53:13
120:12	126:19 160:19	appeal 5:9,10	230:11	53:15,16 54:1
ahead 30:21	174:11 183:21	27:18 68:15	applying 119:24	93:1,10 98:9
48:2 107:17	238:8 245:21	129:7 131:18	188:21	100:1,1 101:16
146:9 161:16	amounts 48:8	appeared 2:8,17	appreciate 7:8	101:18,21,24
Akzo 113:15	ample 188:15	appears 100:17	approach 40:1,3	117:6 125:21
AI 115:5 120:22	Amy 3:18 194:1	135:12	40:4 41:12	129:17 140:5
121:19 197:21	195:16,23	applicable 189:4	44:4 45:7	140:12 152:20
Alachior 127:19	205:11	235:9	61:10 64:20	163:10 223:10
Alan 178:3	analogy 188:22	applicant 18:11	90:12,13 101:2	260:5
algae 132:18	1	onnligation	101.10 100.00	
	207.12 240.2		101.10 102.22	areas 33:15
alleged 141:15	analysis 75:1,2	27:12 28:6	102:23 114:14	areas 33:15 35:12 80:7

				
97:12	assume 61:11	123:20	50.10 144.3	155.13 14 20
argue 18:7	62:18 66:2	attention 241:23	B-11-S-c-h-e-r	229.19.257.16
264:6	71:1.1.10	attenuation	211.17	258.18 259.12
argument 7:11	175:6 211:19	256:1.2	h)4 97.5	250.10 259.12
17:6 47:17	253:19 259:10	attorney 2.10	B S 74·20	hacterial 163.16
123:11	265:11	6:7.8.11.12	bachelor 31.1	had 47.9 54.1
arises 223:17	assumed 25:5.14	56.15 267.21	bachelor's 88.16	hanks 114.17
Armak 113:15	110:7 119:13	267.22	112.23 212.1	bar 161.1517
ARRA 42:2	147:1 156:20	attract 243.11	234.11	hare 170.11
arrived 85:1	assumes 256:10	attributed	hack 9.9 17 23.1	hase $71.2078.17$
239:12	assuming 71:6	160.21 165.15	23.7 25.12	163.16
arrives 59:4	118:20 142:17	165:20	57.21.67.6	hased 9.23
aside 42:3 72:21	142:21 143:5	audit 43.18	85.3 106.2	10.10 12.16
240:17	148:4 169:1	August 8.4	137.7 143.17	34.22 37.23
asked 65:7	175:8 256:6	131:5 180.7	144.2 6 145.11	39.10 47.2
120:22 121:16	assumption	202:12	146.19.20	48.11 22 51.14
123:14 165:1	103:10 119:3.4	authenticate	147:16 148.17	52.11 54.3
166:1 170:15	228:18	202:20	149.2.4.151.9	55.1 77.13
219:3 230:7	assumptions	author 32:3	152:16 156:6	78.14 80.22
231:18 232:9	102:13 141:10	available 7:24	157:8 162:17	83:8 103:7 10
232:16 237:23	156:4	19:13 64:17.22	164:4.21	117.18 118.7
asking 109:2	ASTM 95:9	117:6	178:13 181:17	120:21 122:6
169:19,23	Atrazine 127:19	average 80:13	186:16 203:19	125:8 135:4.12
261:20	attached 7:7	103:5.14 104:3	205:10 211:2	140:24 141:15
asks 69:6	13:19 32:11	117:20,22	220:15 231:8	141:17 153:3
assembly 42:14	35:6 36:16	118:20,24	236:6.11.16	158:10 160:6
48:21 62:14	89:18 121:20	119:24 120:2	237:16 240:9	177:15 194:14
assess 224:13	254:17	133:8 142:17	252:6 262:6	194:21 195:3
assessment	attachment 12:2	226:10	265:5	207:19 209:15
83:12,16	16:14 32:11	averages 255:6	backflow 145:10	219:18 221:11
196:20	33:21 34:12	avoid 41:10	background	224:11,17
assessments	35:636:16	117:14 158:23	74:18 79:6	225:21 226:3
114:3	38:14 42:1,5	259:3	91:14 114:21	226:13,18
assigned 5:5	46:19 50:9	avoidance 44:7	115:4 122:9,23	235:13 240:14
93:22 185:1	96:12 114:8	awaits 46:13	127:6 135:20	245:19
assist 91:16	121:21 123:9	awarded 90:14	138:14 153:16	basement 57:22
assistance 33:8	123:23 129:4	113:1 115:22	193:6,7 222:21	181:19 261:12
assistant 6:7,12	135:17 138:2	aware 13:2 82:6	223:1,4 224:11	262:17
associated 28:20	140:4 141:6	99:11 139:23	225:20 256:20	bases 12:19
100:22 114:1	attachments 7:2	166:3 203:3,10	256:23 263:1	basically 5:18
124:8 127:1	8:10 12:1 16:5	203:21 207:11	264:11	7:6 26:24
154:13,15	18:3 19:7,21	231:15 245:6	backing 79:21	106:1 107:7
168:1 179:5	29:12 74:8	246:10,13	backup 37:2	143:18 146:16
254:6 261:6	attend 190:11	249:21	57:20 80:8	146:18 147:10
264:15	198:19	axial 40:3	183:22	148:15 149:13
Associates 31:12	attended 186:4	R	backups 57:23	152:9 162:22
55:2	234:5	$\frac{D}{\mathbf{p}}$ A.2 18.4 24.12	116:5 181:19	165:22 181:23
association	attendee 45:19	10 4.2 10.4 34.13 38.11 11.0	261:12 262:17	185:5 188:6
90:20	attendees 99:4	JU.14 44.7	Dacteria 132:18	199:24 248:6

ĺ

- Malear

	1	1	•	•
253:9	147:9,12,16,24	basis 15:19	218:19.20	173:7 211:22
basin 9:12 11:11	147:24 148:4,7	27:23 28:8	219:18 225:3.8	234:8 235:17
24:24 25:2,3,8	148:18 149:3	29:4 45:7 52:4	228:15 231:13	238:21
25:10,18,22,22	149:12,16,19	69:5 71:5 78:5	231:21 238:12	Black 38:19
25:23 26:9,24	151:8 153:24	103:15 135:8	240:18 244:18	blanket 165:4
34:2,20 35:3,4	154:9,11	146:16 193:3	246:16 249:12	blankly 262:11
38:22 39:2.8	156:23 157:1	197:6 200:7	258:3	blends 101:23
39:17,22 40:9	158:8 159:14	204:16 207:3	believed 98:7	blighted 44:16
40:17 41:9	160:9,16 161:2	212:18 213:3.5	249:13	block 70:1
44:10,20 53:6	161:16,23,24	214:13,19	believes 44:3	148:13
53:9,13 54:19	162:6,7,16	232:3,7 238:22	47:14 134:7	Board 1:1 5:4.12
55:17,24 56:6	163:24 164:3	239:3 262:9	209:18 210:3	5:17 9:3 11:6
59:10 60:19	164:11,14,21	Bates 20:22	beneath 139:24	13:2 18:12
61:5,12 63:9	164:23 165:12	121:22 123:24	beneficial 43:14	22:17 123:10
79:10,13,15,20	165:12 166:15	126:5 131:5	benefit 35:24	123:13 125:1
79:24 80:7	166:16,21,23	133:18 135:17	44:5.19	129:7 131:18
82:9,18,22	167:6.18	139:15 141:7	benefits 63:20	139:6.8 239:14
83:2,8,18,21	168:24 171:7	177:23 178:4	168:2	246:19.21.22
85:6,12 86:4	172:13,16,17	180:6 190:23	bentonite 95:2	246:24 265:6
86:14 90:11,23	173:2 175:15	198:12	berming 254:23	265:10.11
91:12,16 92:18	176:8,13,18,24	bear 21:1,4	best 43:1 74:14	Board's 5:14
93:2,8 94:10	182:9,10	Beck 56:18	78:23 79:3	127:10 129:13
94:19 96:13,18	183:15 186:7	becoming 42:23	202:7 230:14	138:1 247:5
96:24 98:6	186:13,23	began 124:6	better 19:23	BOD 49:4 119:2
100:4,16,19	188:16,18	beginning 9:9	33:19 50:19	119:5,10 120:2
101:1,13 102:1	196:19 204:4	39:21 68:18	56:4 85:11	120:4,6 126:18
103:2,21 105:4	206:6,7,9	206:18	159:14 165:8	126:20 163:13
105:10 106:10	213:20,21	behalf 2:8,17	170:15 174:22	163:18 177:16
106:11 107:15	215:7 218:10	27:4 105:16	beyond 138:20	178:11 217:10
107:18,20	219:9 221:17	213:22 266:1	bias 47:3 49:14	263:14,18
108:3 109:15	223:10,10,16	belief 74:14	49:15 100:14	BOD5 118:21
114:12,15	225:13 230:1	99:16 141:18	Biddle 2:3 6:4	body 257:24
115:8,15,20	236:7 237:10	146:7 167:17	biennial 36:14	boilerplate
116:3,4,10,23	237:11,20,24	believe 6:19 7:6	42:5	199:24
117:10,16,17	238:5,19	11:1 15:14	big 258:13	bore 158:9
118:13,15	239:22 240:8	17:16 19:8	biggest 237:13	boring 158:5
119:8 121:14	241:11 247:22	37:7 49:12,14	bike 101:20	borings 118:7
125:20 126:14	248:3,13	53:1 61:1	Bill 121:19	bottom 56:24
126:19 127:3	249:19 251:8,8	76:15 156:6,12	122:18 126:4	59:13 62:10
132:3,9,23,24	252:20 253:3	161:17 164:9	197:20	67:8 94:9,23
133:7,14 134:9	253:10,15	168:22 169:24	bio-gas 43:21	105:2 146:24
139:13 140:1,8	254:19 255:23	170:2 177:6,17	biochemical	147:23 200:24
141:3,13 143:2	256:11 261:8	179:6,8,24	118:21 132:6	241:10,24
143:12,13,15	261:22 262:14	180:9,17 186:6	biological	253:9
143:16,17	basin's 92:22	189:7 190:8	135:24 136:19	bound 9:23
144:16 145:6	254:22	192:21 204:8	biology 163:7	boundaries
145:11,13,21	basins 81:7	206:3 207:6,23	birds 136:9	138:21
146:6,8,9,15	127:14 237:8	208:8 210:4	137:4	bow 167:13
146:19,24	239:20	216:22 217:5	bit 109:17 162:3	box 256:5,9

Bradlev 1:15 5:2	hurean 6:9	253:18	130.10 143.10	256.24
hreak 20:8 85:3	115:6 212:13	calls 149.6	152.15 156.4	certified 74.77
144.1	233.21 234.21	Canada 113.20	156.13 157.5	74.72 267.6
hreaks 66.21	Rurma 255.3	canabilities	150.15 157.5	14.23 201.0
hriaf 12.8 15.2	humad 53.18	101.20	160.2 102.21	CED 250.14
21.11 13.0 13.2 21.11 A7.18	Durneu 33.10 Durahar 3.21	101.20 conchio 25.0	100.5 102.21	CFK 230:14
24.14 47.10	Duscher 5.21	Capable 23.7	193:13 200:3	CFU 49:9
204.21,22 huisfing 7.4	24.1 99.10	103.19	211:5 212:18	Champaign
011e1111g / .4	121.19 122.10	Capacity 51.7	231:5 250:11	31:3
203:13,17	122:18 123:3,7	34:8 39:3,7,13	250:21 252:19	change 151:10
Drieny 55.22	123:10,10	/2:11,15 01:4	265:12	changes 54:4
74.10 150.21	120:4 133:13	92:5 105:2	case-by-case	Chapter 42:17
/4:19 150:21		118:2 155:2	104:/	characterizati
	1/8:24 19/:20		cases 102:19	264:10
196:3	205:4 210:18		cationic 155:2	characterize
briefs /:5	211:9,16,18	250:1,4 253:14	253:14	196:14 240:19
bring 22:24	252:23 260:23	capital 32:18	cattle 125:20	characterized
106:2 164:4,21	Buscher's	37:18 64:19	127:20 142:3	186:6 196:18
186:16 220:15	250:18 254:11	65:2	173:14,17	charge 75:23
236:6,10	by-products	caps 98:1	cause 11:12	253:13
237:15	43:20	capture 200:18	40:21 99:16	chased 67:3
bringing 240:9	bypass 181:20	236:14	115:2 117:12	chemical 74:23
broad 64:13	183:24 250:9,9	capturing 199:9	131:9,11,11	112:24 113:12
79:6 188:1,3	bypassing	carbon 100:22	180:13,15,15	113:19 135:24
broader 64:3	181:23 261:13	career 66:16	195:3 213:18	136:19 242:18
buckle 117:13		70:1	214:1 216:8,12	chemicals
budget 32:19	<u> </u>	carried 50:23	266:6	113:16 242:3
37:16,19,22	C 19:5 35:6	228:20	caused 37:3	262:2
38:2 170:3	44:14 241:24	Carroll 3:3 16:6	44:13	chemistry 74:20
budgeted 37:9	261:16	17:7 18:2	causes 192:23	Chicago 2:6,15
build 41:23	C4.1 46:17	29:14,20 30:1	causing 81:2	31:19
60:19,22	97:22	30:6,14,23	192:15 200:9	chief 211:3
188:18 199:16	calculated 81:13	31:11,13 46:21	CCDD 138:7,12	chloride 128:24
building 32:4	148:9	56:14 69:24	138:15 139:2,6	130:6 152:22
75:21 199:15	calculation	73:12,19 76:5	139:16 141:23	153:9 224:15
buildings 58:7,9	156:20	91:6 104:11.15	171:9.11	224:20.22
buildup 37:4	call 14:19 20:5	133:18 163:23	cells 132:14	225:6 255:15
built 200:21	29:17 56:18	164:8	133:1 165:13	255:18
bunch 13:19	73:1 152:8	Carroll's 14:23	centered 26:21	chlorides 123:1
Burba 3:15	193:13 202:17	19:9.21 20:1.3	centimeter	127:15 150:17
121:12 132:22	204:5 205:4,10	79:9 83:11	94.14	152.67711
165:11.16	225:23 240:14	carry 228:7	centimeters	152.0,7,7,1
184:12.17.19	252:7	248.22	95.15 187.17	152.10,25 153.251112
191:8 193:14	called 30:2 73:5	case 5:16 10:18	certain 54.1	153.16 154.23
193.24 196:17	87:15 112:2	10.19 11.2	100.0 223.16	225.15 256.15
199.14 218.18	113:15 148:12	15.3 6 18.7	242.20 248.4	ahlarinated
233.5 6 11 16	157:9 184:13	24.14 25.4 14	272.20 270.7	126.16 1/0.1
Rurha's 165.20	195:17 205:17	27.17 23.7,17 28.1 40.16	230.23	120.10 170.1
hurden 11.8 10	211:10 233:12	41.6 60.11	26.17 127.3	124.15 181.17
101.7	237:8 252:14	72.21 111.5	1/1.0/ 256.13	124.13 101.17 aboose 78.20
101.7		14.41 111.5	141.24 200.15	CHOUSE / 0.20
1 ,	1 1	1 !		1

AND AND A

			1	1
chose 103:3	88:14 89:2,6	Closing 140:23	218:12 241:9	compacted
Chris 6:6	89:11,19,20	closings 264:20	comes 44:6	117:5
CHRISTOPH	90:6,15,16,21	clumps 155:20	49:14 59:2	company 113:15
2:12	114:9 115:15	coagulant	75:22 84:22	265:8
circumstance	Clark's 90:19	243:10	144:21 146:13	compared 28:22
80:5	class 46:4	Cobb 8:18	147:6 148:14	143:1 149:1
circumstances	120:15 124:22	Cobb's 123:4	160:18 191:22	256:22 258:1
32:21 68:6,7	138:13 139:12	127:9,12	254:5	complaint 24:21
70:23 71:21	141:11 157:10	code 97:4 122:3	coming 65:21	complete 32:10
80:3,22 81:4	classification	122:5 124:24	149:12 159:5	39:22 64:24
81:11	123:17	125:3 131:16	216:21 243:3	144:21 146:22
citation 136:12	classified 57:11	179:11 191:21	261:19 262:7	151:18 162:18
187:20	58:20 59:8	cogeneration	comingle 58:24	164:4 206:11
cite 133:12	157:9	43:19	commencement	completed 38:4
137:11 199:20	clay 41:4 93:2	cold 40:18	267:8	90:21 128:21
cited 27:22	99:23 100:24	coliform 49:5,8	commencing	130:4,22
48:19 49:20	101:6,24 106:8	121:11 122:21	1:14	completing 89:4
94:8,20 97:1	107:4,5,7,9,11	126:9,12	comment 71:5	completion
135:6171:22	108:8 116:21	155:12,12,18	99:4 121:17	94:17 95:18
172:6 187:9	117:2,5,6,7	155:24 163:9	131:22 215:5	complex 132:16
188:7 191:16	118:9 129:15	177:17 178:12	comments 26:15	complexes
192:2	129:17,18	253:22 254:3	121:23 126:3	242:24
cites 141:5	145:17 157:7	257:6,23	131:24 158:12	compliance
<u>1 199:20</u>	158:3,15,21	258:18,21	commercial	31:15 37:23
citing 131:5,22	169:1,2,7	259:1,11	75:20 136:6	38:12 50:6,13
176:1,4,4	170:11,19	263:15,18	137:1	76:4,7 78:6,7
199:19	192:11 202:24	collapse 66:12	commingled	79:1 113:18
city 31:15	clean 20:7 42:16	collapses 66:22	59:2,5	138:6 181:6
140:16,22	67:2 74:7	collection 32:7	commitment	212:11 220:13
143:20 245:12	138:6 201:24	32:15 35:8,15	24:22 34:12	220:15 243:13
245:13	cleaned 38:10	35:20 37:2,20	38:13 42:7	248:21,23
civil 31:2 33:4	53:23 59:21	38:1 39:4	50:7,13 76:5,7	254:21
234:12	cleaning 37:14	50:24 52:14	77:12 78:6,7	Compliant
civil/environm	clear 13:7 15:17	59:3 65:19	139:18 181:6	34:12
89:8	58:12 63:7	83:14 104:14	248:21,24	comply 46:4
civility 265:23	127:8 133:11	232:11	committed	181:6
claims 46:3	clearly 15:10	combat 97:16	139:11	component 65:3
219:11	19:12 26:20	133:23	common 49:13	65:5 163:13
clarification	96:22 125:16	combination	120:8 182:11	components
20:10 66:9	132:24 135:7	124:14	communicate	65:12 177:12
clarifier 189:17	141:2 158:18	combined 31:16	185:15	composition
199:16,21	163:8 164:23	31:21 182:13	communities	242:18
clarifiers 81:5	165:13 172:13	191:5 199:9,10	36:22 41:23	compound
clarifies 81:8	191:11	206:9 247:8,14	182:14 247:8,9	151:21 152:22
clarify 23:8 70:3	client 91:2 167:2	come 21:19	247:17	compounds
165:4 170:9	clients 31:14	51:10 57:20	community 49:2	151:11,24
175:23 179:18	closely 91:5	145:24 146:11	52:24 79:3	152:3,4 163:5
clarity 23:6	116:13	146:19 148:16	117:3 242:24	242:4 253:21
Clark 33:2	closer 209:3	148:17 152:16	compact 107:11	concentration

. Andrewston

ī

1				
119:3 121:4.8	concur 176:12	conservatively	82.10 91.11	contaminant
130:7 135:19	concurrence	102.20	92.14 100.10	136.2.21
137.20 151.5	158.20	conserving 43.3	101.9 107.22	contaminants
256.20	condition 44.17	consider 28.13	142.6 171.7	27.3 28.20
concentrations	48.23 149.11	63.20 84.23	200.19 206.14	48.16 AQ.1 A
119.5 122.9	221.8 242.22	85.10 13/18	254.22	131.10 190.14
254.3 255.18	221.0 242.22	217.15 220.16	2JT.22	204.10 219.10
concent 26:21	250.13	217.10 220.10	10.4 11 24.15	204.19.210.10
41.15 63.4	conditions 25.5	220.19 221.5	25.21 44.15	230.10
64.13 81.20	25.15 20.2	120.18	65.4 66.7 14	126.16 200.0
115.11 128.15	42.21 61.22 23	ansidorably	0.2 02.12 14	120.10 200.9
149.9 192.17	83.1 95.5		90.3 93.12,14	222.0
240.10 251.8	07.1/ 102.17	150.15	94.10 95.10	07.7 12 16
251.12	116.17 125.5	18.12 110.22	97.21 90.19	97.7,12,10
231.12 concents 134.15	125.10 122.21	10.15 119.25	101.5 115.8	155:24 151:21
$\begin{array}{c} \text{concepts } 134.13 \\ \text{concern } 7:21 \end{array}$	125.10 155.21	122.1 219.10	121:21:24:1	221:8 223:12
10.6 19.16	150.25 154.20	220.3	120:10,20	contemplated
	133.3 130.13	considered 7:23	130:23 138:7	154:16
30.12 44.12	102.1 225.15	8:7 27:10 41:1 50:5 6 06:22		contents 148:2
141.9 197.5,7	conducive 40:4	39:5,6 90:22		209:16
197:25 219:15	40:14 11/:2	128:3 1/0:18	1/6:91//:4,/	contingency
238.8,14,15	conducted 5:15	257:10	185:2 190:20	130:10,12
concerned 9:0	14.10 42.12	consisted 90:15	235:9 239:5	continue 36:11
	14:19 42:12	consistent	247:10 248:3	
192:20 255:1	144:3	137:18 139:15	constructions	153:2 163:17
concerning	confidence 60:6	consistently	241:6	continued 83:13
42:15 02:14	contining	142:1	construed 135:2	continues 51:20
95:17 207:11	145:15	consisting 95:1	consult 194:3	83:20
140.24 150.6	contused 11:7	95:12,20 118:8	consultant 31:16	continuing
149:24 130:0	13:10 01:7	consists 35:16	33:2 54:15	144:8
100:11 102:5	confusing	37:12 38:23	consultants 45:4	contract 90:14
192.12 190.24		92:11 132:14	consulting 31:11	97:20 115:22
197.25 207.7	110.2	constantly 0/:1	31:19 88:15	contracted
141.11	110:2 apping ative 26:4	151.20 21C:4 7	112:21	37:16
141.11 aonaludas	conjunctive 50:4	131:20 210:4,7	contact 138:10	contribute 142:8
	116.15 120.21	217:7 221:10	contain 125:0	153:2 204:20
143.21	110.15 129.21	242:9 243:20		contributed
227.22	22.17	224.21 225.16	219:8 240:15	127:15
227.22	32.17	224:21 223:10	240:10 250:9	contributing
	22.5 57.5 C	102.22 104.17	contained 54:20	
220.15	52:5 57:5,0	192:22 194:17	134:14 189:24	control 1:1 5:4
	71.22	204:11 209:19	213:20 220:10	
40.10,17 44.8	/1:22	207:15	230:3 256:14	32:3 34:13
44.10 102.1	25.6 102.12 22	102.15	202:2	30:9 48:18
100.9,15 219.1	23:0 102:13,22	192:15	containing	57:15,16 66:7
219:5,7257:15	102:23 103:3	construct	120:2	92:24 96:5
237:20,23	110:20 119:4	232:10	contains 49:3	212:14 239:13
230.1,3	117:14 141:10	constructed	δ1:10 121:22 129-22 204 10	240:19,21,24
114.15 027.10	151:5 152:8	25:25 57:1	128:23 204:18	247:5
114:13 237:10	130:10,17,19	41:14 44:5,18	214:20	controlled 157:4
1				

