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

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

MR. HARSCH: Yes. My name is Roy M. Harsch. I'm a partner at the law firm of Drinker Biddle \& Reath, and I represent the Rockford Water Reclamation District.

MR. GRANT: My name is Chris Grant, G-r-a-n-t-, and I'm assistant Attorney General with the Illinois Attorney General's office, environmental bureau.

MR. PETTI: Robert Petti, P-e-t-t-i, also with the Attorney General's office, assistant Attorney General.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: A few
administration duties to fulfill.
Mr. Harsch just handed me a revised response to respondent's motion in limine to exclude irrelevant testimony and documents not included in the record.

It was previously filed, I believe, on November 26th. I will take it -- I'll take it as Hearing Officer Exhibit A.

Any objection?
MR. GRANT: None.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right.

1 I do want to -- there had been some prefiled 2 testimony and attachments filed by the 3 petitioner a week or so ago. There has been 4 written briefing on it. I have read the 5 briefs.

7 documents that are attached to a couple of the

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.

I think the second part is that the final decision of Illinois EPA in this matter was made on August 1, 2012. We'd like to retain the right to object to anything that's submitted that was generated after that date and was not considered by the Agency.

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Let me -let's go to the testimony of Jim Huff and the attachments. Could you zero in on that first, please?

MR. GRANT: Just one second.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Something about the rulemaking. You talked about the rulemaking.

MR. HARSCH: The document referenced in the motion, Mr. Grant, is the testimony of Mr. Cobb. It was entered in a prior proceeding.

MR. GRANT: We don't have any really strong objections. At the time we filed it, we noted that there were documents that were not in the record that were being used.

But there are -- frankly both of us are

1 planning on using some other documents that 2 weren't included in the record specifically 3 without formally moving the Board to supplement 4 the record with the documents, so not so much 5 of a problem.

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
$i 2$ 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.

So my concern was, and still is, that sandard.

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

1 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.

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

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

1 there's quite a number of attachments.

Do you have a problem, first of all, with the testimony of James Huff, the written testimony?

MR. PETTI: In total?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: In total. MR. GRANT: No. As long as I'm able to retain my objection to testimony regarding the 620 regulations and groundwater degradation, that entire area, which we do.

Anything that doesn't have to do with water pollution including groundwater pollution because groundwater pollution -- because then we don't think -- because the hearing is based only on the final decision of the Agency, not on what discussions they had over all sorts of other potential bases for rejection of the plan. So we can maintain that.

Now, as far as his testimony on it, you know, we'd like to exclude the reference to the part 620 of the regulations.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm going to

1 take that as administrative notice, judicial 2 notice. The Board is well aware of part 620.

MR. GRANT: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: So I guess your objection is overruled.

MR. GRANT: Okay. I just want to make sure I made it clear in the record because in our post-hearing brief we'll --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm just a little confused, and it is on the record, what you're objecting to.

But this whole packet of Mr. Huff's resume -- and, Mr. Harsch, could you expound on that? I mean, what -- I'm not sure why this was altogether sent to me.

MR. HARSCH: It's the prefiled testimony.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: But it's also -- it has a bunch of other stuff attached to it.

MR. HARSCH: It has the exhibits that Mr. Huff references in his testimony that we intend to introduce when the witness reads their testimony today.

MR. GRANT: I think, you know, if there's something that's particularly egregious that he's using -- if he's going to read the testimony, I think that takes away a lot of the -- a lot of the problem I'd have. I was -- you know, we were putting an objection out with the idea that this would just be all of the sudden in the record as evidence. We could cross-examine on it. But if he's going to actually read the testimony in, then -- if we needed to have a question and we have the opportunity to do that, that's fine.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Huff is going to read the testimony in?

MR. HARSCH: Yes. My intention was to have all three witnesses read their testimony.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We had talked about in our conference call having it admitted. This is the first I've heard of that.

MR. HARSCH: I think given the State's objection to portions of Mr. Carroll's testimony and Mr. Huff's testimony, it was just

1 more reasonable to have them read it.

6 that in our case.

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

Regarding this, I am going to mark it Petitioner's Exhibit A. I'm overruling the State's motion. I'm taking judicial administrative notice. And that was James E. Huff's written testimony and attachments. And then Dana Carroll, Mr. Grant, or Mr. Petti --

MR. HARSCH: What did you mark that?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Exhibit A, Petitioner's Exhibit A, Mr. Huff's written testimony.

MR. PETII: The written testimony and the exhibits together as Exhibit A or each individual attachment is going to be dealt with separate?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: No. I admitted the whole. If we part and parcel it out, I think it --

MR. PETTI: I understand.
MR. GRANT: It's very similar to Mr. Huff's testimony. If he's going to read $i t, ~ t h e n ~ w e ~ d o n ' t ~ h a v e ~ a n y ~ o b j e c t i o n ~ t o ~ i t ~ a t ~$ this point.

MR. PETTI: The objections are the

1 same. I would say, you know, that with regard
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. put the same objections on the record to his testimony as regarding the 620 regs and any new information. But I don't believe there was anything new in there. I just put that out there now as opposed to doing it while he's testifying.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Mr. Harsch, any --

MR. HARSCH: I mean, they were all submitted at the same time electronically to the counsels.

3 the attachments, take it as Petitioner's
4 Exhibit B. I'm taking particular
5 administrative notice of regulation 620.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. I'm taking the testimony of Dana Carroll and

You know, I guess you could also argue -- there's a Joliet case. There's a sentence in here that says, "Additionally, if there was information in