· · ·

10.17				
49:17	167:20 170:22	166:14,17	critical 32:20	d)2D0 94:11
conventional	171:8,10,12	168:1,10,11,15	175:2	daily 104:3
134:15	172:8 173:5,8	182:23	critically 97:17	damage 116:22
conversation	1/3:12,24	costs 44:6 92:24	133:24	167:14
46:20	175:12,16	169:6,23,24	crops 142:3	damages 70:23
conversion		Council 42:11	CROSS-EXA	Dana 3:3 16:6
151:18	177:16 178:16	counsel 267:21	56:12 84:3	18:2 19:24
converted	179:14,17	267:22	104:21 159:10	30:1,22 46:21
151:15	183:23 185:24	Counselor 64:12	193:22 200:5	91:5
convince 27:10	186:8,11,20	70:4	222:1 246:8	dangerous
cooperate 28:16	187:5 188:11	counselors	257:4	257:11
coordinating	188:12 189:5	265:21	cross-examine	data 39:11 51:16
91:3	190:10 191:13	counsels 17:24	14:9	92:1 102:15,19
coordination	194:4,19	country 42:24	cryptosporidi	147:19
91:18	199:23 201:6	88:22	258:12	datalogger
copy 30:7,10	201:11,12	counts 158:16	CSO 20:20	116:9
36:16 73:12	202:15,16	COUNTY 267:3	31:17 191:5	date 8:6 24:11
74:7 76:22	206:17 207:22	couple 7:7 56:21	247:7	202:11 266:6
77:2,22 87:19	207:23 208:1	86:7 102:2	CSR 268:8	dated 135:16
88:4 89:17	208:10,20	237:3	cubic 100:24	day 1:14 34:6,8
96:10 112:9	209:8,9,12	course 143:8	cull 17:5	48:11,13 62:4
114:7 121:20	211:20 222:22	177:12	culled 60:14	71:2 72:9 92:4
123:3,8 180:3	222:23 225:7	courses 235:16	curb 147:14	100:16 103:8
188:4 139:6	225:23 227:20	cover 76:12	current 31:7	103:20,20
204:23 254:10	233:22,23	covered 180:2	32:12 34:11	110:8 120:1,4
corner 98:5	234:2,7,23	cow 126:20	37:11,15,23	120:7 142:16
corporate	235:3,7,11	cows 229:2	39:14 41:18	142:20,23
113:16	236:20,23	crack 40:20	66:13 138:1	143:6,19
correct 10:9	238:13,14,17	44:10 219:7	212:9 245:6	144:24 148:24
53:8 58:1,13	239:17,18,24	cracking 40:19	248:2	154:5 156:21
58:14,16,17	240:3,4,20	170:13	currently 23:16	157:12 159:12
59:7,10 60:20	242:2,6,10	create 93:6	26:8 34:6	173:24 178:9
60:21 61:14	245:5 246:5	100:19 101:12	35:10 55:24	208:6,8,12,14
62:7 67:5 76:2	247:3,6,15,24	136:3,23	80:20	208:15,18
76:10,21 78:19	248:1,7,8,24	137:21 166:22	currents 132:17	209:2 255:7
81:18 82:15	249:5 250:7	166:23 214:5	curriculum	256:7 263:12
84:8,11,13,19	251:15,16	217:16	23:24	268:2
85:7,12 86:4,5	254:11 257:17	created 101:22	customers 101:7	days 143:6
86:11,16,18	260:15	creating 107:22	cut 101:11 264:8	151:8 182:21
103:17 105:12	correction 99:4	107:24 139:20	cuts 100:21	dead 175:17
105:15 106:19	corrective	214:22 220:20	CV 211:18	deal 71:8 76:19
109:18,19	220:14	221:8	CX 3:2	dealing 24:19
110:5,8,9,13	correctly 51:19	creation 100:10		59:9 62:9
148:3 150:7	65:17 105:7	Creek 153:4	D	101:8 214:15
159:15,21	cost 41:14,20	crime 53:19	D 3:1 4:1 36:17	238:23
160:4,9,16	43:14 44:4	criteria 122:1	44:18 73:11	dealt 16:14
161:2,10,11,12	60:1,24 101:3	124:20 133:3	94:22	death 155:24
161:13,14,20	101:11 117:7,8	140:24 141:20	D-r-a-g-o-v-i	debris 53:24
162:1 166:5	158:24 159:3	141:21	195:24	85:18 138:7

Same -

Contract

Table 1

	l	1		
decade 114:6	260:19	denving 194:20	118:2 119:23	41:2
December	degrading 150:6	department	120:18.20	determination
265:16 268:3	222:14	32:14 89:8.9	122:1 130:23	191:15 192:1
decide 79:14	degree 74:20.22	113:3.13	133:17.19	198:7 204.17
137:6	88:17 155:10	departments	134:15 145:2	224:24
decision 5:16	212:2	89:1	149:6.9 154:7	determine 81:22
8:3 9:22 10:9	deicing 152:22	depend 70:22	154:16 156:2.7	178:21 186:21
10:10.20 12:17	153:12	82:24 225:19	156:16 157:8	224.2.10
15:19 21:10	delay 261:8	dependent 81:11	158:3 159:4 24	determined
47:15 56:6	demand 118:21	147:7	164.2 10 167.4	39.11 224.1 20
71:5 140:7	132:6	depends 68:6	176.17.21	226.11
141:14 190:17	demands 53:21	deposit 214.4 10	187.11 198.8	detrimental
198:9 203:5	Demolition	215.6	199.5 212.21	48.8 136.5 24
decisions 71:20	138:7	deposited	219.16 246.16	137.22 139.21
decrease 34:24	demonstrate	153.21	249.18	140.14
decreases 39.20	46.2 49.6	denosition	designation	develop 118.17
decreasing	122.20 141.19	213.19.267.12	124.23	developed 53.16
34:19	demonstrated	267.18	designed 36.24	116.8 134.12
deem 80.6	49.15 95.5	describe 53.11	55.5 17 72.10	development
deemed 137:16	demonstrating	57.2 13 58.2	81.12 93.2	33.14 127.5
176.14	94.16.95.17	68.7 74.16	105.13 108.9	128.22 134.22
deen 97:24	demonstration	85:15 102.9	$109.19\ 100.9$ $108.10\ 110.21$	175.10
237:14	222:20	212.9 16 213.8	154.141010	deviations
deen-rooted	denial 15.16	described 33.22	156:10 164:11	185.17
108:5.15	24:15 27:17.24	50.22 95.23	187.1 193.8	devices 132.5
defer 70:19 79:5	27:24 46:10	234.3 239.4	220.11 236.3	dewatering
deferred 60:10	67:19 93:24	describing	250.5	162.16 168.7
deficiency	94:2.4 97:2	261:11	designer 43.11	dialogue 229.9
187:10	125:14 129:7	description 61.9	designs 66.14	diameter 48.13
define 68:11	131:4.12.17.21	64.9 158.7	110.23 111.7	98.1 142.17 17
69:17 96:6.18	135:5.8.12	design 33:4 8	114.4	dictate 97.14
105:22 137:19	141:5 159:1.5	40:1.13.15	desire 46.22	133.21
defined 15:5	179:19.23	41:5 8 43.18	119.21 137.19	die 163.9
27:21 69:19	184:23 186:19	45:7.11.16	desired 114.13	diene 201.9
96:3.7 105:13	187:7.9 189:21	46:3 54:24	220.21	Dietz 33.2 88.14
115:2 135:22	189:23 190:1	79:10 80:13.16	desnite 28.22	89.261119
204:21	191:12 194:2	80:21 85:5.9	189.1	89.20 90.6 15
defines 97:6	195:2 196:7	88:23 89:21	destroyed	90.16 19 21
defining 18:19	200:1.7.12	90:5.20.22.23	254.24	114.9 115.16
definition 58:5	202:11 203:8	90:24 91:9.10	detail 42:7 46.12	difference 58.3
68:13 96:11.21	213:3 214:19	91:14.21 92:10	50:22 53.11	58.6 143.11
100:20 132:10	238:9 239:1	92:23.23 93:4	144:14	146.5 206.16
132:11 136:15	denied 47:2	93:15 96:23	detailed 27.5	differences
209:20	99:18 140:23	98:14 103:13	130.22 158.24	54.24
definitions	141:19 213:5	106:22 109:4	159:4	different 60.13
64:14	239:2	110:21 111:5	detected 262.7	60:14 61.19 20
degradation 9:7	denitrifv 155:8	113:18 114:11	detention	61:21 62:24
12:11 152:2.3	deny 10:21 29:3	114:16.22.24	127:14	104:8 109.2
152:9 203:17	141:14 231:1	115:15.23	deterioration	138.4 173.20
				1.50.117.5.20
	1	1	1	1

"House

T				
206:3 227:6	209:24 213:23	disposal 171:9	185:23 196:9	documents 6:17
234:15,17	232:17 242:16	171:12,13	196:15 202:9	7:7.19.20 8:22
254:4	243:1 244:3,7	dissimilar 261:1	203:4 206:22	9:1.4 11:16
differently	244:8,11,13	dissolve 243:7	217:4 219:23	76:15 90:1
151:20	247:18.21	dissolved 123:2	237:6.22	93:15 98:15
difficult 41:4	252:19	243:10	238:18 242:8	131:1 203:10
80:2	discharged 28:8	distance 122:3	244:12 245:2.7	203.19.212.21
diffusion 148:21	28:11 86:11	distinction	246:10 248:22	doing 11.20
dike 147:14	217:16 261:11	250:22	262:8 266.1	17.18 108.17
diking 254:23	discharges 58:7	District 1:4 5:6	District's 32:17	167.8 212.4 6
dilute 152:18	114:2 178:8	6:5 15:7 24:16	32.18 22 33.12	238.7 262.5
diluted 152:12	209:17 230:9	24:23 25:21	34:5 37:6 38:3	264:12
208:2.4.19	263:11	26:14.19 27:4	58:11 65:8	dollar 191.7
dilution 209:10	discharging	27:11 28:9 16	91.6.93.15	dollars 61.2
256:1.1	181:24 206:8	30:24 31:7 9	101.7 119.21	101.12
direct 30:4 57:4	206:10	31.13 32.13	125.14 139.13	domestic 127.1
57:6 58:8 73:7	discovering	35.7 10 10 14	219.11 221.12	136.6 137.1
87:17 112:4	123:18	36.1 17 21	240.23 255.9	160.13 243.1
144:9 184.15	discuss 45.15	37.9 24 38.12	261.4	255.14
188:23 195:19	55:3 56:24	38.15 39.21	districts 172.18	double 189.18
204:9 207:7.20	62:11 98:22	40:12 41:16	236.24 237.4	199.17
211:12 233:14	122.17 178.7	43.16 18 22	diversion 117.22	doubt 149.15
241:23 252:16	228:16.17	44:3.15 45.1 4	118.1 119.9	213.22
directed 25:7	discussed 17:2	45:23 49:6	143.3 236.21	downstream
265:10	46:24 48:14	50:7.12.17.23	divert 104:4	255:21
direction 143:17	68:19 93:20	51:20 53:12.13	186:16 236:5	Dr 2:5
146:19 267:15	161:18 173:10	53:20 54:2,14	diverted 35:4	draft 46:12 99:6
directly 28:11	174:23 179:24	54:15 56:5	84:24 85:10	121:18 122:17
138:16 160:21	190:13 206:5	59:15 65:10	117:20 118:22	126:4 135:16
194:11 209:24	discusses 48:21	75:4,5,8 78:20	118:24 119:17	141:5 178:14
261:14 267:23	215:6	78:23 79:7,8	129:22	185:17 254:11
director 180:8	discussing 63:22	82:17 89:21	Division 212:11	drafted 243:15
dirty 66:24	63:24 69:22	90:4,12 93:11	docket 5:8 139:9	Dragovich 3:18
disagree 15:3	159:13 259:4	94:1 98:16	document 7:22	194:1.5 195:16
215:9 229:23	discussion 9:18	100:2,12	8:16 19:9,10	195:23 205:3
disagrees 127:10	10:15 36:12	101:15,15	19:12 20:16	205:11
138:1	111:19 115:5	103:11,18	21:8,16 55:9	drain 145:10
disappointment	131:19 167:9	114:11,13	73:16,17 96:8	148:1 149:4,12
174:24	252:4 257:22	115:14,21,24	132:20 134:13	drainage 49:7
discharge 26:8	265:2	120:17 121:3	134:15 141:4	drained 151:8
26:10,11 69:2	discussions 9:11	121:20 122:16	191:1,9 199:4	draining 39:22
69:14 70:4	12:18 45:5	123:7,14,22	202:8,13,20	dramatic 155:23
71:15 124:13	78:14 93:18	125:6 126:1,23	214:18	dramatically
124:17 128:17	131:2 166:10	130:17,18,22	document's	53:10
131:10 136:2	166:14 197:12	138:9 139:11	239:12	draw 39:5
136:21 177:1	197:16,19	142:11 149:4	documentation	drawing 97:22
180:14 183:10	disinfect 244:13	171:3 174:2,10	93:17 158:1	98:11
204:9 206:7	disinfection	178:8 180:8	documented	drawings 97:20
207:4,20	244:17	181:5 184:22	46:8	133:19

"Nationality"

draws 92:16	e-mails 99:7	36:15 53:12	201:4	121:18 131.2
Drinker 2:3 6:4	196:11 203:11	egregious 14:3	emergencies	133.17 134.1 2
drinking 140:11	earlier 24:9	eight 31:18	261.14	150.19 158.4
Droessler 3:8	26:22 69:20	119:14 151:7	emergency	158.24 212.2
17.9 19.6	157.3 161.18	151.16 234.16	250.11	219.20 234.13
29:15 33:3	163:23 175:20	eight-inch 48.12	emerging	235.5
49.19 55.22	186.6 228.5	97.24	134.12	ensure 5.18 39.2
87.14 88.2 13	232.15 237.21	eight-milligram	emissions	enter 117.15
104.23 154.8	238.10 248.4	121.5	129.19	entered 8.18
161.19 168.14	248.20 253.12	either 11.17	emnhasis 135.2	38.12 50.8
Droessler's	253.24	41.4 79.21	emphasize 64.21	86.3 160.23
164.12	early 158.20	80.24 96.19 23	employed 75.3 5	entering 160.23
drons 260.13	234.5	106.8 138.12	113.11 114.18	ontors 85.10
dry 120.13	earthen 34.7	151.2 155.3	amployoo	161.22.24
155.5 170.14	170.11	186.22 238.5	267.20.21	ontiro 12:12
208.7	Fast 1.13	261.11	207.20,21	22.12 25.15 22
dual 90.7 115.16	edge 122.4	alacted 130.6	mptics 143.13	107.15 18
due 32.20 57.23	aducation	1/1.23	25.2	107.13,10
00.20 24 100.8	211.24 221.11	141.25 alastria 20.24	55.2 omntuing 25.15	106.5 174.2
100.15 101.4	211.24221.11 234.10	electric 20.24	emptying 25.15	195.21 ontinety 22.22
107.8 124.13	aducational	electronically	64.11	entirely 22:25
176.10 250.3	21.12 7A.18	17.23	04.11	122.1 190.2
duly 29.22 30.3	21.12 / 4.10	alement /0.15	118.812	265.8
73.3687.13	Edward 211.16	elements 40.15	110.0,12 Angusto to	205.0
87.16 111.22	effect 262.14	54.1 126.7	134.21	31.20.32.6.0
112.3 184.11	effective 41.20	elevated 41.10		AA-23 A8-0
184.14 195.15	43.15 44.5	49.8 152.23	175.9	03.7 101.10
195.18 205.18	60.24 155.17	elevation 116.11	endanger 71.17	108.7 114.20
211:8.11	182:23 253:4	116.13 14 22	energy 43.3 18	115.1 136.15
233:13 252:15	254:2	117:9 118:3.6	enforces 36.18	192.15 262.20
267:10	effectively	142:13 143:11	engineer 31.4	environmental
DuPage 153:3	119:11 253:15	143.14 144.19	88.13 20 89.4	1.7 5.7 6.9
durability 95:3	254:1.20	145:18.24	89.7.24 113.5	26.16.33.7
durable 64:18	255:24	146.10 12 13	113.8 121.12	36.3 18 41.19
duration 66:16	efficiency 120:9	146:14 147:2	185:2 3 219.19	42.11 44.19
duties 6:14	155:13	147:18 23	233.21 234.14	50.8 52.23
75:13	effluent 26:7.13	148:14 241:10	235:20	54.17 78.15
DX 3:2	45:2 69:2.15	elevations	engineer's 97.17	93.1 109.14
dvnamic 62:1	70:6.7.12 80:8	145:20	engineering	112.21 113.2 8
	81:24 82:5	Elgin 31:15	30.23 31.2.8.9	113.17 19 24
E	90:9 93:6	eliminate 65:19	31:12.13 32:14	115.3 125.4
e 3:1 4:1,2 11:24	115:19 126:24	169:4.8.9.11	32.16 33.4	131.6 169.16
16:4 42:1,5	142:7 169:12	169:11 181:7	52.11 24 80.22	180.11204.22
96:4 112:1,8	169:15 177:15	247:22 249:9	81.13 88.15 22	209.21 210.5
112:19 205:16	242:15 244:9	eliminating	89.1 5 9 91.6	220.23 221.1 2
252:13	effluents 258:23	24:18	95:9 96:5	221:4 223.17
e-mail 149:22	effort 36:4.7.10	embankment	112:24 113:2 3	247:2
150:1,3,5	92:24	94:9.23	113:12.18	EP 201:8
197:2,8,10	efforts 24:17	Embedded	120:19.24	EPA 7:23.24 8·3
	l i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1	1	1

.

w/consta

	0.11 14 21.0	antablished 02.7	117.12 010.17	110.10	10.00
	9.11,14 21.9	02.0 100.12		118:12	12:22
	20:5 29:5	95.9100.15	everybody 100:1	exceed 65:23	excreted 126:20
	91:19 99:7	102:14 108:24	203:22	95:22 122:8	excuse 22:3 56:3
	109:22 110:5		everyday 81:11	237:16 242:20	94:3 136:11
	110:24 111:8	establishing	evidence 14:9	250:4	182:8 196:15
	113:7 120:18		20:12,13,14	exceeded 25:8	263:18
	123:21 127:23	establishment	21:23 22:19	81:1 124:12	excused 72:23
	128:13 135:14	117:3	24:10 30:8		87:6111:16
	138:24 140:20	estimate 00:4		226:16,20	184:9 195:13
	140:23 142:10	151:4 157:14	189:9,14 202:1	exceedences	205:9 210:12
	150:3,11	160:3 207:20		19:22	233:3 251:23
	100:11 109:3	estimated 39:21	260:5	exceeding	executed 37:9
	170:9201:14	40:11 41:8	evident 27:9	110:12	exerted 100:9
	202:23 209:18		93:7	exceeds 39:18	exfiltrate 48:7
	212:0 213:23	estimation 160:7	evidentiary 5:19	126:10 157:1	exfiltration
	214:4 220:19	etcetera 230:2	ex-filtration	236:4	100:15
	221:5 233:21	etnyiene 201:9	142:22	exception 21:16	exhibit 4:3,7
	234:19 251:7	evaluate 38:15	exact 138:9	excerpts 22:14	6:21 8:1 16:2,9
	EPA'S 10:10	80:4	153:12 255:4	excess 9:12	16:10,13 18:4
	EPDM 201:10	evaluated 97:17	exactly 1 /:11	11:11 33:23,24	19:5 21:1,5,7
	203:1	133:24	151:22 154:8	34:1/36:4,22	21:24 22:4,4,7
	equalization	evaluation 38:19	150:5	37:8,10 38:22	22:10,12 23:1
	23:23 121:14	40.3	exam 89:5	39:6,17 54:19	23:18 24:3,11
· · · · ·	152.25 145.0	25.2 29.17	20.4 69.19	01:5 89:22	29:13,13,14,16
	154.9,11 104.2	33.2 30.17 20.2 12 24	50.4 08.18 72.6 72.7	90:0,10,23,24	29:10 30:9
	165.22 167.6	39.3,12,24 40:0 52:4 54:2	72:075:7	91:11,23 92:0	45:10,17,18
	105.25 107.0	49.9 55.4 54.5	07.17 110.10	92:11,15,17,18	50:11 / 5:25,24
	170.0,13 182.9	54.0 55.2,18	112.4 101.1	92:22 95:8	74:5,577:24
	106.10 206.6	70.10 21 22	104.15 100.25	94:10 90:13,18	/8:2,3,3,11
	190.19 200.0	70.10,21,22	195:19 202:5	90:24 98:5	88:5,6 99:10
	250.7247.22	92.2,10,21	203:19,20	101:13 103:15	112:13 138:22
	equally 204.3	105.9 104.7	211.12 233.14	105:5 115:8,15	18/:0 189:/,14
	142.18 22	110.11 110.0	251.5 252.10	115:19 110:4	190:4 199:14
	142.10,22	117.23,24	207.9 avaminad 20.2	117.10,20	200:15 211:19
	equivalent 05.22	119.1,11,10 120.14 128.11	73.6 87.16	119.5,5,15	212:25 210:15
	120.1 126.10	160.22 240.11	112.3 184.14	120.7 129.22	217.19,20
	147.12	250.22 272.14	195.18 205.19	164.17 172.10	222.5 250:24
	erred 103.3	events 24.19	211.11 233.13	182.10 235.22	241.17 203.0 ovhibits 12.21
	error 135.7	51.4 65.22	252.15	$102.10\ 233.22$ $236.1\ 2\ 12\ 14$	16.12 22.15
	237.12	76.3 13 16	evample 21.13	230.1, 5, 15, 14 236.15, 237.1, 7	24.5 0 20.0 10
	escape 105.9	79.190.12	44·20 71·19	230.13 237.1,7	24.5,9 29.9,10
	espousing	101.14 115.21	79.23 81.5 24	excessive 40.21	evist 54.1
	222:18	117:19.22	104:5 142.11	126:23 179.6	100.17 101.10
	essence 222:18	121:4 145:23	156:8 189:17	255:13 261.7	202:13
	essentially 11:14	152:19 162:12	262:1	exchange 155:2	existed 172.8
	75:13 263:3	247:18 248:5	examples 237:4	253:14	existing 46:17
	establish 223:7	250:3 256:21	241:8	exclude 6:17	89:14 98:4
	256:20	eventually	excavation	7:17,18 11:16	101:5 122:9
		-			

Г

Contraction of the second seco

. .

100 11110			1	
172:4,14,19	expert 235:18	97:11 134:16	115:13 153:19	118:5,10 122:4
181:7 223:7,15	expertise 33:15	138:12 139:7	176:24	130:5 133:5,6
223:20 248:16	212:12 229:14	141:23 235:2,6	fallen 53:17	133:8,9 139:12
249:2,4	229:16,20	235:23 236:2	falls 177:6	141:12 147:5,6
exists 163:16	explain 45:7	237:1,5	familiar 80:11	147:9 149:18
172:22 253:12	49:20 51:7	facility 23:19	83:4 84:10	168:16 225:13
exits 206:19	79:13 144:13	28:23 54:13,16	85:5 86:6	255:21,24
expand 43:21	150:9 167:23	54:23,24 58:10	149:22 171:24	256:7
107:23 182:24	184:20 188:17	58:11,12,18,23	198:11 216:4	felt 167:4
expansion 32:16	196:3 198:15	59:1 65:16	219:10 233:24	fertilized 109:13
89:13	220:7	68:19,24 69:12	235:4,8,14,21	fertilizer 109:11
expect 51:5 53:9	explained	69:13,17,20,20	236:24 243:18	125:21
65:13,18 82:13	122:19 123:5	69:21 70:9	243:23 247:13	fewer 65:22,22
82:22 86:14,17	123:16	71:15 84:8,11	famous 260:9	field 157:11
86:19 104:12	explanation	84:15 85:20	fantasy 71:8	229:2
223:9 226:14	240:6	89:15,22 90:6	far 7:20 12:21	fields 254:6
245:20 246:1	exposed 40:17	91:24 106:3	47:8 61:24	figure 249:24
expectation	exposure 41:2	124:2 131:9	64:3 126:23	file 27:12
52:17 65:10	48:18 258:16	154:4 160:15	192:20 213:8	filed 6:19 7:2,16
83:19 230:5	260:2	161:9 164:6	214:13 228:23	8:21 11:15
expected 43:9	expound 13:13	166:4 169:5	fashion 5:19	19:18 22:17
79:16 122:7	154:2	170:21,21,23	148:12	158:4 185:24
125:6 143:1	express 36:12	171:4 172:4,8	fast 81:14,15	265:7,9
208:11 226:16	expressed	173.2,21,23	115:22	filing 18:16
expects 37:24	174:24 197:7	174:1 177:16	feasible 167:11	fill 41:13 138:7
84:15,21	extended 186:22	180:13 219:17	167:19,21	138:20 190:5
174:14	extensive 93:16	220:12,15	features 41:17	filled 237:12
expedience 23:6	255:5	223:19 224:12	fecal 49:5,8	filling 25:15
expend 37:21	extensiveness	229:2 235:10	121:11 122:21	94:18 95:19
expenditure	255:12	236:14,17	126:9,12	filter 90:8
60:2 64:19	extent 140:8	237:18 238:2	155:11,12,18	257:19
expenditures		242:14 245:9	155:24 163:9	filtered 155:21
79:4,5	151:12 153:13	251:9 261:17	177:17 178:11	253:8 254:1
expense 28:22	155:7 166:17	facility's 172:7	253:22 254:3	filtering 253:4
28:23 65:3	166:19 250:24	fact 19:10 24:21	257:6,23	260:19
expensive 44:7	extra 65:20	82:3 86:9 93:7	258:21 263:14	filtration 155:19
126:22 237:18	extraordinarily	192:18 202:21	263:18	163:12
experience 31:6	257:23	207:4 228:19	federal 36:8	final 8:3 9:19,22
34:9 37:20	extreme 182:1	factor 226:12	Federation 32:6	10:9,9,20
52:12 88:21	extremes 40:18	facts 47:7,8	32:10	12:17 21:10
110:20 111:4	eyes 56:20 68:1	49:11 71:21	feed 171:19	44:24 47:16
113:6 119:4	F	fail 66:4,5,9	236:16	81:5,7 98:14
125:8 158:11	F 46.10 129.02	168:4	teeding 161:2	98:23 99:7
211:23 219:19	F 40:19 138:23	failure 135:9	feel 177:11	139:8 158:16
221:12 234:9	face 95:24	141:15	192:13 193:1	finalizing 99:3
235:13,14		tair 67:16,18	feels 19:22	finally 43:22
245:19	100:13	tairly 146:16	feet 38:7,8 41:10	130:9
experienced	24.17 90.15	224:6	59:18,18 93:9	financial 101:4
101:5 207:14	34:17 89:13	fall 90:4 113:10	108:4 118:3,4	101:7

SOLOW.

				<u></u>
find 55:12 64:18	41:3.9	141.13 144.15	97.6 112.3	164.12 191.7
208.10 226.14	flinning 23.6	144.2123	132.12 184.14	218.4 247.18
fine 14.13 18.23	float 117.13	145.9 20 154.3	195.18 205.18	fourth 144.0
21.20 66.11	219.12 241.2	154.5 164.14	211.11 233.13	fraction 1/2.15
118.8 165.3	floating 130.3	164.20 172.19	252.15	152.3
177.21 194.13	flood 71.17	186.7 12 14 15	foot 143.6	Francis 3.15
232.23 253.7	147.10 12 14	188.19.20	145.15 146.3	121.12 194.12
firm 6.3 31.11	149.10	206.15.10	253.17	121.12 104.12
31.19 88.15	flooding 41.11	200.13,19 208.5712	footpote 127.22	233.11
90.18 91.21	43·4 44·13	208.5,7,12	130.5 1/0.10	Example 106.5
102.6 109.21	181.19	207.7,10210.1 213.17235.22	1/3.5	frankly 8.24
1102.0 109.21 110.1 4 112.21	floor 2.14 93.8	236.1 3 4 6 6	$\int \frac{143.3}{100.22}$	152.24 152.17
firms 90.16	114.17 117.12	236.13 15 15	forbid 10.22	150.2
first 8.10 12.4	117.13 16	230.13,13,13	form 27.17	139.2 fmon 177.11
14.20 20.17 10	118.3 15 110.8	237.1,8 238.2	150.4	free 1/7.11
30.2 35.3 73.5	120.23 120.2 2	241.1 247.22	foregoing	140.4
87.15 90.8	129.23 130.2,2	249.19,24	101 egoing	140.4 fmoguomov 92.19
0/.10 90.8	flotation (1).5 11	flowing 162:17	207.12 former 256.11	247.22
112.2 115.17	flow 0.12 11.11	204.10 256.6	forever 230.11	247:23
128.16 131.22	25.23 21.22	flows 25.7 8 10	forget 129.7	rrequently
1/20.10 101.22	23.23 31.22	25.11 11 22.24	form 06.16	203.22,23
186.2 101.18	31.18 24 35.2	23.11,11 33.24	100.24 151.1	front 22:15
194.15 195.17	36.5 22 37.10	37.0 30.7 10	151.14 161.0	110111 22:15 56:20 76:15
205.17 207.13	38.4.22.24	1 37.939.7,19	131.14 101.9	02.10112.10
203.17207.13 211.4 10 212.4	30.5 13 17 17	52.14 81.6	100.14 104.17	92.19 112.10
217.3,10,212.4	39.18 40.2 3	82.14 81.0	formal 03.11 21	226.0
217.5 255.12	51.15 16 21	83.12 100.5	formally 0.2	220.9
245.16 252.14	53.4 54.19	102.5 103.15	130.20 21	fulfilling 00.10
253.14	59.15 60.18	102.3 103.15	formations	full 25.13 73.10
fish 136.9 137.4	61.4 65.20	116.18 19	97.13	79.17 80.2
fissured 97.13	71.14 72.10 15	145.9 147.4	forms 93.14	84.16 110.22
five 5:17 7:9	80:14.16.19	160.17 182.10	forth 9.17 27.24	112.7 182.9
42:17 82:24	81:12.18 82:3	206:17 236:9	72.10 78.5	184.18 186.17
87:4 119:2.5	82:3.6.7 89:22	250:4	135.16 203.19	236.5.11
119:10 120:2.4	90:6.10.23.24	focused 66:17	Fortunately	256.11
120:7 121:5	91:12.23 92:3	102:7 114:6	259:21	fully 133.13
126:18.20	92:6.11.12.13	focusing 89:13	forward 83.20	139.23 163.7
133:6 140:4	92:16.18.18.18	139:20	found 36:17	function 40.8 22
151:6.16	92:22 93:8	folks 197:20	50:9 99:9	61:5 90:7
157:10 210:20	94:10 96:13.18	follow-up 50:3	100:19 185:17	115:16 143:9
210:23 222:4	96:24 98:6	102:2	foundation	145:14.17
256:7	101:14 103:13	following 38:5	214:9	146:2 149:16
five-year 54:3,6	104:3,6 105:4	42:13 46:9	founded 88:15	169:2 199:11
55:1,5,17	106:2,4 111:5	90:16 99:13	112:22	functioned
78:18,21 79:10	115:8,15,19	124:15 203:6	four 7:9 12:2	32:22
249:14	116:4 117:10	follows 30:3	31:6 35:1	funds 42:4
fixed 132:9	117:20 118:23	45:9 47:5 73:6	45:20 108:4	further 72:4
flanged 98:1	119:3,5,13,17	87:16 90:18	113:14 123:23	87:2 92:7.21
flexible 40:13,24	126:12 129:22	94:20 96:8	124:22 126:22	104:17 107:23
1				

ł

 $\langle \langle \rangle$

[
140:15 159:7	General's 6:8.11	167:3.4 174:10	gotten 149:2	granting 221.6
180:23 183:2	56:15	174:18 183:16	governmental	221.13 241.20
184:1 193:10	generally 53:2	183.18	75.20	grants 130.13
195:9 203:22	212:8 224.8	goes 5.18 9.9	gradient 122.22	grass 100.12
204:24 205:6	247.13	83.19 124.10	124.12 130.6	grasses 114.17
207:15 210:8	generated 8.6	134.17148.20	graduated 212.1	gravity 145.10
210.13 232.21	242.17	161.15	grained 118.8	160.17 162.17
251.1 19 257.2	generation	going 10.21	grant 2.12 3.13	100.17 102.17
future 41.18	124.18	11.17 12.24	3.16 16 10 21	172.14
51.4 65.8	generic 253.10	11.1712.24 14.31015	6.6.6.72.7.12	173.14 magaza 27.4 66.9
86.18 20	generic 255.17	15.21 16.1 14	7.14 15 16	217.10 252.2 6
245.18	<u>41.4</u>	16.21 10.1,14	8.12.17.20	217.10 235.2,0
2-73.10		10.21 10.21 10.2 21.20	0.12,17,20	233.0
G	geological 212.2	24:10 20:6	12.9 15:5,0	great 41:15
G-r-a-c-e-f-f-a	212.5	47.6 56.16	14:1 15:5 10:0	105:19 205:25
180:8	212.J	62.4 6 69.5	10:20 18:14	greater 34:10
G-r-a-n-t 6.7	206.11 220.22	02.4,0 08.5	19:14 20:9,21	44:19 53:11
gallon 72.9 82.8	200.11228.22		21:3,0,19	82:13 128:18
92.13 101.24	give 7:9 24:12	81:0 84:10	22:13,20,23	226:22
237.10	19:3,17 80:2		23:3,8,14,23	greatly 182:18
gallons 34.6 7	130:12 139:4		26:21 28:2,3	green 25:1 41:17
48.11 12 56.1	1/4:6 180:3		29:7 47:6,16	41:21,23 42:4
60.1 14 70.8	210:20 237:3		47:21,22 48:1	42:7,15 43:7
70.16 71.13 16	240:5 241:8	148:11,13,15	55:7,13 77:19	63:11,14,20
80.14 15 20	257:18	148.16,19	77:22 84:1	64:6,9 65:3,4
82.14 02.4 0	given 14:22	151:10 152:13	111:1 128:4	92:23 100:13
02.14 92.4,9 102.12 4 0 12	25:19 36:23	153:7 158:8	136:11,16	107:19,21
103.1,2,4,9,12	38:9 53:4	163:17 170:11	137:5,8,13	108:19 109:13
110.0 12 111.6	59:20 109:22	170:12,13	189:12 193:12	169:15 191:6,6
117.22 110.1	146:22 230:24	190:22 193:13	193:13,23	198:17
120.1 142.16	267:16	195:3 196:22	194:17 195:7	greener 114:14
120.1 142.10	gives 42:6	201:18 210:16	200:4,6 201:17	114:19 167:5
142.20,25,24	glaring 17:5	210:18 214:17	202:2,4,19	greenhouse
145.5,0,10	glossary 96:4,11	215:10,23	204:2,13 205:1	129:19
154.5 100.8,10	go 7:12 8:9 15:5	225:16,17	205:5,10	Greg 33:3
101.7 102.21	19:17 20:1	228:9,21 231:3	207:17 210:6	Gregory 3:8
207.21 208.6 8	30:20 48:2	243:4 253:5	210:16 211:13	19:6 29:15
207.21200.0,8 208.121214	56:20 /0:16	255:8,24	214:11,12	87:14 88:1,12
200.12,13,14	80:/105:19	256:12,13	215:7,9,14,16	ground 48:17
200.10 209.2,5		260:6,14	215:20 216:3	106:7 126:21
257.15 255.7,0	146:9 148:10	261:14,21	221:19,21	151:13 155:14
203.12 andia 259.12	148:11,13	264:4,21	227:5,12	222:16 248:9
garula 238.15	156:6 157:2,7	265:13,14	228:21,24	252:20
gan 127.17 100.7	159:2 163:24	good 5:1 41:18	231:3 232:22	grounds 262:18
general 2.10 0:7	193:15 215:10	41:19 60:5	232:23 233:4	groundwater
0:12 33:13	216:15 236:10	66:18 72:19	233:10,15	9:7,15,20
42.14 40:20	252:2 256:21	104:23 111:12	246:6 250:14	11:18 12:11,14
02.14 101.12 224.1 224.9	262:6 264:24	147:3 163:4	251:4,6,17,24	12:15 15:12
224.1 220:8	goal 38:18	169:16	257:3,5 265:8	26:23 27:3
240.12	166:22,24	goodwill 46:2	265:15	28:9,21 43:2,8

(

- Weard

	<u> </u>
40:1,5,6 47:4 213:24 217:16 28:1 29:6,25 80:19 201:22 20	2:6
48:18,22 49:15 218:10,22 30:17,20 47:11 happy 143:22 202:17 20	3:2
68:10,11 91:17 219:11 220:5,8 47:20,23 48:2 144:20 175:23 203:22 20	4:15
93:5,10 97:3,7 220:9,20 221:6 50:4 52:2 54:7 259:19 204:24 20	5:6
97:8,16,19,23 221:9,17 222:8 56:10 69:23 hard 28:15 205:21 20	7:15
98:4,8 99:21 222:10 223:11 72:2,5,18,20 53:17 81:13,15 210:7,8,14	4,15
100:1,9 105:11 226:3 227:7,16 74:1,4,10 78:1 harmful 136:4 210:20 21	4:8
$\begin{bmatrix} 107:8,12 \ 108:1 \\ 227:19 \ 228:1,9 \\ 78:10 \ 84:1 \\ 136:23 \ 137:22 \\ 215:1,4,14 \\ 215:1,4,$	4,18
108:16,18,21 229:18 230:18 86:23 87:3,8 139:21 140:14 216:1 221	:22
108:24 109:6 232:18 235:12 87:22 103:23 Harsch 2:4 3:3,6 222:2 227	:13
114:23 116:11 235:14,18,20 104:19 110:16 3:8,11,12,13 229:6,13	
116:12,15,17 236:22 241:1,2 111:11,13,17 3:15,17,19,22 230:23 23	1:14
116:19 117:15 241:12,12 128:4,8 129:5 5:24 6:2,3,15 232:8,21	246:7
118:6 120:14 243:19 256:6 137:5,9 143:23 7:12 8:16 246:9 250	:17
121:1,11,15 256:14 260:1,2 144:6 159:8 11:23 13:13,16 251:1,18,	19
122:10,20 260:11,17 180:24 183:4 13:21 14:16,22 252:2,7,1	7
123:15 124:11 group 176:11 184:2,5 189:10 16:8 17:21,22 257:2 264	:16
124:19,19,22 198:9 189:13 193:12 18:17 19:1,2,8 264:17,23	
124:23 125:13 grow 53:21 193:20 195:8 19:18,20 20:3 265:15 26	6:1
125:19 126:13 155:20 195:11 197:13 20:10,15,16,24 Harsh 137:	9
126:17 127:16 guess 13:4 15:2 201:23 202:3 21:4,14 22:2 hazard 214	:6,22
127:18 128:24 18:6 27:7 63:3 205:2,7,12,15 23:15,21,22 head 40:2 5	6:21
129:10,20 64:21 66:9 210:7,9,13,22 24:4,12,14 61:24 62:	1
130:1,7,10,12 183:18 235:16 211:1 214:11 28:2 29:11,17 89:22 114	:12
130:14 131:15 261:15 214:23 215:2 29:19,24 30:5 143:10 14	6:4
133:15,23 guessing 64:4 215:12,15,24 30:13,18,19 heading 18	7:24
134:5 135:13 guidelines 10:4 221:20 227:10 47:11,12 50:2 188:1 239	:21
137:24 138:1,4 gunked 67:1 229:3,11 50:5 52:2,3,8 241:24	
138:5,13,14,17 Gurnee 237:9 230:19 231:7 52:10 54:7,9 headworks	
139:12,24 guys 210:23 231:11 232:4 54:11 55:15 33:24 34:	16,18
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$:18
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$:3
141:11,18,22 H 4:2 251:3,18,20 72:5,7,17,24 health 48:9	
142:9 145:20 H-u-f-f 112:8 252:1,6,12 73:8,20 74:4,9 115:1 136	:5,24
146:17,18 nabitat 44:21 257:3 264:16 74:12 77:17,23 258:16	
148:3,13,20,22 101:22 264:18,24 78:3,12 83:23 hear 7:11 2	5:17
149:17,20 nail 155:22 265:4 87:1,2,18 88:3 52:3 241:	3
150:6 152:12 Halloran 1:15 hand 211:5 104:9,17 244:23	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$)
155:7,22 156:1 7:15 8:8,13 handed 6:15 111:2,10 112:5 84:6 158:	15
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	5:20
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$:9
191:19 192:3 14:14,18 15:24 82:4 144:24 159:6 180:24 220:2 240	:23
193:6 196:23 10:9,10 17:20 186:16 250:5 181:2 183:2 244:19 24	8:3
197:20 203:15 18:1,24 19:4 handling 235:22 184:3,4,16 hearing 1:1	2,16
204:10 207:5 19:10,24 20:6 happen 65:18 189:6,15 5:1,3,11,1	8
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	3
213:12,15,16 23:12 24:8 happens 61:22 197:18 200:3 10:7 11:7	22

have

· _ · • .

· Southers

	1	1	1	1
12:8,16,24	264:18,24	262:6	264:19	93:20,22,24
13:4,9,18	265:4	hit 148:21	Huff's 13:12	94:2,4 97:21
14:14,18 15:24	hearsay 194:9	hold 20:4 39:7	14:24 16:5,10	98:16,22 99:10
16:9,16 17:20	heat 40:18	164:20 182:15	16:21 29:12	99:13,18
18:1,20,24	heave 100:8	240:8	49:19 67:13,18	100:12 139:14
19:4,16,24	107:8	holding 183:8	human 115:1	174:14
20:6,15 21:22	heavily 101:16	holds 240:10	209:16,24	IEPA's 36:14
22:4,9,11,18	heaving 168:8	holiday 265:23	216:10 221:15	42:5,7,13
22:22,24 23:12	heavy 40:9	holidays 265:24	252:24 253:18	46:12 48:4
23:18 24:2,8	153:14 208:11	homes 71:17	257:11,12,13	62:13 97:2
28:1 29:6,23	260:12	79:22	257:14 258:10	IIT 113:11
30:17,20 33:11	held 1:12,15	hoping 123:22	258:15	II 2:6 122:3,5
47:11,20,23	26:18 36:10	host 178:5 228:7	hydraulic 33:10	124:23 125:2
48:2 50:4 52:2	42:12 45:4	263:8	34:8,23 39:3,7	131:16 179:11
54:7 56:10	98:22 122:16	hour 18:17	39:14 44:12	ILCS 131:7
69:23 72:2,5	123:7 127:23	104:5	61:21 72:12	180:11
72:18,20 73:20	128:14 162:6	hours 35:1,3	100:8 117:11	illegally 261:12
74:1,4,10 78:1	183:10	39:23 74:24	117:18 118:19	Illinois 1:1,7,13
78:10 84:1	help 61:7 253:9	92:20 133:10	129:23 143:10	2:11,15 5:3,7
86:23 87:3,8	helping 43:4	146:11 149:8	149:1 188:19	6:8 7:23,23 8:3
87:10,22	hepatitis 258:7	156:21 159:12	244:22	9:11,14 10:16
103:23 104:19	herbicides	162:6,15	hydraulically	21:9 26:16
110:16 111:11	127:19	House 42:9,11	116:15 129:21	27:21 28:5
111:13,17	hereto 267:23	houses 53:18,24	hydraulics	29:3 31:1,3,3,5
128:4,8 129:5	high 40:2 61:24	Huff 3:10 8:9	235:16,18	36:3 42:15
137:5,9 138:21	71:10 99:24	11:24 12:5	hydrogeology	48:5 49:21
143:23 144:6	109:8 116:18	13:22 14:14	212:10	50:8 54:17
159:8 180:24	126:12 152:19	17:6 27:4 33:6	hydrologic	78:15 88:20
183:4 184:2,5	155:10,14	33:6,7 45:20	116:7 167:12	91:19 94:5,11
189:10,13	160:11 241:15	45:20 46:11,14	hypothetical	97:4,8 99:19
193:12,20	high-flow 121:4	46:14 67:24	199:15	109:22 110:5
195:8,11	150:23	68:13 90:17,17		110:24 111:8
197:13 201:23	higher 116:24	91:8,8,9,13		113:6 115:7
202:3 205:2,7	117:9 138:15	98:20 99:12	idea 14:7 20:17	120:18 123:21
205:12,15	143:14 146:14	107:23 108:22	identical 261:23	125:4 126:20
210:7,9,13,22	152:1 153:15	112:1,6,8,19	identified 38:21	127:13,17,23
211:1 214:11	156:15	112:20,21	153:11 252:24	128:13 131:14
214:23 215:2	highest 147:11	113:21,21	253:18	131:23 134:10
215:12,15,24	highlights 36:15	116:8,8 128:12	identifier 156:8	135:14 138:23
221:20 227:10	highly 208:2,4	143:24 144:9	identify 223:18	140:20,23
229:3,11	highway 152:21	144:13 181:3	identifying	141:1 142:10
230:19 231:7	Hiltz 33:9 90:17	184:6 186:5	203:20	142:14 156:3
231:11 232:4	91:20	203:12 205:10	IEF 34:13	156:10 166:11
232:22,24	hindered 80:1	205:13,16,22	IEFA 22:7 36:17	169:3 176:2,14
233:6,9 243:22	historical 27:14	207:18 210:10	38:13 42:18	176:17,21
246:7 251:3,18	34:22 51:14,16	225:3 228:5	45:545:5,10	177:3 180:16
251:20 252:1,6	51:17 102:15	229:8,24	45:14,17,18,22	185:6 187:13
252:12 257:3	125:17	249:12 252:9	4/:2 48:14	191:16,21
259:22 264:16	history 32:23	252:13 257:6	49:10 90:2	201:14 202:23

Г

	I	1	1	1
209:18 212:6	122:4 260:13	37:16 45:15	indicated 28:6	160:20 209:14
213:23 214:4	improve 65:18	59:16 91:3,14	115:9 121:3	244:21 245:4
220:19 221:5	improvement	113:24 123:1	157:3 158:7	245:21 246:4
228:8 233:21	32:18 37:19	142:3 207:3	indicates 187:15	261:17
234:15,18	improvements	inclusion 134:24	indicating 191:2	influences 66:6
237:1 239:13	38:18 51:21	income 53:16	indication 163:6	influent 34:23
246:24 247:1	53:3 65:11	incoming 145:9	indicator 253:23	39:18,20 58:24
251:7 267:1	66:1 78:17	242:13	257:7,9,14	118:23 144:21
268:2,8	83:13 104:14	inconsistent	258:23 259:1	150:24 216:22
imagine 237:13	improving 43:1	47:3 125:16	indirectly	216:24 242:15
237:19	83:20	129:4 210:4	267:24	informal 115:5
Imhoff 267:5	in-house 124:17	inconsistently	individual 16:14	information
268:7	inability 117:4	133:12	33:15	17:16 18:9,12
immediately	inappropriate	incorporated	individually	27:6,14 28:5
101:21	141:2	33:6 88:14	27:8	52:6 99:5,12
impact 33:7	inch 48:12	95:8	induce 48:16	122:6 134:19
51:2,6,7,9	142:16	increase 27:2	industrial 75:18	157:24 207:2
55:16 82:16,21	inches 95:14	38:1 44:22	75:20 88:17	216:20 224:13
83:17 93:1	118:14 119:24	130:6 135:19	136:7 137:2	225:4 226:7,19
109:14 113:24	128:16 142:18	137:16,20	209:16,17	259:20
114:1,22	143:6 148:8	141:21 174:18	221:15 242:24	informed 130:19
128:23 140:9	156:21 157:12	182:19 193:6	industry 58:19	infrastructure
192:14	157:13 159:12	221:14 222:21	258:20	25:1 31:20
impacted 15:12	incidental 193:8	222:24 223:3,6	infections	36:23 37:5
125:13 140:1	inclined 40:20	223:22,23	216:12	41:24 42:16
141:9	include 33:5	224:7,20,22	infiltrate 144:18	65:3 198:17
impacts 123:18	58:8 121:24	225:15,17	196:22	inherently 40:20
124:19 130:10	212:13 213:12	226:1,2,13,17	infiltrated 121:8	inhibit 81:8
impairment	228:3	226:21 227:14	143:16 148:10	100:10
129:11	included 6:18	227:23,24	148:17 151:13	initial 26:15
implement	9:2 19:20 21:8	228:8,14,20	157:22 162:22	98:12 118:11
41:16	21:9,12 27:13	230:17 245:3	164:24 256:8	120:20,21
implementation	35:5 62:13	245:20 255:18	infiltrates 230:4	121:13 185:22
166:15	68:3 73:13	255:20 256:8	infiltrating	initially 93:20
implemented	92:1 93:16	256:13,16,18	146:17 153:13	107:12 155:18
43:19,22 109:5	96:11 98:14	256:22	infiltration 32:4	initiative 100:13
implicated	114:8 123:9,22	increased 225:7	44:24 48:16,21	initiatives 62:11
195:2	130:24 133:16	241:2 256:24		injurious 136:5
implying 1/0:/	138:51/2:7	increases 116:23	128:10 142:6	136:24 137:23
important	197:12,15	148:7	143:1,3,7,9	139:22 140:14
108:14 110:20	198:11 204:14	incurring	145:13,14	inlets 5/:/
119:25 158:25	includes 7:0	158:24		innocuous 96:10
223.13	21.0 22.1 28.0 99.21 07.22	127.20 195.12	148:8 149:11	
imported 100.23	00.21 97.22	137.20 103.13	157.22 160.10	101:10
120.18	160.11 10	20.10 101.5	200.14 244.21	122.12 262.1
127.10 imposed 125.24	including 12.14	20.19 191:5 10/-7 100-2 0	209:14 244:21	122:13 202:1
imposed 125.24	31.11/27.7	174.7 177.0,8 205.22	240.4 infinite 256.10	202:12 204:2
impossible 41.5	31.17 32.2	205.25 indicate 255.4	inflow 220.10	263.0
mpoundment	55.15 50.17	multate 233.4	11110W 52.4	205.9
	l	l		

Г

207:23	isolated 53:24	T/.1 TO.20	213.20,21	Larry 5.5 17.10
interested	125:22	40.11,13,21	215.20.21	Targer 15/11/
100:3 245:16	Irrigation	46.11 15 21	107.16 202.1	Les.21
100.5 245.16	irrigate 20:0	45.19 21 21	194.5 & 106.1	273.71
181:18 182:4,/	227:21,24	June 42.14	100.3,5 107.10	141 gc 03.17 148.15 188.10
38:10 144:10	225:11 227:18	202.24 Jumping 67.6	177.10 101.11	170.2 230.9 Jarga 95.17
interceptor	irrespective	JULY 50:11 262:24	177.10 101.11	100.2 250.0
intercept 33:24	7:18	10:5 Tuda: 26:11	1/1:21 1/2:10	language 81:16
interaction 43:9	irrelevant 6:17	JUDICIAI 13:1	109:2,14	232:1
157:14	ion 253:13	Jonet 18:/ 113:9	105:10 128:6	231:2,5,16,20
intentionally	132:17	JOINT 42:12	0/:10//:19	230:8,12,15
intention 14:16	involving	joining 89:5	00:7,9 66:8	12/:21 142:4
164:19 256:3	212:17 234:4	joinea 89:2	18:0,1/4/:9	55:25 I20:8
132:5 164:1,3	166:19 196:3	203.12	14:1,0 1/:1	1210 44:1/ 33:21
intent 92:22	involvement	2003-12 203-12	14.1617.1	239.17 240:12
1/8:10/203:13	231:23 241:20	Jupanuy 110.21	know 10.1 12.22	739.17 7/10.10
178.10.262.12	172.1 231:21	ieonardv 116.21	35.22	188.7 180.3
intensively	101.4 191.15	205.16 252.13	Kishwankee	173.11 13 16
115.20	113:22 100:13	112.1 8 19	255.22	96.2 132.2
202:17 intense 00:11	09:11 102:3	16.4 33.7	163.10 167.18	271.17,13 lagoons 04.77
202.17	77:785:22,24	11.24 12.5	kind 17.3 64.4	241.14 241.14
23/:13	52:14 /0:5 77.7 05.00 04	James 3.10	kick 139.3	192.4 100.11
199:0 230:8	involved 5:22	12.12 88.1 12	120.1 120.12 180.21	70.24 103:21 137.4 100:11
100:14,17	involve 102:12		12010311a 07.7 kov 126.7	06.24 105.21
40:22,22 133:1	248:22	00:14	Kenacha 20.0	109.14 201.10 Jagoon 06.70 77
10.22.22.122.1	mvestment	16ems 00:11,13	178.2 212.10	77.21 134.23 150.11 751.15
20:4 203:4	invested 101:16	nem 94:8 263:8	121.10.10	QQ.71 13/-72
20.4 205.4	intrusions 00:8	11°U 209:0,/	115.5 9 120.22	lack 85.11 00.21
integrity 95:4	intrusion 37:4	151:8 180:12	Keller 46.22	L 30.22
14/11/ integrity 05.4	21:13 144:13	20:19 98:19 121.0 100.12	261.10	Τ,
147.17	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Issuing 10:2	109.13 100.7 170.13 181.16	knows 253:6
intagrator	/3:21 189:9	134:4	109.13 168.7	262:12
insufficient 81:4	72:21 190:0	55:19 07:22 124:4	keen 54.8 67.2	204:19 223:11
institute 115.12	15:25 84:0	30:22 38:4 52:10 67:22	Kansas 74.22	known 57:4
104.4 Instituto 112.12	12.72 01.6	155UES 5:20 26:00 20.4	K	243:12
	14/:19	131:4 issues 5:20	200:9,10 263:4	209:15 230:14
instance 207.11	147.10	95:24 125:20 121:4	207:18 234:8	194:15 202:7
instance 207:11	207:9	issued /0:8 /8:6	200:23 207:6	108:13 175:13
142:13 192:8	207.0	225:10 229:7,8	203:13,14	69:11 /4:14
90:1,/ 110:9 140:12 100:0	155:20	203:18 219:14	198:23 203:7	60:8 64:17,22
09.17116.0	127:12 129:12	180:17 203:12	1/7:24 197:3	49:14 58:18
10/:10	10:10 127:8,10	155:5,6,18,22	159:20 177:13	knowledge
124:5 100:10	10.16 127.9 10	155:11 159:9	150:20 159:20	259:17
28:18 29:1	interpret 136:11	98:20 129:3,12	135:15 139:14	250:15,18
Installation	Internal 91:5	84:24 85:6	130:11 134:3	244:18 249:1
219:24	43:7	01:0 02:10	120:8 129:9	239:11 243:3
139:7 171:0	intermingled	30:0,13 42:10	122:16 126:2,6	227:7 239:10
120.7 171.0	• • • • • • • • •		100 16 106 0 6	220.22 225.11
Install 28:17	124:10 138:3	ISSUE 9:8 27:17	/6:14 16 99.14	1 - 770 - 777 - 14

ATTONN

(Strates)

These of

		······································		
33:17 73:4.11	252:2 259:23	137:4 155:22	218:6.8.14	119.18 20
lasting 64:18	259:24 262:6	168:5 258:5	219:1.4 12 24	120.3 5 11 12
lateral 35:16	262:11 264:24	life-span 258:18	238:1.6.19	126.18
37:13 142:12	letter 18:21	259:10	240:24 241:2	loadings 120.6
142:17 148:23	42:14 45:21	lift 75:15 145:8	251:15	loam 145.16
laterals 142:21	46:11.12.14	245:17	liners 95:2	loan 42.4
174:3,4	47:1 48:20	liked 90:12.13	lines 66:21	local 35.15
latitude 210:17	62:14 67:13.19	115:21	108:23 174:11	located 35.22
law 6:3 29:3	76:24 77:2.6	likelihood 25:18	193:17	53:14 97:10
lawn 109:11	77:10,14 93:24	53:5 82:17	lining 37:13	98:5 100:4
layer 41:7	97:2 126:8	83:17	38:6 59:16	126:15 140:12
118:18 129:17	129:7.10	likewise 40:9	61:2 244:20	223:11 248:13
145:15 146:3	130:11 131:4	limine 6:16 7:16	liquid 133:5.6.7	location 28:9
201:4	131:12 134:3	limit 72:9	216:10	35:4 44:14
layout 90:22	135:5,16	207:19 244:1	list 45:19 77:1	97:12 107:6
leach 143:17	139:14 158:16	limitation 48:17	122:13 150:9	167:19 226:19
254:5	159:21 160:8	limited 18:15	178:24 179:6	246:13
lead 160:7	177:14,24	48:8 102:19	190:7 242:3	locations 97:18
leading 90:20	178:1,2,3,4	140:10	255:2,2,5,5,13	249:3
100:5	179:19,23	limiting 48:21	260:22 261:16	log 93:22 94:1
leaf 118:16	180:4,7 186:19	118:18 238:8	264:2,14	logs 158:5
leak 106:9,11,17	187:7,9 189:21	limits 124:6	listed 15:13	long 7:21 12:9
107:13 193:9	189:23 190:1	177:2 242:20	178:14	25:19 53:8
197:6	194:3 196:7	line 38:8 59:18	listing 59:13	64:18 75:3
leakage 142:15	199:18 200:12	67:8	lists 140:20	129:15 234:18
142:19,23	203:8,14	linearly 206:15	150:10 254:14	237:14,19
159:13 160:3	207:18 214:19	lined 25:2 44:10	254:16 262:3	long-term 83:12
162:21 174:12	239:1 254:17	52:14 102:1	liter 118:22	longer 7:10
174:13,18	260:8,9 261:1	173:11 237:15	119:2,6,14	51:11 59:6
238:8	262:24	liner 28:17,18	120:3,15 121:5	161:1 258:5
leaked 106:23	level 36:8 60:5	29:1 40:24	121:9 151:7,16	259:16
leaking 130:15	93:10 96:15	41:3,9 44:7,12	224:15	look 81:21 104:2
140:18 171:16	102:9 105:5,14	60:19,23 68:2	literally 117:13	108:17 109:12
197:23 236:19	109:8 116:24	68:5,8,16 93:3	130:3	168:17 193:7
leaks 143:19	117:10 118:4,5	95:21,21 99:21	litter 118:17	199:18 216:17
173:23 193:4	128:24 133:7	99:23 100:7,24	little 13:10 20:7	216:23 217:22
learned 235:17	143:12 145:2	106:13,15	85:3 109:17	218:2 224:23
leaving 113:10	147:8,10 148:6	107:4,5,7,9,11	144:13 162:3	241:16 262:6
led 76:4 160:6	164:15 174:16	116:20 117:2	173:7 211:22	looked 40:12
left 5:17 46:16	174:21 211:24	122:7 129:16	222:12 234:8	83:3 168:15
legal 69:6	214:10 224:19	167:10,15,17	235:17 238:21	188:23
legitimate 136:8	224:19,22	168:3,16,21	240:5 242:20	looking 11:23
157:3	241:13	169:1,3,7	Livable 41:23	29:8 169:10
length 105:19	ieveis 49:9	170:12,19	lives 71:17	177:14,21
lessening 104:12	110:19 153:16	192:4,7,10	Investock 136:8	187:19 190:3
111.17 102.10	iideral 15/:14	195:1 198:18	137:3 173:8	199:13 222:3
111:1/193:18	137:18 Ham 101:6	200:21 201:9	10ad 119:9	238:13 242:18
208:3,10,16,16	Heu 101:0	201:10,13	244:22	261:15
210:22 238:21	me ov:2 136:9	202:21,22	10ading 118:23	100ks 230:10
Loss 94.24 95.21	00.21 01.2 3	05.4 101.5	246.2 20 247.1	momoranduma
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------
05.73	90.21 91.2,3	106.0 128.15	240.5,20 247.1	202.11
lost 55:13	123.15 124.22	164.16 182.16	230.19203.24	205.11
183.22 262.16	120.12 14.22	183.10 204.2	207.10	memory 78.25
lot 0.6 13 17 17	220.5 8 0 20	210.0	207.10	mention 180:1
	220.3,8,9,20	219.9 materials 11.1	07.15 122.22	mentioned 97.10.227.20
10.14,1511.4 14.5564.14	221.0,9 managar 10.10	111111111111111111111111111111111111	97:15 135:25	87:10 237:20
64.14 102.6	manager 19:19	95:15 100:19		mentions 201:7
04.14 102.0	30:23 31:8	100:9 190:10	242:23	merely 105:23
153:20 155:0	32:13,23 33:3	252:19	measurable	met 61:22 94:7
103:3,3 107:9	33:18 /5:9,10	matter 1:12 5:5	119:16	
1/1:19	/5:12,17 /0:1		measured 120:6	
10ts 00:5 115:24	84:8 80:2	/9:2 85:1,6	measures 28:13	197:9,16
Louise 195:23	88:14 89:7,8	96:9,15 105:6	109:4	202:14 225:12
10w 40:2 53:16	89:19 91:7	129:3 155:18	meet 9:10	metal 243:11
61:24,24 95:1	113:16 115:6	179:20 243:21	108:23 125:23	262:12
	185:19,20,21	matters 254:4	138:12 158:11	metals 242:19
259:7	212:10	267:11	190:6 192:18	243:6 262:2
lower 106:23	mandatory	maximize	meeting 45:13	method 43:1
lowers 101:2	239:7,8	183:19	45:14,16,19	methodology
lunch 144:1	manhole 37:13	maximum 38:24	76:20 78:14	226:9
N	57:21 182:2	72:10,14 80:16	98:21 99:1,1,6	methods 95:10
	248:6 261:12	80:21 81:12,18	99:13 120:21	109:4 134:23
MI 0:2	manholes 35:18	82:6 92:12	121:14,15	175:10 223:24
IVIAUISCA 38:23	38:9 52:15	110:22 111:5	122:2,15,18	mgd 34:17,19
main 100:5	59:20	133:5,9 144:23	123:19 126:5	35:1 39:13,15
	manner 17:7	154:3,4,6	135:15 165:21	39:18,20 65:23
mainline 37:12	25:24 26:5	156:22 167:6	186:1 192:23	92:6,7,13,17
37:13 38:5,6	36:24 149:16	186:15 236:4	197:3 207:6	middle 165:9
59:16,17	199:11	McCliment 33:9	234:5 254:7	179:9
mains 142:12	manual 32:8	90:17 91:20	meetings 15:8	migrate 151:24
1/4:4	132:19	McFALL 3:5	26:18 45:5	152:13 253:7
maintain 12:20	map 35:4	19:18,23 33:17	77:7 93:18	migration 28:19
37:24 149:13	March 45:12,14	50:16 56:4	127:24 128:14	218:21 235:13
maintenance	120:17	60:7 70:20	131:3 132:23	235:15,18
40:21 64:19	Marcia 149:23	73:1,4,9,11	165:11 185:23	mile 48:13
/5:14,15 82:12	150:10 151:19	78:13 84:5	190:11 196:9	142:16,20
	190:12 197:1,9	103:10,18	207:1	miles 35:17 37:6
major 35:2 38:9	197:17	104:11	meets 122:20	37:7 38:5,6,10
59:20 229:8	mark 16:1,8	McFall's 20:4	members 5:17	59:16,17,21
making 5:16	19:4 77:17	McHENRY	5:22,23	142:12,21
21:10 71:5	109:1 189:6	267:3	memo 121:18,20	mill 201:8
107:9 190:16	marked 22:7	mean 13:14	121:22 122:17	milligram 119:2
mammal's	29:9 30:8 88:5	17:22 47:7	126:2,4 141:6	119:6 224:15
257:24	112:12	66:5 118:4	150:20 178:14	milligrams
man 262:12	massive 129:24	147:9 154:6,22	197:2 203:16	118:22 119:14
manage 34:10	168:6	168:3 175:6	217:24 225:5	120:2,15 121:9
management	master 113:1	194:11 199:2	254:11,13	151:7,16
10:4 32:8	material 40:19	221:2 230:15	memorandum	million 32:19
48:15 88:17	41:13 93:21	235:19 245:11	260:24	34:6,7 37:17

.

ſ				· ·
11.5 10.11	misstate 177.11	246.14 255.10		
44.3 40.11	misstate 177.11	240:14 255:10	native 43:25	neignboring
70.9 16 71.12	04.14	200:22 202:10	92:14 93:4	49:7
70:8,10 /1:15	04:14	monitors 120:24		neitner 96:2
/1:10 /2:9	misunderstood	227:8	natural 43:13	187:3 189:3
80:14,15,17,18	162:10	monomer 201:9	44:15 101:19	net 141:21 256:8
80:20,21 82:8	mitigate 220:13	month 127:23	101:22 108:1	never 123:17
82:14 92:4,9	mitigates 44:11	128:2,14	132:16 154:19	130:17 139:3
101:4,12 103:1	mixing 148:19	months 153:1	162:8 226:15	158:19 159:2
103:1,4,9,12	Mobil 113:7,10	244:14,16	natural-looking	202:8 246:14
103:16,16,19	model 25:4	moot 139:19	101:13	262:23
110:7,11,12	82:19 91:22	morning 5:2	nature 32:20	new 17:15,17
111:6 117:23	92:1,8 102:16	24:6 104:23	62:23 129:14	43:17 46:18
118:1 142:23	102:17 103:7	motion 6:16	156:17	134:18 142:14
142:24 143:3,8	109:18 255:19	7:14,16 8:17	near 98:5	142:22 158:19
143:18 154:5	255:22 256:6,9	15:22 16:3	116:24 179:9	158:19 172:14
160:8,10 161:7	256:10	17:9 18:16	nearly 100:23	173:2 174:14
162:21 168:21	modeled 117:19	137:11 215:19	236:15	174:16 220:20
168:22 173:23	modeling 33:10	265:7,8	necessarily 58:8	221:7,8 232:10
178:9 207:21	34:23 39:10	move 20:11,13	72:14 108:7	245:1,3,8,16
208:6,7,12,13	51:13 102:4,7	21:21 22:21	250:21 259:9	245:24
208:14,18	102:11,14	23:11,17,20	necessary 38:18	Nightingale
209:2,3,8	109:23 110:3	72:3 73:21,23	97:15 117:16	138:23
237:14 255:7	110:10 116:7	78:4 144:3	122:8 133:23	nine 113:19
263:12	117 :18 118:19	201:18 229:5	13478 192:5,8	11 8:7, ið
mind 64:10,15	130:4 255:16	moved 11:15	195:4 200:10	nitrate 91:17
154:21 162:4	models 25:14	17:4	need 7:10 20:11	109:8
186:12 226:22	money 61:1	movement 218:9	22:21 23:11	nitrates 119:17
241:9	262:15	moving 9:3 65:6	37:7 38:21	120:14,22
mine 18:18	monitor 98:8	multiple 75:13	44:10 53:9,20	121:6,7 122:21
165:18 212:14	116:10 177:14	municipal 31:14	65:13,14 66:9	127:18 150:17
minimal 256:1	178:10 224:3	88:24 179:2,5	67:1 108:1	150:22 151:15
minimize 93:1	242:11 256:19	261:7 264:15	109:9 149:12	155:5,8
108:5 183:21	258:21 263:13	municipalities	154:22 165:8	nitrified 155:4
241:7	monitored	35:12	169:12 176:8	nitrites 119:16
minimum 133:5	177:16 254:15	mutually 46:23	194:23 224:12	nitrogen 119:15
218:21	255:6		needed 14:11	119:15,17
minus 187:17	monitoring 46:1	<u> </u>	64:20 99:5	120:4,11 151:1
minute 265:20	46:18,19 97:3	N 2:5 3:1 4:1	130:2 179:18	151:2,3,6,11
minutes 7:10,10	97:19,24 98:4	name 5:2 6:2,6	needs 219:15	151:14 155:1,9
45:16 144:3	98:6,10,13	30:22 56:14	222:8	155:10 163:5
210:21,23	99:22 116:9	73:10 84:5	negative 94:14	Nobel 113:15
252:3	122:12,22	87:23 88:1,12	negligible 149:1	non 222:13
misreading	124:5 127:2	112:7,19	negotiate 46:7	non-degradati
178:23	130:5 131:16	184:18,19	46:23 49:16	122:2.23 123:6
Mississippi	133:15,16	195:21 211:14	negotiated 50:14	125:11.18.23
234:16	138:6 139:1.7	240:17	negotiations	127:8.11 129:2
Missouri-Rolla	149:18 179:4	named 31:19	114:5	129:13 134:7
212:3	191:20 242:1	nameplate 56:19	neighborhood	135:13-21
misspoke 77:5	243:19 246:11	nationally 153:6	53:19	137:19 138:19
		-		
		I	I	·

1

139:3.18	58:13 68:20	205:13 233:7	occurrences	229:3.11
141:20 179:24	80:10 84:10	252:10	79.21	230.19 231.7
180:18 207:9	89:16 114.4	object 8:5 47:6	October 38:20	231.11 232.4
222:7 228.3	166.4 176.24	55.7 69.4 16	offer 123.10	232.71 232.72.74
nonefficent	177.1 247.11	103.22 128.1	offered 45.23	233.6 9 246.7
40.15	255.3 261.2 16	214.8 228.21	offhand 187.18	251.3 18 20
nonhuman	264.3	214.0 220.21	office 2:10 6:8	251.5,18,20
216.13	nuisance 136.4	abjected 10.0	6.11 56.15	257.3 264.16
None 171.20	136.23 137.21	objecting 13.11	80.10.268.2	257.5 204.10
173.17 184.4	130.20 137.21	264·12	officer 1:16 5:1	265.1
normal 26.14	192.23	objection 6.22	5.3 6.13 21 24	205.7 offsite /11.13
93·9 14 116·17	number 5.0 12.1	12.10 13.5	7.15 8.8 13	OHM 22.0
118.4 6 133.7	15.7 8 20.22	14.7.23.16.22	11.22 12.8 24	00.17 01.20
145.10 147.4	20.24 21.2 5	17.8 30.16	12.4 0 18	90.17 91.20
156.3 158.10	20.24 21.2,5	17.8 50.10	13.4,9,10	92.7 OUM/a 02.1
208.5 200.12	45.13 20 46.17	54.5 70.1 74.2	14.14,10 15.24	OHIVI 8 92.1
208.3 209.12	45.15,20 40.17	79.0 129.0 11	10.9,10 17.20	OII 115:7
241.11 normally 61.20	40.20 39.14	/ 0.9 120.9,11	18:1,24 19:4	0KAY 10:21
110.22 111.7	65.22 80.22 24	189:11 201:22	19:10,24 20:0	17:22 13:3,6
110.25 111.7	03:23 80:22,24	$214:25\ 229:4$	$\begin{array}{c} 20:15 \ 21:22 \\ 22:11 \ 18 \ 22 \ 24 \end{array}$	
190:13 221:3	81:1,10,13,14	251:12 243:10	22:11,18,22,24	22:11 23:12
north $101:17$	81:15 89:12	243:18 251:7	23:12 24:8	24:8 47:22
208:15 257:0	95:22 94:1	251:11,14	28:1 29:6,23	57:19 61:8
INOS 4:4		201:4	30:17,20 47:11	63:5,13 66:1
129.9 120.C	121:22 120:7	objections 8:21	47:20,23 48:2	68:14 /0:21
128:8 129:0	151:19 150:10	9:13 16:24	50:4 52:2 54:7	/1:9,11 /2:4
229:6 265:6	15/:16,18	17:14 24:5	56:10 69:23	74:10 109:2
noted 8:22 15:20	159:24 160:1	216:1	72:2,5,18,20	137:8,13
122:5 128:11	168:19,19	objects 23:21	73:20 74:1,4	159:23 160:6
129:9 132:22	1/9:8 180:5,6	obligated 34:13	74:10 78:1,10	160:12 161:6
133:19 134:6		obstinately 46:6	84:1 86:23	161:21 165:6
	208:23 216:16	obstruct 134:22	87:3,8,22	165:19,24
165:11 216:1	238:15 241:24	obstructs 1/5:10	103:23 104:19	166:20 170:6,9
notes 99:1	247:20 254:14	obtain 26:14		170:20,20
	261:3 262:1	obtained 19:11	111:13,17	171:21 172:3
134:20 139:5	263:8 264:12	obviously 86:7	128:4,8 129:5	172:11,24
140:19 229:12	204:14	1/0:20 243:16	137:5,9 143:23	173:5,7,19
nouce 13:1,2	numbers $21:7$	occasional 40:5	144:0 159:8	1/4:5,9,20
	208:9	40:10,14	180:24 183:4	1/6:61/8:3,1/
19:5 /0:8,11	numerical 63:23	occasions 81:1	184:2,5 189:10	1/8:18 1/9:18
/0:19	03:24 04:3	occupied 58:7,9	189:13 193:12	184:1 191:4
noticea 5:11	134:5	occupy 119:8	193:20 195:8	193:20 194:2,5
notices 30:19	numerically	occur 25:16	195:11 197:13	194:10,13,20
128.15	29:10 numorous 45.4	32:20,21 37:23	201:23 202:3	200:14,21,23
138:13 Normania 1,14	numerous 45:4	70:24 80:23	205:2,7,12,15	201:13,17,23
November 1:14	100.0	119:1 129:11	210:7,9,13,22	204:8,13 205:7
0.20 / 7.15	103:3	150:11 144:10	211:1 214:11	208:4,9,16,22
01.7 144:0	0	13/:19 181:11	214:23 213:2	209:15 210:6
203:10 NDDES 22:10	oath 47.19	76.16 02.10	213:12,13,24	210:10 211:22
INFUES 23:19		/0:10 93:19	221:20 227:10	212:8,16 213:5

"themas"

	1			
213:8,14,18,22	27:23	option 103:4	147:15 156:9	46:15 56:24
214:12 215:15	operate 142:4	options 125:12	160:16 166:21	59:12 61:9
215:24 216:14	156:14	192:11 238:4	166:22 171:7	62:11 67:7
216:19,23	operates 35:14	238:15,16	172:13,16,17	104:24 133:18
217:2,7,10,19	58:13 68:19	oral 7:11	176:18 182:2	139:14 164:12
217:23,24	166:4	Orchard 33:9	183:15,22	165:8 175:1
218:2,6,12,17	operating 28:23	90:17 91:20	189:18 191:5	178:4 179:9
218:20,24	75:22 81:21	order 37:23	199:9,17	191:2,2,4,18
219:10,18,23	124:2 147:8	122:8 151:6	200:18 239:20	200:23 216:15
220:2,7,16,19	operation 75:17	170:3 181:21	239:21 247:8	218:2,3 241:23
221:11 227:5	75:24 76:1	255:20 257:21	247:23 248:5	242:4,4 263:6
227:12 233:24	79:16 82:11	265:18	248:17 249:2	pages 38:21 46:9
234:3 235:4,21	124:6,8 128:20	orderly 5:19	249:10 251:8	55:12 123:24
239:9 241:16	138:8 223:16	ordinances	overflows 24:18	135:18 191:3
260:21 264:18	223:19	140:17,22	37:3 43:4,6	215:11
old 35:21 53:23	operation's	organic 75:1	181:8,10	paragraph
53:24	138:20	96:9,15 105:6	182:11,12	105:3 178:7
older 36:21 66:2	operational	118:23 119:15	199:10,22	180:10 191:18
once 25:6,16,20	34:15 39:16	120:6 132:16	206:9 247:14	218:4 222:3
34:16 40:11	45:24 46:7,24	151:2,14,21,24	248:14	parameter
61:5 82:18,23	49:17 89:16	164:16	overlooked	61:21 111:6
82:23,24	operations	organisms	98:12	152:5 226:6
103:14 117:21	33:16,18 75:9	253:22,24	overrule 231:11	264:13
119:1 133:8	75:10,12,14	258:1,4 259:2*	overruled 13:5	parameters
147:17 148:21	84:7 86:1	organized 35:9	70:2 103:23	63:23 109:17
149:2 156:24	132:19 182:20	originally 53:15	214:24	109:20,22,23
160:23 225:19	operator 69:12	155:2	overruling 16:2	122:13,24
226:7 247:24	237:12	ought 262:10	oversaw 196:5	124:7,9 127:1
262:13 264:1	opinion 52:12	outcome 267:24	overseeing	150:10,13,16
once-a-year-ty	52:18,21,23	outfall 70:13	32:16 75:13	178:11,13,21
145:23	53:7 58:3	outflow 57:14	oversight 75:18	179:4,12,15,16
one-day 110:11	67:17 69:10	57:15 70:17	75:19	217:2 223:9
one-fifth 55:21	79:9 82:20	outlet 152:14	owned 28:10	254:14 255:11
one-quarter	83:7,15 96:17	outset 166:22	owner 112:20	261:3 263:14
55:21	102:20 105:18	outside 65:6	owners 37:21	263:21
one-third 209:6	105:23 108:13	109:16 207:19	owns 35:14	parcel 16:17
209:11,13	149:15,21	210:17 257:24	oxidation	park 53:12
ones 110:4 259:4	158:10 187:3	outstanding	132:15	101:15
ongoing 36:10	188:13 189:1	265:7	oxidized 121:7	part 8:2 9:21
138:9	192:4,7,21	overall 65:9	oxygen 118:21	10:5,17,22
online 21:12	209:23 223:6	90:20 101:2	132:6,17	12:23 13:2
186:17 236:6	225:11 256:17	166:14,21		16:17 19:20
236:11	260:7	170:1 192:17	<u> </u>	21:11 24:17
open 11:1	opinions 47:8	overflow 31:16	P 1:15	26:7 43:16
193:16 212:23	opportunity	36:9 57:16,18	P-e-t-t-i 6:10	52:7 54:13
opened 139:8	14:12 220:12	57:19 59:10	packet 13:12	68:16,23 71:19
opening 24:13	222:15	61:12 65:15	page 23:7,7 35:5	85:9,12,20,20
openings 253:8	opposed 17:18	85:6,12 86:14	43:15 45:10,13	90:2,9 91:8,21
operability	25:2	145:2,4,7	45:17,18,22	94:22 95:12

F

Jun 4.000

AUGUST.

l,

ſ				
97:21 98:2	221:15 229.19	94:13 17 95:3	221.13 228.17	23.4 30.16
99:8 102:11	257:15	95.14.17	228.74 220.17	52.1554.5
108.10 109.21	navers 36.1	187.16	220.2422).1 220.16231.14	56.13 1/ 60.5
112.20 114.9	PCB 1.6 5.9	nermeable	229.10231.1,4 232.10233.21	60.8 0 10 70.5
115.18 122.3 5	neak 39.12	117.11 157.4	232.10 233.21	72.4 18 19
128:3 131:1	65:20 92:3 5	nermissible	241.18 21	74.3 78.9 84.2
138.19 145.1	103.13 104.4 5	68.24 69.12	242.7 243.15	84.4 5 86.21
154.16 162.22	nending 123.12	70.18 71.13	243.21 244.3	86.24 103.22
165.9 167.7	245.14	nermit 5.9 10	246.12 247.11	104.19 20 22
175:21 176:19	nenetrate 117:5	10.2.12.3	250.8 12 255.3	110.14 111.11
176:23 180:21	129:16	23:19 24:15	257.21 261.2	111.12 128.1 6
187:13 214:3	people 35:11	27:7 12 18	261.16.262.5	159.9 11
220:16 221:6	64:14 170:15	28:6 29:2.3	263.20 264.3 4	180.22 183.4 5
234:24 245:16	245:7	31:15 35:5	nermits 230.8	183.7 184.1
246:11.20	percent 37:18	45:3.6.22 46:1	231:1 15 235.1	265.15
247:3.4 248:23	118:9 120:9	46:9.10.16	245:20 247:7	nH 177.17
260:1 261:4	157:21 209:11	47:2 49:23	250:8	178:12 263.15
participate	236:14.15.18	54:20 58:13.20	permitted 71:12	263:19
196:8	percentage	58:21 68:20.23	79:14 110:21	phase 128:20
participated	160:11	69:11 72:11.12	115:9.12 142:9	phenomenas
185:22	percolation	79:23 80:10	176:20 229:1	155:19
participation	124:3,13,17	81:16 86:6,8,9	permitting 33:4	Phone 2:7,16
196:11	157:10	89:16 90:3	33:8 90:22	physical 61:21
particular 18:4	perform 40:22	93:12,14 96:14	91:10 231:24	135:23 136:19
42:21 61:23	53:22 124:17	97:21 98:19	249:15	pick 245:10,18
216:7 223:8	242:8	99:8,9 105:4	person 58:19	pipe 48:12 70:12
224:12 226:6	performance	110:22 114:4	206:22	105:24 106:6,8
226:10,19	42:18,20,23	115:6 121:2,12	personal 267:15	142:14,22
237:8	62:19,23,24	121:16 123:20	perspective	161:3,4 174:14
particularly	63:4,6,8,8,10	124:2,5,10,14	174:7	pipelines 65:9
14:2 125:19	63:16 64:2,5	125:5,6,10	petition 125:1	pipes 66:12 69:3
158:22	65:8,9	130:20,23	petitioner 1:5	69:15 70:6,7
particulate	performed	131:8,17,18,21	2:8 5:7 7:3	70:10 106:4,20
163:14,15	38:19 44:17	134:3 135:12	9:10 11:8	106:23 161:2,5
parties 5:23	51:13 91:4	137:18 138:10	28:10,24 77:18	piping 65:12
66:7 267:23	102:11 168:12	139:23 140:24	211:2	174:17 232:12
partner 6:3	255:16	141:8 150:20	petitioner's 4:7	Pittsburgh
110:2	performing	164:14 166:4,9	16:2,10 18:3	74:21,21
parts 66:2,4	243:19	171:22 172:5,5	29:11,13,14,16	place 66:15
party 243:23	period 24:20	172:7176:9,11	30:9 50:10	190:19 221:14
pass 68:13	25:16 26:2		73:22,23 74:5	267:19
path 101:20	/8:24 82:14	185:1,2,3,4,18	77:24 78:2,4	placed 118:15
257.12 14	140.24 131:12	103.19,21,24	/0:11 88:5	138:10 16/:18
237.12,14	102.15 170.14	190:15,20,25	112:13 189:7	placing 127:3
253.21 251.1	201.21 224.2	192.12 194.17	107.13 Dotti 7.12 2.1 6	pian 12:20 34:13 30-16 42-22 24
259.21 254.4	220.7 237.17 neriods 147.22	197.21,22	1 CUI 2.15 5.4,0 3.0 11 12 6.10	<i>39.10 43:23,24</i> <i>16.16 51.12 12</i>
nathogens	208.11	208.24 212.14	5.9,11,120.10 6.107.1212.7	51.10 54:12,15
204.19 216.11	nermeability	212.14	16.7 12 10 24	76.10,23,24
	r - mounting	J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.	10.7,12,17,27	10.17 11.15
		I	I	1

· • • • •

Colorados,

To be the

1				
121:24 130:10	77:12 80:13	212:4.20	223:1 224:21	13.847.18
145:4 166:14	92:5	244:10 258:16	225:16 226:24	264.21.22
166:21 242:17	planting 166:18	263:5	227.4 9 15 23	nost-nermit
245:9	plantings 91:15	points 27:5	230.7 239.13	129.7
planning 9:1	108:2 109:7	93:19 99:15	246:19.21.24	nostgraduate
89:15	plants 26:9	102:19 131:20	247:4	75:1
plans 101:19	35:19 108:6.16	policies 33:13	pond 84:24	notable 140:3
188:24	113:19 118:16	policy 36:9	94:23 95:19	potential 9:13
plant 19:18 25:9	129:14,16	41:19.19.21	96:19 105:20	12:19 49:4
25:12 26:12	149:6,7,14	47:3 57:17,17	105:22.23	97:15 100:15
31:24 32:15	155:4,12	63:18 79:7	124:13,17	107:8 108:5
33:16,17 34:1	162:23 163:3,7	134:21 247:16	132:10,11,12	110:11 117:14
34:3,5,20	169:9,11,13	polishing 26:6	188:10 189:2	133:22 153:14
35:23 38:16	170:2,5,10	26:11 44:24	198:4	232:20 244:20
39:4,6,8,13,19	185:21 201:2	90:8 115:17	ponds 94:22	257:1 259:1
44:1 51:3,17	230:2 237:7	142:7	96:1 97:9,10	potentially
51:22 52:13	Platteville 88:19	politely 71:4	124:3 132:2,15	104:1 107:16
70:13,15,17	please 6:1 8:11	pollutant 137:16	132:20 133:4,4	190:4 208:14
75:9,10,12,15	41:21 43:15	137:20 141:21	239:16	216:11 245:17
75:23 79:18,19	54:8 68:12	152:8 154:22	pool 237:13	258:11,11
80:5,10,23	72:3 73:9,10	pollutants 124:7	population	262:16
81:17,21 82:10	74:16 87:23	128:23 142:8	163:16	poultry 127:20
84:17,22 85:1	88:10 105:1	154:18 228:9	porous 97:12	142:4
86:10 89:23	112:6,17	230:3 252:24	portion 26:12	pound 120:3
92:4,20 93:5	136:13,17	253:16 261:6	35:20 37:21	pounds 119:1,10
100:3,6 101:18	161:14 175:24	264:14	42:3 45:1	119:11,18,19
103:12,19	184:17 195:21	pollution 1:1 5:3	54:23 144:17	120:5,7 152:11
104:2,6,13	197:14 211:5	9:24 10:10	148:1 187:19	152:13
	211:15 218:2	11:2,12 12:2	187:22 236:11	power 94:14
146:21,23	229:5 231:8	12:14,14,15	portions 14:23	95:15 187:17
149:5 150:24	232:5,5 233:17	15:4,15 27:20	position 27:11	PowerPoint
154:/ 160:18	263:5	28:14 29:5	74:17 75:7	20:19 194:6
	pleasing 26:1	43:24 49:24	131:22 135:13	205:23
	plug 206:19	68:10,11 96:3		practical 40:16
181:21,25	plug-llow	98:18 99:17	196:2 212:9	/2:15 81:18
182.3,17,20,24 182.0 12 17 20	140:12 nlumo 126:16	115:2 151:11	positive 120:21	12/:4 152:10
185.9,12,17,20	plume 120.10	133.10,21,22 127,17,141,17	109:13 233:13	practice 32:8
206.12, 200.17	110.15	137.17 141.17	222.18 262.22	33:13 mastices 49:15
216.21 236.5	noint 7.0 16.23	102.22 103.2	$223.10\ 202.23$	62.21 127.16
236.10 237.9	18.22 30.13	192.22 193.2	possibility 104.3	05.21 127.10
237.16.17	37.13 41.14	195.4 200.8 8	possible 83.2	156.12
238.23240.10	47.7 18 48.24	200.10 203.6	95.1 225.6	nrairia 11/1.17
243:2.4.244:22	67.11 72.24	200.10 205.0	250.3	prairie 114.17
245:22.248:10	86:19 147:13	207.10 209.19	nossibly 96.21	128.17
249:20 250:5	156:13 159:6	210:3 212:14	128.2 155.4	nreclude 107.20
250:10 261:13	170:17 178:19	213:6.18 214:1	173:19	precluded 98.18
261:19	179:23 190:17	214:5.21.22	post 215:22	precluding
plant's 39:14	201:17 206:21	216:8.9 217:17	post-hearing	135:2
-			*	
1	•	•		1

-

watere w

			1	1
predict 92:2,8	228:5.11	127:2 166:11	135:1 243:5	64:21 68:3.8
predicted 82:18	238:16	188:9 190:19	processing 34:4	88:13.14 89:7
157:21	president	240:9 244:13	produce 39:12	89:7.19 90:1
predicting 102:5	112:20	255:12	43:19 92:3	90:14.19.20.21
predominant	pressure 44:12	priority 36:6	155:9	90:22 91:1.2
118:13	100:9 117:11	private 32:4	product 107:19	92:11.24 93:13
preexisting	117:14 129:23	38:7.8 59:18	107:21 108:19	93:19 94:1
221:2,4	167:12	59:19 71:17	185:10	98:2.17.22
prefer 261:19	pressures 41:6	222:12	production	99:16 100:14
preferable	41:11	probably 22:9	43:21	100:18.21.23
106:24	presumably	25:19 58:5	professional	101:3,11,21
prefiled 7:1	132:7	60:17 147:16	31:4 32:2 49:2	102:12.16.17
13:16 30:7,10	presume 17:13	174:15 188:1	49:13 52:11,18	103:6 108:20
30:14 73:14	presumed 259:5	190:19,20	52:22,24 53:6	109:21 114:22
87:20 88:6	pretreatment	245:24 247:23	69:10 70:1	121:13 122:19
112:9,14	75:19 161:9,16	problem 9:5	88:19 89:4	123:7 135:9
138:22	242:22,23	12:4 14:5	96:17 108:13	140:15 141:16
preliminary	pretty 155:21	21:14 80:6	108:14 113:5	141:18 149:24
26:17,18 45:11	163:4 166:1	101:8,11	209:23 234:14	152:21 168:10
45:16 54:12	190:2	178:22 179:4	267:6	181:3 185:5
85:14 93:17	prevent 28:13	207:5 215:23	professionalism	186:22,24
120:19 121:17	28:17 68:9	219:21 220:13	265:21	187:1 189:16
131:2 133:17	106:20 107:14	220:23 221:2,3	program 31:17	192:5,8 196:14
i34:2 i50:19	116:4 129:24	221:4,7 223:17	32:17,18 37:11	196:18 199:7
158:4 212:21	130:2 218:21	241:7 243:16	37:11,19 38:3	203:5 206:2
		1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	
preparation	prevented 28:19	255:22	42:2 60:3	212:20 213:10
preparation 166:9	prevented 28:19 prevention	255:22 problematic	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23 presented 7:22	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5 93:20 94:18	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17 process 41:9	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19 38:23 44:2,14	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6 promoting
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23 presented 7:22 28:5 52:6	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5 93:20 94:18 95:19 98:23	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17 process 41:9 77:23 132:16	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19 38:23 44:2,14 45:8,15 46:4	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6 promoting 48:15
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23 presented 7:22 28:5 52:6 110:4,23 111:7	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5 93:20 94:18 95:19 98:23 99:2,2 122:13	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17 process 41:9 77:23 132:16 176:23 234:13	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19 38:23 44:2,14 45:8,15 46:4 49:18,22 50:1	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6 promoting 48:15 promulgated
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23 presented 7:22 28:5 52:6 110:4,23 111:7 135:14 148:9	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5 93:20 94:18 95:19 98:23 99:2,2 122:13 123:18 124:16	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17 process 41:9 77:23 132:16 176:23 234:13 processes 43:13	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19 38:23 44:2,14 45:8,15 46:4 49:18,22 50:1 54:2,4,13 55:4	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6 promoting 48:15 promulgated 239:13 246:18
preparation 166:9 prepare 76:18 112:14 185:11 186:19 217:24 prepared 30:11 54:12,14 88:8 98:24 134:13 143:21 207:7 217:3 present 2:1 27:18 50:16 75:7 88:10 98:21 120:19 121:6 127:24 128:15 155:8 156:3 259:6,7 presentation 194:6 205:23 presented 7:22 28:5 52:6 110:4,23 111:7 135:14 148:9 159:20 160:2	prevented 28:19 prevention 43:24 previous 153:23 198:2 267:8 previously 6:19 115:10 130:24 223:20 224:21 primarily 89:13 90:16 102:7 155:18 253:13 primary 152:22 263:21 prime 33:1 principal 15:14 32:3 printed 194:6 prior 8:18 26:11 31:12,18 45:5 93:20 94:18 95:19 98:23 99:2,2 122:13 123:18 124:16 124:18 125:7	255:22 problematic 121:23 240:24 problems 11:4 26:19 81:2,23 procedural 5:14 procedures 95:9 proceed 29:8,24 128:12 129:8 144:10 216:2 233:10 proceeded 27:12 27:17 proceeding 8:19 139:17 proceedings 1:11 125:15 138:8 266:4 267:17 process 41:9 77:23 132:16 176:23 234:13 processes 43:13 53:22 134:18	42:2 60:3 75:19 84:11 95:6 130:15 140:19 212:15 220:17 programs 31:23 130:16 212:13 prohibit 131:8 180:12 218:9 prohibited 127:15,17,22 248:15 prohibitive 168:10 project 15:13 20:20 27:19,21 32:21,23,24 33:1,3,14,22 35:4,21 37:19 38:23 44:2,14 45:8,15 46:4 49:18,22 50:1 54:2,4,13 55:4 61:9 64:9,16	212:20 213:10 213:12 222:20 249:8,8,24 project's 34:15 192:14 projected 102:20 103:5 projects 31:24 41:18 42:5 50:23 52:16 63:11,15,18 64:7 89:12 102:4,18 113:14,23 142:2 158:12 promised 126:5 promote 40:19 41:21 63:19 promoted 89:3,6 promoting 48:15 promulgated 239:13 246:18 prone 219:7

e terrer a

Г

Summer .

1 T M M4

	1	1	I	1
proof 11:9,11	165:22 199:16	206:13,21	61:18,19 62:6	0
propagate 36:8	propylene 201:9	207:2 225:3	89:14	analified 19.23
properties 136:1	protect 41:22	226:8,12	pumps 63:8	qualify 192.9
136:20 139:2	108:21 109:5	254:10	130:1 145:5	193.1
property 101:17	181:21 250:10	provides 43:12	168:7 181:16	qualities 169.4
139:13 140:10	261:10	providing 77:24	Purdue 112:24	quality 42.11
171:17	protected 41:7	91:22 107:21	113:3	43.1 124.11 20
proposal 68:16	protecting	108:19 109:15	pure 160:12	126.10 138.14
139:4 221:13	108:16,18	proving 11:11	purpose 40:23	149.17 216.21
proposals 90:5	222:9 262:19	provision 95:24	182:15 188:18	222.7 223.8
115:14	Protection 1:8	228:3 250:16	222:9,13 236:1	222.7 223.0
propose 158:19	5:8 26:16 36:2	provisions 9:16	236:13 238:7	225.12.20
218:8 246:11	36:3 50:9	9:21,24 10:1	240:8,12,16	223.12,20
proposed 15:13	54:17 78:15	10:11 11:19	255:15 256:12	auantity 95.22
24:24 25:21	97:8 115:3	26:23 49:20	259:21	quantity 95.22
26:4 27:1,19	125:4 131:7	94:15 95:16	purposes 152:10	19.22 28.10
34:17 38:22	136:15 180:11	97:23 138:19	156:20 249:14	52.9 54.10
40:4 41:15	204:22 209:21	139:3 187:11	249:18	69.4 16 71.7
44:2,14 46:18	210:5 247:2	189:24 190:6	pursuant 5:12	71.24 79.6
48:19 49:18,22	protective	199:19	68:23 124:23	109.3 116.14
54:2,6 55:24	114:19 115:1	proximate 97:10	173:11 243:20	147.3 154.12
59:10 68:14	protozoan	public 5:22	pursue 124:14	157.15 166.1
76:19 90:7	259:13	41:19 42:15	push 167:13	167.1 24 168.5
95:4,7 96:13	protozoans	48:9 62:15	pushback 149:1	169.18 170.2 7
96:18 97:3	257:17 258:12	127:23 128:14	pushed 62:12	170.15 172.9
100:4 105:4	prove 215:21	136:5,24	pushing 42:9	197.4 198.10
106:12,13	provide 30:6	212:11 222:11	put 7:24 17:14	214.3 8 221.13
114:16 115:16	44:18,21 66:17	229:18	17:17 20:14	224.5 225.14
116:10 122:12	73:12 90:20	publications	21:6 47:17	229.10 231.8
125:7 126:14	91:2 96:14	32:2	54:19 61:2,4	239.6 250.12
132:3,5,9	105:5 107:19	publicly 5:11	67:23 68:5,8	259:14 264.8
133:6,14	120:10 123:5	published 32:5,9	109:11 152:11	questions 21.17
138:11,18	124:16 154:1	36:14 38:20	154:6,13	33:19 45:21
139:16,24	162:18 164:3	41:20,24 42:6	164:19 166:20	46.13 50.3
140:5,8 141:2	164:15,22,23	239:19 247:5	167:15 168:3,6	56:5 8 16 65:7
141:13,24	188:24 212:12	pulled 23:5	168:24 169:7	66:11 83:24
146:24 164:14	220:11 222:10	62:18 165:10	170:19 174:6	86.8 102.2
169:3,5 183:14	222:14 229:16	pump 33:23	176:8,12	104:17 143.22
186:22 188:13	232:9 259:19	34:1 35:18	190:22 195:4	159:7 183:3
189:17 191:20	provided 24:6	39:1,5 40:1,3	197:2,6 198:16	193:11 207.15
196:15 198:3	27:14 33:17,20	62:5 79:18,18	199:2 200:10	232:21 251:19
199:7 201:15	54:16 55:10	90:24 91:23	243:10 252:18	anick 217:22
206:2 218:6	73:18 91:13	92:6,12,16	254:21,24	quickly 28:3
238:19 239:20	95:3 109:9	102:24 145:3,5	255:8 261:8	56:24 84:19
248:13 249:8,9	121:19 122:7	149:4	262:14	145:24 193.18
260:12,23	123:3,8,19	pumped 25:12	putting 14:6	auite 12:1
proposes 130:11	125:2,12 131:1	144:15 160:15	109:12 122:14	quote 42:13 43:5
proposing 55:22	144:22 158:1,1	pumping 40:8	159:3 200:8	62:18 124:11
138:5 158:18	166:17 202:8	43:17 61:12,13	PVC 106:9,15	132:13.18
				,

133:21 134:1	143:1.9 146:1	reads 13:23	recess 87:7	15:9.21 17.14
134:21 135:23	146:12 156:9	191:19	144:5 210:24	18:15 20:11.12
136:10 196:18	156:18.19	real 28:3 71:9.21	recharge 126:11	20:14.21.21.16
quoted 175:6.8	157:2,4,11	256:24	recharging 43:2	21:23 22:6.13
quotes 135:3	159:14 160:4	really 7:17 8:20	recitation 135:9	22:16.19 23:2
1	162:21 174:13	9:8 17:5 18:19	149:24	23:5.9.16 27:7
<u> </u>	189:18.18	25:22 28:4,22	reclaim 101:17	27:16 34:22
R08-18 123:4	199:17	53:17 55:8	reclaimed 44:16	35:5 38:21
127:9	rated 34:6 72:11	63:3 66:17	100:2	43:15 45:3,8
R2012-009	72:12 80:13	79:4 153:8	reclamation 1:4	45:10,13,18,22
138:21	92:5,12	154:23 162:15	5:6 6:5 24:16	46:9,15,17
R2012-009b	rates 34:18,24	167:1,11 177:2	30:24 32:13	47:24 49:23
139:10	40:2 48:21	206:6,7 224:17	35:7 44:17	51:18 52:7
R2012-09 138:8	51:15 65:21	237:14 256:3	89:21 114:10	54:19,21 55:12
138:11	82:4 106:18	261:1,4,7	115:14 178:8	56:23 77:20,21
R26 256:4	120:12 152:4	reason 11:14	184:22 202:9	78:8 87:23
K89-14 123:11	156:15	17:10 71:6	203:4 217:4	89:24 99:10
radioactive	raw 28:7,19	97:1 141:5	262:8	111:18,20
135:24 136:20	43:13 48:7	229:23	recognize 40:2	112:7,18
rain 155:15,19	132:13 181:22	reasonable 15:1	48:6 64:12	121:21 123:23
155:21 102:12	207:24 208:2	46:7 49:17	217:11 241:18	125:15 129:6
rainiali 54:14	213:19,23	125:12 229:10	recognized 57:8	140:7 141:4
59:11 49:9	240:9 261:10	reasonably	58:5 134:11	144:7 150:3
152.10 250.3	263:17	18:10 82:13	recognizes 43:10	
132.19 230.3 raise 17.8 108.3	RCX 3:2	reasons 11:15	recognizing	190:23 195:22
211.5	RDX 3:2	93:3	53:20	198:12 201:20
raised 99.15	reach 05:10	Reath 2:3 6:4	recollection	211:2,14,18
207.8	134:19 waaabad 24:16	rebuild 50:24	186:10	214:16 215:3,5
raising 107.15	reactied 54:10	rebuilt 52:15	recommend	215:10,17,22
107:18.20	00.24	2.12 12 205.11	70:21 238:1	210:1,10
129:2 241:10	86.10	206.22 252.11		217.20218.3 220.7.11221.0
ran 31:11	reaching 51.3	200.22 232.2,0	Perommendet	229.7,11 251.9
range 80:3	104.12 252.21	55.20 67.13	A2.17	233.17,17 238.24 252.3 5
119:7 121:5	reaction 219.14	68.21 168.23	recommended	250.24 252.5,5
258:4 259:15	241:5	197.3 220.5	48.5 49.21	265.5 9 267.16
ranging 118:9	reactions 26:15	225:1 232:2.6	94:6.11 99:20	records 22.15
rapidly 116:23	read 7:4 11:9	receive 19:2	131:14.23	recreational
118:17	14:4,10,15,17	39:8 51:23	134:10 141:1	136:7 137:2
rate 34:16 36:1	15:1 16:21	52:13 100:4	142:14 156:7	RECROSS-E
37:23 38:24	30:14,19 56:23	132:13 161:8	156:16 176:2	183:6 204:1
39:13,18,20	88:10 112:17	162:24	176:15,17,21	207:16
51:9 72:10	136:16 137:7	received 31:1	185:7 187:14	redirect 72:6
80:16,19 81:12	150:1 164:7	83:4,9 88:16	239:4,6,9	110:17,18
82:6,7 103:20	189:21 231:8,9	93:22 112:23	246:18	181:1 202:5
106:12,23,23	readily 101:23	130:17 161:22	record 5:15,21	205:20 227:11
110:22 111:5	132:7	receives 161:7	6:18 7:19,21	251:5
	reading 59:23	receiving 114:2	8:23 9:2,4 13:7	REDIRECT
142:19,22,23	105:7 175:5	206:8	13:10 14:8	204:14
	-	-		

 $\ldots = A$

and the second second

-

	F			
redirected 34:20	259:6	38:1	155:13	requested 98:19
reduce 37:8 43:4	refusal 49:12.16	rejected 123:11	render 136:4.23	122:15 126:22
83:12 124:19	refused 28:24	rejection 12:19	137.22 140.13	127.6 130.9
132:6 163:17	46:7 219:23	reioining 31:13	rendering	179.6 212.19
169:6 174:11	262:21	relate 147:1	139.21	224.14
236:9 244:21	refuses 49:10	related 33.16	renewal 243.15	require 10.1
244.22	regard 17:1	139.22 179.2	renovation	97.18 139.6
reduced 25.11	184.20	relates 144.18	89.13	222.10 242.7
44.6 51.9 11	regarding 12.10	177.1	renair 38.6	required 20.3
53.6 10 64.18	16.1 17.15	relating 54.18	50.17 82.12	38.15 41.12
64.19.65.21	20.19.21.18	relationshin	renaired 38.8	42.3 55.1 92.9
151.1 267.14	56.5 62.19	49·10	59·19	94.9 107.4
reducing 120.13	65.8 81.16	relative 36.19	renairs 37.13	108.4 122.12
155.13.17	115.7 125.11	144.16 146.4	44.11 65.11	124.5 130.2
230.3 254.2	149.23 194.7	174.7 255.14	reneat 85:7	$178 \cdot 10218 \cdot 21$
reduction 37.10	203.4 11 20	267.20.21	225.14	242.11244.12
65.2 155.10 23	207.8 220.4	relatively	repeating	255.10 263.13
257.20	207.0 220.4	142.13	163·20	255.19 205.15
reductions	regardless 37.4	relevance 11.20	renhrase 106.21	203.20 204.0
124.18	regards 24.15	18.20 54.5	replaced 38.010	26.24 07.7
reenforced	regional 35.8	228.23 231.4	59.19.20	00.10 128.10
46.22	registered 31.4	relevant 10:23	renlacement	133.13 134.7
refer 23.10 55.9	88.19 113.5	11.5 17 15.20	37.14 38.7	243.13
56.23 104.24	234.14.16	39.5	59.17	requirements
201.10	267.5	relied 11.3	renly 137.11	94·3 5 114·24
reference 9.7	regs 17.2.15	18.11 21.10	report 36:14 16	122.2 133.16
12.22 15.4	180.1 20	135.4 190.16	42.6 45.11 16	135.7 190.7
35:6 72:8	regular 28:8	relief 117.15	95.9 97.17	242.1 247.14
120:10 189:23	146:16 209:6	130:1	120.19.24	requires 43.16
197:22 250:14	232:3.7 242:8	rely 9:20 175:3	121:18 133:17	86.9 185.21
referenced 8:16	regulation 18:5	191:11.15	134:1.2 150:19	requiring
38:14 50:6	123:12 138:2	remaining 135:8	158:4 193:24	128:15 129:15
62:24 63:1	regulations 5:12	remedial 220:17	194:1 242:11	reredirect 184:3
77:10 150:16	9:8.22 10:17	248:18	reported 267:13	reroute 169:12
references 13:22	10:22 11:18	remediate	reporter 231:10	rerouting
19:11 96:4	12:11.23 36:18	172:20	267:6.7	169:14
referred 26:22	46:5 96:3	Remediation	reports 26:17	Research 113:12
81:23 189:8	129:13 141:24	130:15 140:19	147:19	reservations
246:17	173:12 176:21	remedv 140:7	represent 6:4	255:9
referring 15:16	194:18 218:15	remember 55:19	213:2	resources 43.3
58:11 61:11	218:17 220:10	247:19.20	representation	respect 131:21
63:7 69:18	247:17	reminded 252:9	114:23	134:4 164:19
133:20 165:5	regulatory	remotely 179:2	representative	176:11
178:13 179:10	113:18 114:24	removal 120:9	32:22	respond 33:20
180:20 203:15	135:6	remove 243:8.9	represented	47:13 146.8
204:3 222:6	rehab 38:9	253:15	33:2.6	215:7.13
refers 150:5	50:24 59:20	removed 53:23	request 30:14	responded 27:5
Refinerv 113:9	rehabilitation	96:9 201:21	33:18 243:21	46:12 99:14
reflect 47:24	37:8,16,22	removing	254:17	215:18 246:16
1	•		•	1

Sugar Street

"Hangarati

Same Same

	1	•	•	
260:24	194:22 203:6	revolving 42:4	181:24 184:22	261:14 262:8
respondent 1:9	207:4 222:21	Richard 123:3	202:8 203:4	263:12
2:17 5:8 211:4	228:14,19	right 6:24 8:5	204:10 206:2	Rockford 1:13
respondent's 4:3	232:17	18:1 20:6	210:2 213:14	6:5 24:16 31:1
6:16 22:3,9,12	resulted 221:14	22:18 78:3.10	213:17.24	101:15 117:6
23:1.18 24:2	228:8	81:3 136:14	217:4 218:11	126:15 129:17
24:11 187:6	resulting 181:18	151:23 154:8	238:3 242:23	140.2.16.22
199:13 201:24	results 95:6	165:8.9 173:4	244:9 245:17	142:18 143:20
responding	110:3 185:15	177:19 179:9	245:21.24	156:13 166:6
126:3	resume 13:13	180:17 182:3.6	251:9 252:21	182:22 201:15
response 6:16	19:19.22 20:1	188:8 191:22	253:17 260:6	role 90:18.19
15:2 19:1	20:4 32:10	194:13 196:12	260:14.15	91:1 184:20
33:18 45:20	33:20 73:13.18	196:13 200:2	261:14 262:8	room 144:3
46:11.13.14	74:13 78:2	201:5 208:11	263:12	root 37:3 163:3
67:12,17,18	89:17 114:8	211:1 215:10	river's 126:11	163:4 230:2
76:8,18 99:12	retain 8:5 12:10	216:23 227:12	145:23	roots 108:15
120:20 130:18	retained 25:10	250:1.15 252:1	roads 153:7	117:4 129:15
150:22 203:3.9	89:20 114:10	257:15 258:14	Rob 84:5	rounds 122:11
207:7 215:4.16	retardation	259:4.23 260:3	Robert 2:13	254:18 261:5
225:4 257:19	152:2,10	260:14 261:24	6:10 56:14	routine 40:21
262:21	retention 25:22	265:4	184:12.19	44:11 46:1
responses 67:23	39:2 42:20	rise 77:8 197:3	rock 1:3 5:6	261:2
67:24 93:18	63:9 84:24	219:12	26:8,11 28:11	routinely 130:13
99:6 153:24	114:11 142:5	rises 129:22	28:21 30:24	140:16 142:9
responsibilities	return 39:18	145:2	35:7 44:21	228:8 250:8
32:12 234:24	144:4	risk 259:8	49:7 57:10	Roy 2:4 6:2 55:8
responsibility	returned 34:3	river 1:3 5:6	89:20 97:13	RPR 268:7
75:18	92:19	26:8,12 28:12	114:10 115:13	RRWRD 46:13
responsible	reusing 101:5	28:21 30:24	116:2,13 118:5	46:22 140:10
91:18 113:17	reverse 143:16	35:7 41:11	126:10 129:20	263:11
rest 251:24	146:18	44:13,22 49:7	140:11 143:11	RRWRD's
restate 111:3	review 89:16	57:10 81:8	143:13 144:19	48:10
rested 211:3	98:12 121:17	89:21 101:20	145:18,19,23	rubber 203:1
restored 101:18	139:9 185:1,3	114:10 115:13	146:5,10,11	rule 5:19 94:20
restriction	185:4,5,10,12	116:2,14,16,18	147:2,4,5,6,11	139:8 188:6,14
140:17 201:19	185:16 190:18	116:18,19,22	147:15,23	188:21 189:2,4
201:20	196:6 203:7	117:1,9 118:5	148:6 149:10	189:7,19 190:8
restrictions	212:20 213:1	126:10 129:20	152:15 170:23	199:20 207:12
45:24 130:14	221:12 230:7	129:21 140:11	178:7,9 181:24	rulemaking 8:14
140:21	231:18 232:10	143:11,13	184:22 202:8	8:15
restrictive 146:3	235:1	144:19 145:18	203:3 204:10	rules 5:12,14
result 27:2,20	reviewed 166:8	145:19,21	206:2 210:2	26:23 27:22
29:4 49:24	179:19 185:18	146:5,10,11,13	213:17,24	187:20,21
53:3 79:21,22	205:22 245:10	146:14 147:2,4	217:4 218:11	192:2 246:21
98:17 102:21	246:14 247:7	147:5,6,11,15	238:3 242:23	247:5
104:13 117:24	reviewer 32:7	147:23 148:6	245:17,21,24	ruling 17:6
129:18 135:10	reviewing 121:1	149:10 152:15	251:9 252:21	run 70:9 71:3
141:16,17	reviews 230:12	153:3 156:24	253:17 260:6	103:11
157:17,19	revised 6:15	170:24 178:7,9	260:14,15	running 103:19

extention.

1 cm

				
241:13 264:13	263:11	section 5.13	194.22	service 32.17
runoff 152:24	scenario 104:7	9:23.24 10:3	seen 42:24 45.8	35.13 37.12
runs 171:3	scenic 101:20	46:6 47:4	168:19 190.15	79.3 122.14
Rust 31:20,21	schedule 254:21	54:18 94:10.21	191:8	127:3 261:9
	265:17	96:4.6.22 97:6	seenage 94:24	services 38.7.8
<u> </u>	schedules	107:3 121:1.16	95:21.22	59:18.19 91:3
S 4:2	265:14	121:16 124:24	seldom-seen	serving 88:23
safe 153:7	school 212:5	125:3,3,19	101:8	set 27:24 42:3.19
safety 136:6	234:12	131:13,24	selected 109:18	46:16 63:22
137:1	science 31:2	133:3 134:13	109:20 110:1.4	72:10 118:3
salt 153:4,20	88:16 112:23	134:17,20,20	118:2 140:6	135:15 166:20
salts 79:24 81:6	113:1 212:2	135:3,14	selection 91:15	177:3 268:1
samples 224:3	234:11	137:12.24	109:7	setback 109:1
226:4	scope 18:20	138:4 139:22	send 194:2	sets 78:5
sampling 122:11	210:18	141:22 172:6	sending 156:2	setting 44:15
254:18 261:5	screen 161:15	174:24 175:3,3	senior 88:13	seven 31:8 32:9
262:10,22	161:17	178:5 179:10	89:3.6 112:20	35:11 41:10
263:2 264:11	screening 85:14	179:15 185:19	sense 68:9	88:21 94:14
samplings	85:16,17,19	185:21 188:8	133:14 261:9	seventh 95:15
262:18	se 28:14	191:22 192:3	262:19	187:17
sand 118:8,9	sea 118:4 147:10	194:24 195:5	sent 13:15 77:3	severely 100:21
sandy 118:11,14	seal 94:8,12,17	198:8 199:21	97:20 99:3.12	sewage 28:7.19
sanitary 35:10	94:22,24 95:7	200:11 212:14	149:23 197:10	48:5 49:21
- 36:5 37:3 48:6	95:12,18,20,23	214:20 230:10	sentence 18:8	50:24 52:13
57:1,3 142:7	131:13 187:15	239:3 240:1,17	133:21	94:6,12 99:20
142:12 181:7	188:24 192:9	241:24	separate 16:15	131:23 134:11
181:10 182:13	192:11 238:13	section's 49:16	36:5,8 57:1,3	141:1 142:15
237:6 243:1	253:9	141:18	57:11,14,16,18	151:20 160:13
248:14	sealed 90:1	sections 131:6	57:19 58:20	181:22 185:7
Sanjay 190:12	94:23 238:6	180:10 191:16	161:2,5 177:3	185:20 187:14
saturated 155:7	Seals 95:1	229:17	separately 23:11	187:24 204:5,9
save 23:23	seasonal 226:5	secure 123:22	193:16	208:1,3 209:7
214:17 263:7	244:17	138:10	separation	209:12,13,16
264:20,22	second 7:18 8:2	securing 117:7	31:22	209:24 213:19
saves 101:6	8:12 23:24	see 40:10 41:22	September	213:24 214:4
savings 101:4	55:8 90:10	43:15 46:19	36:15 42:10	214:10 215:6
saw 10:14 18:17	94:15 95:15	47:18 62:16	128:10 138:22	216:5,21
79:20 194:5	97:1 111:18	65:22 129:4	septic 43:11	218:22 221:16
saying 55:9	115:19 145:4,8	130:6 133:17	142:4 155:17	229:1 231:16
106:11 162:5	162:15 168:4	138:2,21	157:8,11 254:5	231:19 240:9
175:9 227:7,8	180:9 187:17	139:14 140:4	series 117:14	242:14 244:4
250:16 262:11	191:18 218:2	146:10 188:3	127:23 128:14	245:21 249:20
263:19	218:14 255:2	208:5 216:24	196:8	258:10 261:10
says 18:8 162:20	259:23 260:1	217:2,7 218:4	serious 53:19	261:21 263:16
164:13 165:10	second-to-last	238:21 242:5	116:22	263:17
175:19,21	105:2	256:22	serve 240:15	sewer 24:18
177:23 178:17	secondary 34:7	seek 158:12	served 31:14	31:16,21 32:5
191:4 216:24	90:9 115:18	241:12	serves 35:11	35:17 36:5,8
239:21 263:3	secondly 11:6	seeking 171:6	238:7	37:3,6 38:5,6

· Mangadari

Sector Sector

	1	1	1	
38:10 43:4,6	255:16,20	170:18 224:6	siting 97:9	solids 49:5 123:2
57:1,3,7,11,14	256:4,12	256:5	sitting 82:10	214:4,10 215:6
57:16,18,19	showed 130:5	simplified	158:17	232:1 253:1.5
59:16,17,21	158:5	121:13 165:21	situation 201:14	soluble 163:14
81:24 116:5	showing 198:17	simply 98:12	224:14	solution 44:7
174:3,11 181:7	shown 15:9 34:9	106:16 154:18	six 35:1 41:10	46:23 64:20
181:10 182:12	49:23 98:11.17	194:21 195:2	60:13.13	solutions 40:13
182:13 191:5	108:22 196:12	single 98:11	122:11 126:3	41:21 42:8
199:9,10 206:9	227:15 230:16	119:9 244:10	127:2 129:4	43:7 219:20
245:16,23	shows 45:3	244:11	143:6 156:21	solvents 126:16
247:8,14,23	46:17 49:23	sir 48:3 71:8	157:10.13	140:2
248:14 249:23	243:2	76:23 87:4	159:12 178:6	somebody
sewers 35:16	shut 11:1 68:24	88:7 106:14	224:3,14 226:3	194:22
48:6 85:18	69:13 70:15	110:6 111:9	254:18 255:12	someone's 57:21
142:8,19	82:12	112:11 147:21	261:4 262:13	someplace 229:2
143:19 153:14	shutting 71:2	158:3 159:18	262:18 263:9	soon 39:19
243:1	sic 79:23 155:19	159:22 160:5	263:24	145:7 260:13
shallow 142:13	side 193:19	161:11 166:7	size 55:4,16	sooner 146:8
share 61:23	258:24	166:12 167:16	182:19 208:14	sorry 21:3 30:17
sharp 144:2	significant 33:5	172:2 175:14	248:5	30:21 52:3
shave 104:5	35:20 41:13	175:17 179:21	sizing 91:23	55:13 56:3
she'll 211:5	42:6 49:4 51:5	181:9 193:21	92:6	60:3 67:7,8,11
sheet 46:17	79:4,5 89:12	205:14 208:21	sludge 125:22	76:14 77:5
97:22	91:8 113:22	210:15 216:18	242:16	85:2 177:20
shock 158:17	129:1,24	217:1,9,12,23	small 28:22	sort 71:8 201:18
Shore 237:6	143:15 153:2	218:1,5,7	smaller 79:11	201:20 230:11
short 75:6 80:3	160:19,21	219:2,5,22	smarter 170:16	258:13
82:14 148:23	162:24 163:9	220:1,6,18	society 64:13	sorts 12:18
151:11 155:22	163:11,13	221:10,18	74:23	235:10 237:5
257:20	170:1 223:3,5	222:5 224:18	sodium 152:21	sought 26:14
short-lived	223:22,23	228:12 231:17	153:8	sounds 237:18
257:24	225:24 226:2	232:14 233:8	Sofat 190:12	source 256:10
short-term	226:17 227:14	251:21 252:11	soil 41:7 43:12	sources 160:20
90:10 115:19	227:23 230:17	254:12 257:8	48:18,22 95:12	216:13
149:8	255:17 256:18	258:16 263:17	95:23 117:5	southeast
shorter 258:6	significantly	sit 40:17 259:18	118:7,7,13	126:15 140:2
259:16	117:7 169:6	site 42:22 90:22	145:16 146:4	southwest 98:5
Shorthand	signs 191:7	90:23 97:15	157:10,12,24	speak 111:1
267:6	silt 118:9 157:7	100:19 107:5,6	158:6 163:12	192:17 197:14
shortly 256:21	silty 145:16	107:10 130:14	201:4 259:10	230:20 232:5
show 15:11,14	similar 16:20	133:22 140:18	soils 92:14 95:1	235:19 264:5
26:24 54:24	62:5 78:18	151:22 157:6	97:13 117:11	speaking 226:8
73:16 122:22	95:10 123:21	171:9,12,13	118:11,14	special 250:12
135:9 141:15	199:12 206:1	172:14 223:8	155:3 230:1	specific 19:8
150:2 164:13	261:19	224:18,22,24	sole 135:11	22:5 27:22
165:1 179:22	similarity 62:2	225:23 230:21	solicited 90:5	33:15 44:2
180:4 188:4	similarly 57:13	230:22	115:14	45:24 46:10
190:22 223:9	simple 11:10	sites 140:3	solid 216:11	51:22 63:22
225:6,17	28:4 130:4	231:16,19	243:8,9	66:11 91:1

-

107:3 131:22	198:4 239:16	176:15.17.22	statements	34:2:40:9
131:24 134:19	240:11	176:24 185:6.7	63:18 240:24	90:11 91:24
137:10 150:12	stabilize 132:15	185:7 187:11	states 36:2 42:3	92:9.14.94.10
150:15 154:22	staff 45:5.15	187:14.21.22	94:20 113:20	96.24 103.2
190:5.8 224:9	75:14.14.15	189:22 191:17	234:15.17	109:15 115:8
225:23 238:11	79:16 84:15.21	191:23 195.1	statewide 153.6	115.20 130.16
253:20	86:1 89:3 91:5	198.8 222.7	stating 65.17	140.18 171.17
specifically 9:2	103:11	225.12 227.2 8	106.16 222.19	240.15 261.22
17:4 55:19	stage 147:14	228.1 2 235.9	station 33.23	store 92.10 15
63:17 67:10	149:11	239.5 5 242.19	39.1 5 40.1 3 5	106.1 182.10
120:23 131:12	stakeholders	246.17 18 23	40.7 61.11 12	stored 34.19
139:22 150:17	36:11	247.3	61.18 19 22	92.18 204.4
150:18 183:13	stamped 121:22	standnoint	62.5 90.24	storing 27.1
187:15 224:23	123:24 126:5	11:10	91.23 92.6 12	101.13
247:19 252:23	131:5 133:18	stands 21.23	92.16 102.24	storm 25.5 26.3
specifications	135:17 139:15	start 52.9 54.10	145.8 245.17	38.17 39.3
94:16 95:16	141:7 190.23	113.9 151.16	station's 62.3	40.7 42.19
98:13 156.8	198.12	178.6 263.9	stations 35.18	43.6 23 48.15
specified 110:22	stamps 20:22	starting 198.12	40.8 43.17	48.16 22 49.1
149:7 267:19	stance 125.18	starts 152.24	61.13 75.16	49.2 3 51.22
specifies 142:15	stand 149:7	state 1.13 2:11	statistic 224.19	53.4 54.3 6
speculation 52:5	standard 10:12	42:4 61:10	statistical 91.22	55.261857.4
72:1 103:22	42:24 48:13	65:2 73:9	102.17 127.5	57.7 8 24 58.3
Speculative 52:1	63:16.23 64:1	74:21 87:23	225:21 227.14	58.72123
spell 87:24	64:2.3 76:24	105:3.19 109:1	statistically	59.6 61.13 18
233:16	95:9 120:16	112:6 124:11	100:16 223:3 5	62.5 9 21
spells 201:8	121:12 123:6	134:9 136:1.3	223:22.23	63:17 76:13 16
spend 11:4	125:2,24	136:21,22	225:5.24 226:2	79:1 90:11
260:21	126:10 130:8	151:11 179:3	226:17 227:22	92:2.10.15
spent 31:18 61:1	131:23 156:16	184:17 195:21	230:17 255:17	101:14 102:4.6
113:14 262:16	192:19,24	207:19 211:14	256:17,24	104:7 113:23
spoke 20:10	239:14,15,19	227:16 233:16	statistics 226:14	114:7 115:21
23:14	256:14 258:21	267:1,7	statute 9:24	116:6 117:19
spot 105:24	standards 42:18	State's 14:22	11:13	117:21 124:4
199:2	42:20,23 48:4	16:3	stay 191:6	125:20 127:14
spray 125:22	48:5,19 49:21	stated 24:9	stenographica	128:22 142:5
spring 153:15	62:19,23 63:1	55:20 62:3	267:13	152:19,23
153:20	63:4,6,11 64:6	67:12 84:7,13	step 72:20 87:3	160:11,21
SS 267:2	66:14 94:6,12	94:2,4 98:16	111:13 210:9	161:4 248:5
SSO 57:17	96:23 99:20	107:2,7 179:7	233:1 251:21	249:14 250:2
SSOs 36:19	108:24 122:20	233:20	259:24 264:19	Strategic 41:22
stabilization	124:12 129:10	statement 47:4	steps 59:14	stream 152:18
94:21 96:1,7,8	131:15 134:6	84:14,20	108:20	160:23 206:8
96:19 105:20	134:11,14,24	105:15 164:18	Steve 180:7	216:13
132:1,10,11,12	138:13 139:12	165:4,15,16	Steven 138:23	streams 114:2
132:15,20	141:1,12	167:22 178:24	Stimulus 42:2	street 1:13 2:14
133:4 165:10	142:14 149:17	186:10 215:1	stock 190:2	35:22 57:7
186:23 188:2	149:20 156:7	225:9 240:19	stop 11:23	181:19
188:10 189:2	156:10 176:2	258:4	storage 26:3	strike 74:17

 $(1, \frac{1}{2})^{-1}$

ĺ.

	1	1		•
102:9 111:3	substantiates	supporting	184:11.14	26:9 85:17
196:16 254:9	95:7	118:15	195:15.18	87:4 114:13
strive 66:17	suburbs 31:19	suppose 213:12	205:18 211:8	144:1.2 186:14
79:18 83:1	successfully	258:9 259:24	211:11 233:13	210:23 216:16
84:21	34:10 114:18	sure 13:7.14	252:15 267:10	217.22 225.10
striving 78:24	156:14	19:17 22:20	synthetic 25.2	226.5 238.23
85:21 86:2	sudden 14:8	27.15 28.3	93.3 95.2 20	245.8 253.2
181:5	Sue 231.8	30.20 54.9	99.23 101.24	259.23.265.11
strong 8:21	suffer 41.2	56.17 60.15	116.21 192.10	265.20
studies 113.24	sufficiently	66.10 87.9	238.6	taken 9.20 17.3
study 38.19	219.8	88.12 150.23	system 32.15	28.13 50.14
stuff 11.5 13.19	suggested 28.16	160.23 167.21	35.15 16 21 23	07.0 108.20
23.4 60.12	120.23 237.23	167.24 169.20	37.2 15 21 22	155.1 / 210.15
sub-consultant	suitable 99.24	177.5 180.5	38.1 16 30.4	226.2.267.18
110.2	126.17	183.24 205.12	/2.11 /2.10	220.3 207.10
sub-consultants	Suite 2.5	215.2 + 205.12	51.1 52.14	tolly 65.22
33.5 01.1	Suite 2.5	215.2 225.14	51.1 52.14 57.1 2 0 12 14	155.11265.12
55.5 91.4	sulfatos 122.1	250.19 257.15	57.1,5,9,12,14	155:11 205:15
27.22 07.11	sum 166.19	257.10 259.5	61.2 4 65.10	203:17
121.10 100.14	sum 100.10	203.0	01:3,4 05:10	talked 8:14
242.21	summaries 99.0	surface 128:17	05:19,20 00:5	
243.21	114.21 150.21	130:9 230:22	00:3 83:14,20	202:24
140.9	114:21 150:21	241:13 238:22	90:797:3	taiking 20:22
149:8	Summarized	surprise 209:18	104:15 106:22	63:3,10,12,16
159.12	121:23 120:8	surprises 209:21		63:17,18
138:13	summarizing	210:2	131:16 168:12	145:22 171:24
Submittal 45:0	99:2	surprisingly	1/4:2,3,16	1/2:1/ 1/3:1
98:23 203:7,14	summary 98:24		1/6:20 191:5	173:13,15,17
206:23	99:3,7	survive 108:2,6	191:20 198:18	173:20 174:8
	summer 115:4			
150:13 228:6	153:4,19	Susan 267:5	232:11 244:20	183:15 199:15
submitted 8:0	244:13	268:7	245:2,23 246:1	207:24 208:2
	sump 144:21	suspect 256:23	246:11,15	208:19 221:1
20:17 27:5		suspended 49:5	systems 32:8	227:5 228:24
//:14 90:2	sunlight 41:3	253:1,5	36:6 66:18	240:11 242:13
93:11 99:8	132:17	sustain 229:3	108:9,11	244:20 247:10
126:2 131:1	Superfund	sustainable 25:1	113:19 120:8	247:21
134:4,19	140:2 151:22	41:1/44:9	142:4,5,6	tank 130:16
14/:20 184:21	supervisor 31:9	63:14,20 64:6	155:17 157:8	
185:12	196:5	92:23 100:14	249:23	254:5
subsection	supplement 9:3		Т Т	tasked 91:9,22
261:16	265:9	114:6 167:5	T 4.2	team 33:1 89:20
subsequent	supplies 97:11	sustained 82:7	T + C = 0.256.5	90:6,13,13,15
122:15 191:3	140:11 212:12	swear 211:5	1-A-U-U 200:0	91:9,21 108:10
subsequently	229:18	swimming	table 100.3	109:21 114:9
28:11	supply 126:17	237:13	254.16	114:16 115:16
subside 145:9	231:24 258:24	sworn 29:22	234:10 TACO 25(-4	115:22 116:8
subsides 145:7	260:4	30:3 73:3,6	1AUU 200:4	120:18 124:14
164:20	support 15:18	87:13,16	12.1 19.2 20 7	technical 32:7
substantial 28:7	47:4 129:2	111:22 112:3	15:1 18:3 20:7	64:22 91:13

COMPLET.

94:3.5 131:20	test 178:5 244:1	88.6811	210.10 232.24	229.9 232.23
144:14	261:20 262:11	104:10 105:1	251:1.3 252:12	233.20 234.3
technician 88:24	263:8.20.22	107:2 109:16	264.18 265.20	233.20 234.5
89:3	264:1	112:10.15.17	265:22 266:2 3	239.4 24
techniques 75:2	tested 124:7	123:4.5 127:9	Thanks 205.1	240.21 244.2
technological	testified 30:3	138:23 141:7	210:23 221.20	245.15 248.3
64:17	51:14 52:12	143:21 162:2	233:1 251:20	253.6255.9
technologies	73:6 76:5	163:20.22	theoretically	259:14 263:6
134:12	83:14 86:13	164:1.13 165:1	162:21	265:918
technology	87:16 104:15	165:6 167:12	thermal 135:24	third 253.11
88:17 158:19	109:17 112:3	167:14 168:20	136:19	Thirty 209.1
158:20 188:15	173:21 184:14	171:23 172:6	they'd 248:23	thought 60.11
191:6 234:12	186:5 195:18	173:8.22	254:24	115:11 240.6
235:5	196:17 199:14	174:23 175:2	thickness 95:13	threaten 99.16
telephone 46:20	203:13 205:18	175:18.20	118:10	131.9 180.13
265:17	211:11 228:5	177:9 178:18	thing 15:14	216:8
televised 38:11	229:8 233:13	179:7 180:3.19	21:12 158:16	three 14:17
59:22	238:10.12	198:3 214:16	169:15 177:22	46:20 97:23
televising 37:14	249:12 250:19	215:21 220:2.4	238:24 258:13	98:4 108:3
tell 73:16 156:13	252:15 253:12	228:10 229:24	things 7:17 9:12	113:11 118:4
191:1 194:11	253:24 254:13	232:15 244:19	22:6 23:5.15	122:11 123:9
211:22 234:8	testify 47:8,19	248:4,20	80:23 163:2	124:9 125:1
237:11	55:23 108:22	250:19,19	173:20 214:14	126:18 138:2
tells 43:5	267:10	252:18 258:17	217:13 227:6	140:19 147:5.6
temporarily	testifying 17:19	258:19,20	228:16 235:12	177:12 178:21
39:16 92:15,17	33:10,12	260:8 267:16	241:9	179:1 208:21
106:1 182:10	testimonies	testing 95:6,10	think 8:2 12:16	209:3,4,6
temporary 34:2	237:21	126:22 178:22	14:1,4,22	237:6 252:24
90:10 115:8,20	testimony 6:17	242:8 243:13	15:20,23 16:18	253:20
240:14	7:2,8,18 8:9,17	243:19 259:3	17:3,6,9,11	three-foot
ten 133:8,9	10:14,15 11:18	tests 95:11 261:2	20:8 23:20	147:14
187:16	11:24 12:5,6	264:13	27:19 29:10	threshold 35:1
tend 131:11	12:10,21 13:17	thank 28:1 29:6	47:12 55:22	thrilled 174:15
155:20 180:15	13:22,24 14:4	29:16 48:1	64:15 65:1	thrive 91:16
tenth 94:14	14:10,15,17,24	55:13 56:10	67:9 69:19,23	thriving 93:6
term 15:5 27:21	14:24 15:17	74:6,10 86:21	71:23 78:1	time 8:21 11:4
51:12 53:8	16:5,11,12,21	86:23 87:4	128:6 143:24	17:12,23 21:21
63:14 85:11	17:15 18:2	104:20 110:14	153:18 157:13	23:23 24:20
148:24 159:14	19:6,10 20:2	111:12,14	157:19 158:22	25:19 26:2
204:21 207:9	29:12,14,15	137:13 143:23	161:18 163:20	28:18 30:13
253:19	30:7,11,15	144:11 159:8	164:1 167:1,13	31:21 39:21
terms 96:2,6	33:16 49:19	161:6 165:24	167:24 170:6	43:2 50:12,17
144:14 181:12	50:10 55:11	167:8 180:22	173:19 175:17	51:6 53:17
187:10 190:1	56:22 59:13	184:5,7 189:10	178:23 180:2	65:22 67:4
192:14,15	60:15 62:3	193:11,20	180:21 188:2	72:24 75:22
222:6 224:1	65:7 67:6,7,14	195:11 197:14	195:6 198:9,23	78:17,24 79:7
226:9 240:11	68:21 72:8	200:3 202:2,3	199:14 208:5	79:20 80:6,9
Terrific 252:2	73:14 74:8	204:13 205:2,3	214:13 220:2	82:14 83:19,24
tertiary 119:22	84:14 87:20	205:15 210:6	228:16,22	86:13 104:18

	[_
	107:13 137.6	72:2 129:3	39.14 19 43.13	236.16 237.7 0	148.24 151.8
	138:9 143.24	139.15	43.20.24.51.3	230.10 237.1,9	160.8 10 161.1
	145:12 147:22	touch 171.22	51.17 22 52.12	242.17 240.13	161.5 7 165.12
	151:12 152.19	Town 88.22	58.12 15 21	243.7 5 245.22	168.16 178.5
	159:6 162.13	track 55.14	69.20 70.13 15	248.10 240.20	181.17 182.21
	193.11 202.13	115.23	70.17 75.23	240.10 249.20	187.4 100.10
	207.13 212.13	tracked 116.13	79.17 80.1 5 8	277.222.250.5 261.12	208.10 200.1
	212.20 212.4	traditional	81.017 81.16	401.13 tributary 25.91	200.19 209:1
	234.77 737.17	44.20 11/1.15	85.11 12 20 21	tried 28.15	221.3 234:13 227.7 220.1
	237.10 230.11	167.6	85.77 74 86.7	trin 266.2	257.7258.4
	253.3 260.17	trained 235.20	89.14 22 02.20	trouble 177.10	252.5 254:10
	260.18 22	training 230.20	97.71 06.0 15	troublesome	201.7 203.8 two_foot 120.15
	263.1 7 266.7	229.20	100.3 101.10	125.20	160.2
	267.19	trajections	107.8 104.12	truck 124.20	107.2 two_foot top t
	times 53.17	102.24	105.6 1/ 106.7	171.11 72	218.12
	56.21 127.2	transcrint 1.11	106.3 110.2	172.3	210.13 two_thirds 200.7
	178.6 187.16	138.21 164.7	113.14 11/1.0	trucks 170.10	209:7
	255.12 262.12	267.13	114.13 115.10	true 74.12	202.14 two_to_opo
	263.9 24	transfer 30.17	116.1 110.77	152.17 2/0.10	200-10
	today 11.5 21	39:22	124.3 16	258.3 267.15	type 40.5 49.10
	13:24 24.2	transfers 92.17	134.16.23	truly 145.20	61.10 62.6
	25:17 64.13	transition	135.1 144.22	truth 267.10	115.11 119.12
	68:15 87:8	234.13	145.3 146.21	trv 23.8 64.17	147.17 157.10
n singer	88:11 158.14	translate 53.5	-146.22.23 -	- 66·10 162·2	159.74 187.72
	161:18 168.20	translates	149:5 150.24	182.24 185.12	206.19 272.14
	172:22 175:20	119:18	154:1.10.13.14	trving 61.3	types 52.15
	220:3 232:15	transmittal	154:17.18 21	138:10 158.23	134:24 157.24
	237:21 238:18	45:11	154:24 160:18	159:1 165:4	158:6 235.5
	240:22 248:4	transport	161:8.21	172:20 183:9	typewriting
	248:20	181:14	162:19.24	224:5 261:10	267:14
	told 15:9 26:19	travel 260:18	163:24 164:3.5	TSS 217:10	typical 40:7.14
	top 57:21 67:9	treat 34:14 81:5	164:5,9,16,22	turn 59:12	61:13
	87:10 146:3	81:17 84:21	164:24 166:3.6	200:14,23	typically 119:6
	147:8 162:22	86:10 133:1	170:21 171:2	216:14,14	155:6 157:3
	191:4 211:23	165:14,17	175:4,11,16,19	217:19	162:12
	217:8	treated 26:7	175:21,22	turned 217:5	typos 18:18
	topic 42:12	72:15 93:5	176:2,10,14,16	two 7:6,17 11:3	
	188:3	162:7 183:17	176:19,23	23:15 35:18	U
	topsoil 118:14	183:19 222:9	181:14,23	45:13 49:20	Uh-huh 61:15
	118:16 145:16	244:8 250:20	182:4,17,17,20	82:23 83:5,8	62:17,22 80:12
	157:5,6 158:7	250:22,23	182:24 183:9	93:9 94:3,4	162:14 187:8
	158:8,9 162:23	263:16	183:11,17,20	96:12 113:6	200:16
	total 12:7,8 60:2	treatment 25:9	185:20 186:15	118:5 119:24	ultimate 5:16
	61:24 71:24	25:12,13 26:12	186:17,18	121:21 122:6	166:24 184:23
	92:8 120:4	28:12 31:23	206:7,11,12,13	124:21 126:14	ultimately 27:17
	123:1 151:6	32:15 33:16	216:21 222:13	131:15 132:14	155:3
	259:1	34:1,5,7 35:9	229:1 230:6	132:24 133:5	unacceptable
	totalling 35:13	35:19,22 38:16	232:1 235:1,22	135:6,17 139:5	259:8
	totally 18:15	39:3,4,6,8,13	236:4,5,10,12	141:7 143:6	underground
L					

130:15 140:18	47:14	249:22,23	verifiable 46:3	238:21 243:3
171:16	unsuitable	254:19 258:23	verify 116:20	260:21 261:22
underlying	107:5,9	258:24	versus 5:7	264:8.20 265:6
15:19 135:11	untreated 27:1	USEPA 21:12	157:18 168:2	265:20.22
underneath	28:7 69:1,14	36:10 41:21	229:2 255:7	266:2
168:7 201:7	70:8,16 71:14	42:2,12 132:12	viability 149:14	wanted 9:10
259:11	105:11,16	132:20 198:16	viable 117:3	171:21 202:19
understand	132:13 173:24	247:14,16	153:8 163:15	254:14
16:19 51:19	193:4 196:21	users 245:1,3,8	vice 112:20	wanting 243:24
103:21 109:3	197:1 204:5,9	uses 100:18	vicinity 116:10	wash 171:14,23
162:3 163:7	204:18 207:24	136:8 137:3	223:12 248:12	172:3
165:8 169:21	216:5 218:22	usually 132:14	view 222:24	washed 81:6
169:22,22	221:16 236:21	utilities 90:23	226:23 258:16	85:18
170:5 172:23	244:4 250:10	utilize 56:6	viewed 79:2	washing 79:23
181:4 188:9	250:23 261:18	79:15 80:5	vinyl 202:24	124:2,4
235:19 248:16	261:21	83:1 102:4	violate 10:22	Washington
249:7,7 261:23	upcoming	119:22	11:13	2:14 20:18,19
understanding	265:23	utilized 34:18	violates 10:3	191:4 194:7
21:11 77:11,16	upgrade 31:24	92:8 249:13	violation 36:20	199:6,8 205:23
78:13 82:2	upgraded 43:17	utilizes 64:16	76:9,11,19	wasn't 22:20
86:12 123:6	upgrades 32:15	utilizing 81:17	77:1 81:24	54:6 55:10
168:14,17,18	uplift 107:13	82:17 83:18	82:5 194:18	175:19 202:24
181:13 194:16	108:5	124:3	227:1,3 249:6	243:23 255:10
200:17 264:5	upsized 102:24	utmost 80:6: 🐃	viruses 257:17	262:21
understands	upstream 126:9		258:5,7 259:13	waste 58:6 94:21
43:6,12	uptake 91:17	V	vitae 24:1	96:1,7,8,10,19
understood	109:8 163:5	value 118:1	voice 54:8	105:9,20 132:1
132:7 133:13	upwards 37:7	225:22 226:10	volatile 151:21	132:10,11,16
Unfortunately	urban 44:16,23	226:13,18,22	151:24	173:8,15
135:3	128:22 152:20	values 55:20	volume 42:19	186:23 188:1
uniformly	usable 140:3	110:21	51:11 61:24	188:10 189:2
127:13	222:10	valves 117:15	65:15 103:6	198:4 216:10
unincorporated	use 21:20 23:9	130:1	174:7	216:12 221:15
35:12	23:10 25:18	variation 226:5		239:16 240:11
unique 32:21	26:2,4 40:5,10	226:15	W	252:24 253:19
unit 182:20	40:14 44:24	varies 42:20	W2002-00140	257:14 261:7
185:19 187:23	53:5 78:20,21	variety 163:2	77:12	263:1 264:15
192:12 212:11	82:22 83:21,21	various 93:19	Wacker 2:5	wastes 132:13
United 36:2	92:23 93:4	99:14 104:13	walk 180:4	wastewater 27:2
113:20	102:12,16,16	228:6 232:16	want 5:21 7:1	32:7 35:8,18
units 82:11	103:7 110:20	vary 230:21	11:3,6 13:6	39:6 43:14
249:20,23	111:4 115:7	vastly 79:4	17:5,13 24:12	45:1 48:7 49:2
University 31:3	129:11 130:14	veatch 38:20	55:8 59:12	58:4,6,9,16,24
74:21 88:18	135:2 140:4,17	vegetated 34:2	60:19,22 64:21	59:6,8,10,11
113:1,3 212:3	140:21 153:9	39:1 44:22	69:17 129:5	61:19 62:7,10
unlined 106:5	158:8 167:6	velocity 148:23	137:10 162:3	63:2 69:2,14
unreasonable	182:7,9,21	152:1	169:20 180:3	70:9 71:14
71:4	199:5,7 208:16	verbally 121:13	183:11 193:15	75:23 84:23
unreasonable	227:18 238:5,6	130:19	193:16 231:7	85:10 86:3,10

 $r \sim 14$

[
89:23 92:20	55:6 57:4.8.24	223.1 8 224.2	251.24 253.20	51.10 59.15
96:5 101:17	58:3.8.21.23	224:11.18.21	255.7 261.10	60.18 61.3
102:8 104:14	59.7 61.13 18	225.12 16 20	265.5 13 14	89.22 109.15
105:11.17	62:5.10.21	226.23.24	we've 15.20 17.3	114.11 14
109:10 113:13	63.17 80.8	227.1 3 8 15	53.22 23 69.22	118.20 126.11
113.23 114.1 3	85.21 86.3	227.16.23	102.23 189.8	154.3 4
114:6.12	89.21 96.3 5	229.18 230.4 7	204.3	wetland 26.6 0
115.10 124.18	97.10 98.18	229.10 230.4,7	ween $1/6.13$	33.8 A1.1A
125.22 127.2	99.17 102.4 6	231.24 233.22	weather 2/1.18	11.14
127.21 133.2	106.4 109.15	242.19 256.7	31.22 33.23	01.11 1/15
134.16.23	113.23 114.7	258.22.24	36.5 22 37.8	93.6 100.11 20
135.1 142.7	114.10 115.2 6	260.4 12 13	37.10 38.4	101.0 23
146:22 150.24	115.14 116.24	262.8	40.9 10 51.4	101.9,23 107.22.24
152.18 160.8	118.24 120.13	water's 145.12	51.10 59.15	107.22,24 108.2 114.16
160:10.14.17	121.8 124.4 4	waterfowl 44.21	60.18 61.3	115.10 16 17
160.24.24	125.20 126.10	waters 41.21	89.22 114.11	117.3 118.16
161.3 162.5	126.17 127.14	136.1 20 22 23	114.14 118.21	110.0 122.1 8
164.5 165.14	128.22 131.11	137.22,22,23	126.11 154.3 4	126.1/10
165.17 166.6	132.17 135.10	140.14 160.11	208.7	120.14,19
170.21 171.2	135.21 21	213.9 11	webiner 108.16	129.14 132.3,9
173.24 176.19	136.2 4 137.17	way 11.9 84.15	198.19 22	132.23 133.0
179.2 5 181.14	140.3 11	96.18 157.21	190.17,22	$1/0.1 \times 1/1.2$
183.8 16.21	141.17 142.5	178.20 182.23	website 19.12	143.2 145.6
196.22 197.1	143.2 15946.9	192.10 228.22	140.20	149.6 7 14
204:4.18	148:4.10.11.16	240.19	Wednesday	155.12 158.8
206:12 229:15	149.2.13	ways 49.7	265.16	161.16 162.23
230:9.13.16	152:19.24	107.14237.14	week 7.3 119.24	163.6 10 17
231:2.6 232:11	154:13 156:22	we'll 13:8 15:5	welfare 136.6	164.2 9 165.12
235:1.22	161:4.22	20:7 21:21.24	137:1	166.16 18 23
236:22 250:10	162:17 164:4	23:8.10 29:11	wells 46:18.19	167.7 169.4
250:20 255:14	164:19.24	71:9 128:4.8	97:19.24 98:3	170.2 171.7
258:22 261:18	169:12,14,17	we're 10:21	98:4.6.10.14	183:14 198.18
262:7	178:8 180:15	11:17.20 18:14	99:22 122:12	199:5.7.8
wastewaters	184:22 192:16	20:21 21:20	122:23 124:6	201:1 206:14
175:11	192:22 193:1	24:10 58:12	124:13 139:1.7	206:16.18.20
watch 198:20	194:21,23	59:9 63:7.10	149:18 222:12	214:5 230:2
watched 199:3	195:4 197:5	63:22.24 72:19	229:21 246:14	251:12
water 1:3 5:10	200:7,8,9,9	104:2 107:22	254:22 260:4	wetland-type
6:5 9:23 10:10	202:8 203:4,6	108:23 143:24	261:5 262:11	115:7
11:1,12 12:2	204:11,21	144:1,6 153:7	262:18	wetlands 119:22
12:14 15:4,15	206:10 207:10	169:16 172:17	went 163:21	122:14 125:7.7
24:16 26:3	208:20 209:7	173:19 174:7	212:6	142:6 155:6
27:20 28:14	209:19 210:3	177:21 190:3	weren't 9:2	254:1
29:4 30:24	212:11,13	199:15 207:24	195:2	whatsoever
32:5,9,13 35:7	213:6 214:1,5	208:2,19 211:2	West 2:14	262:22
40:7 42:16,19	214:21,22	214:14,16	wet 24:18 31:22	WHEREOF
43:1,7,13,23	216:8,8,20	215:22 227:5	33:23 36:4,22	268:1
48:15,17,22	217:4,16 222:7	228:16,22,24	37:8,10 38:4	whichever
49:1,2,3,24	222:14,15	238:23 247:21	40:9,10 51:4	138:14
·			-	

White 42:9,10	244:19 266:2	88:6 104:24	Yep 204:7	100-year 147:10
wide 105:24	wonder 227:9	109:16 130:17	vields 143:7	147:12
255:23	237:3 241:16	150:13 165:7		101.600 5:14
width 255:23	wondering	265:18	Z	104 3:9
wild 136:8 137:3	20:11	wrong 175:5.17	zero 8:10 133:7	105 38:21 55:12
Wilhite 149:23	words 195:1	208:10 240:1	157:2	110 3:8 242:10
190:12 197:1.9	221:7 236:9	wrote 18:16	zone 98:8	1100 37.6
William 3:21	244:8 245:2	84:18	118:11 123:15	112 3.11
24:1 211:9.16	261:18		124:22 130:12	114 38.21 55.12
Winnebago	work 31:6 37:17	X	140:6 157:4	11th 150.20
245:10.11.12	37:24 38:5	X 3:1 4:1,2	163:4 220:5,8	206.23
245:13	44:17 65:19		220:9 221:6,9	12 45:10 118:14
winter 153:1.12	75:1 88:21	<u> </u>	zones 163:3	131.6 180.10
Wisconsin 88:18	91:4 113:6	yards 100:24	220:20 230:2	194.24 195.5
88:20.23 89:10	114:5 131:23	yeah 15:24 22:2		200.11 214.20
withdraw 52:8	145:10 153:3	22:20 102:14	0	214.20 234.20
54:9	185:9 212:5 6	128:6 129:6	0317-12 93:23	125 118.22
witness 3:2	212:7 223.14	153:5 159:17	94:2	119.2
13:23 20:5	229.17	160:1 162:10		17 4 9.23 10.11
24.1 29.18 19	worked 28.15	172:23 188:5		214.20
29.21 30.2 22	31.21 23 32.1	205:5 209:5	18:4 22:12 24:6	1217.20
40.6 47.13 19	91.5 146.20	210:22	24:9 29:13	12D 214.21 13 31.12
48:4 50:19	working 41.16	year 25:7,16,19	112:13 138:22	13 - 11 1.6 5.0
55.11 56.4	43.21 113.13	25:20 40:11	180:7 187:6	130 82.8
69:7 21 70:3	125.8	42:10 61:5	190:4 199:14	135 82.8
71.23 72.22	works 48.6	62:4 80:14	201:24 212:23	135 02.0 13th 268.2
73.2 5 77.21	49.22 85.11 13	82:18,23 90:9	238:23,24	145 39.13 183.1
87:5.12.15	94:6.12.99:20	100:16 103:8	1-8 4:4	145 4 92.4
88:1 104:1	134:11 141:1	103:14 115:18	1,000 142:12,20	15 75.6 120.2
111:15.21	142:15 185:8	117:21 119:2	1,060 119:10,11	140.21 250.13
112:2 128:13	187:14.24	119:12,19	1,100 35:17	150 208·14
129:9 136:14	workshop 36:10	120:5 142:24	1,170 38:9 59:20	152 45.17
136:18 137:7	world 66:6 71:8	143:4 182:21	1.2 157:12	155-million-ga
137:15 144:9	71:10	198:24 224:3	1.3 128:16	183.1
184:7.8.10.13	worried 257:16	226:4 244:16	1.5 118:10	159 3.11 222.4
193:14 195:12	worst 25:4.14	247:18,24	1:20 144:2	16 38 6 45 18
195:14.17	41:3 156:4	254:19,20	1:25 144:7	59.16 133.18
197:15 202:18	159:16 160:3	255:8,13 261:8	10 45:14 120:15	168 121.22
205:8.11.14.17	wouldn't 103:21	262:13,16	120:17 121:9	126.5 135.18
210:11 211:4.7	177:7 189:20	263:24 264:1	142:18 175:1	141:7
211:10 230:21	243:14 258:8	years 31:6,8,12	10-year 25:5	169 218·3
231:13 232:6	write 84:18	31:18 35:21	34:14 38:17	16th 2.14
233:2.4.8.12	writer 262:5	36:6,9 38:2	39:2,12,23	17 103.1
250:15 251:22	writing 191:12	39:10 62:12	55:278:21	17.000 38.7
252:11.14	written 7:4.8	66:15,18 75:6	79:1 92:2,15	1700 59.18
267:9.9 268:1	10:15 12:5	83:5,8 88:22	116:5 117:24	174 135.18
witnesses 14:17	16:5.10.12	92:1 102:15	100 23:7 66:18	179 150.3
21:18 153:24	20:2 56:22	113:7,11,14,21	71:17 152:11	18-nerson 32.14
210:14 237:22	65:6 67:7 74:7	117:19,21	152:13 236:14	181 3.11
······································		133:8 234:20	236:15,18	
	I	1	I	1

.

" Support

183 45:18	42:6 45:12,14	25-million 92:13	370.110 96:4	480 198:13
184 3:15	45:19,21 46:11	101:24	134:13	493 119:18
187 177:23	46:21 99:14	25-million-gal	370.110(b)	4th 76:16 93:12
189 4:10 45:22	120:17 121:18	39:1	134:17	
46:15 178:4	122:17,17	25,000 49:9	370.520(b)	5
191 2:5	126:2,4,8	251 3:16	134:20 175:1	5 4:9 42:14
1917 35:9	129:10 130:11	252 3:13	370.930 94:11	45:17 61:9
193 3:16	134:3 135:15	257 3:13	94:21 96:22	62:13 78:3,5
195 3:19	135:17 138:22	26 138:22	97:5 132:1	78:11 179:9
1953 88:15	139:14 141:6	256:10	370.930(b)(4)	263:6
1970 112:24	159:20 177:24	263 35:5	131:17 191:21	5/12 131:7
1971 113:4	197:3 202:14	268 139:15	370.930(d)(2)(180:11
1973 113:11	203:7,14 207:6	26th 6:20	187:13 239:3	50 38:2,10 59:21
1976 31:2	254:8,11 263:4	27 77:15	370.932(d)(2)(117:19,21
1979 112:22	2012 1:14 8:4	28 46:11,15	131:14	119:6 237:14
1980s 31:10	87:9 93:13,23	126:8 129:9	3700 2:5	50-million 237:9
37:11	130:24 131:5	130:11 139:14	38 39:10 92:1	500 120:7
1990s 98:7	144:8 180:7	28.1 125:3	102:15	500-year 147:17
1995 88:18	202:12 268:3	28th 1:14 45:21	39 10:1 131:6,7	520(b) 134:20
1999 32:6,10	202 4:5	47:1 87:9	180:10,12	56 3:4
1st 131:5 202:12	202/204 3:19	99:14 126:2	195:5 200:11	56,000 120:1
	204 3:19	134:3 144:8	214:20	569-1000 2:7
$\frac{2}{2}$	205 3:12	159:20 177:24	390.930(c)(2)	5th 76:16 265:16
2 29.14 30:9	2673:12	267:13 260:9	133:3	
45:10 48:11	20th 42:10	260:10 262:24	3rd 45:12	$\frac{0}{(4.10,00.11)}$
50:11 73:23	211 3:21	263:4		64:10 62:11
207:21 216:15	22 4:4 45:13	299 123:24	4	189:7,14
2,400 142:20	46:21	2nd 265:10	4 4:8 59:12	241:24 242:4
2.3 56:1	222 3:22		73:24 74:5,5	60 209:2
2.4 142:23 143:3	230,000 35:11	3	77:24 78:2	6001/9:12
143:8,18	233 3:16	3 23:19 29:16,16	104:24 139:14	00002 2:15
173:23	239 120:5	56:24 88:5	216:16 217:19	60606-1698 2:6
20 157:21	24 95:14 162:15	99:10 178:4	217:20 222:3	020 10:17,22
20-toot 97:24	24-hour 34:14	241:17 263:6	40 34:6 37:18	12:11,23 $13:217.2$ 15 19.5
2003:1937:7	39:2,12,23	3.545 137:12	43:15 80:14,15	17:2,15 18:5
2002 34:12	92:2,15 162:13	30 3:3 66:15	41 133:18	122:24 138:19
38:13 76:15,17	24,000 35:17	119:6 178:9	415 131:7	1/9:8,10,12,15
//:15	100:24	208:6,22,23	180:11	1/9:15 180:1
2003 89:2	240 48:12	255:7 263:12	425 1:13	180:20 220:10
2004 89:5	142:16	300 123:24	430-9-77-012	230:15 620 240(a)
2006 38:20	246 3:17	309.241 190:7	132:21	124.24 U(e)
123:20	25 56:2,3 92:9	51 35:18	440 198:13	620 250 124-24
2008 123:4	103:1,4 118:1	512 2:7,16	45 201:8	620.260.124:24
2009 42:16	122:4 130:5	33 113:21	48 35:3 39:23	620 201 122:3
2010 42:14	139:12 141:12	209:11	92:20 133:10	620.501 122:3
48:20 62:13	149:18 208:7	35 118:9 122:2,5	149:8 156:21	678 0.21
90:4 115:4,13	208:21 225:13	124:23 125:2	159:12 162:6	65 A 02.7 12
2011 9:9 30:11	255:6,21,23	131:16 179:11	48-hour 25:16	65 1 million a
30:13 41:24	25-foot 109:1	570 10:5 96:6	207:21	28.71
				50.24

.

Ę

	ł	I	1	1
68 119:19	866 20:23			
69 2:14	87 3:8 208:12,18			
690.0 118:3	208:21			
6th 45:19.21	876 142:24			
93.23 122.16				
	9			
7				
724:3211:19				
242:4				
7.700 119.1				
7.27 117.12				
119.8 120.1				
7.27-acre 129.23				
7 4 103.9 17				
110.11 117.23				
255.8				
75103.16				
7.5105.10				
7.07 143.7				
700 25:7 147:9				
72 3:3				
73 3:0				
744:8				
77,000 38:8				
59:18			- · · ·	Lader
784:9				
Q				
<u> </u>				
0 22:12 24:0,9				
00 54.7,17,19 25.1 21 20.15				
20.18 20 65.22				
39:18,20 05:23				
/2:9 80:17,18				
80:21 81:10				
82:14 92:6,17				
103:12,16				
110:7,12 111:6				
154:5 208:13				
208:17				
800215:11				
300,000 168:20				
81 80:20 81:10				
814-5588 2:16				
82 81:10				
84 3:6				
84-3956 268:8				
846 131:5 180:6				
848 20:22				
190:24				
85,000 35:13				
861 200:24				
	l l		1	

Same -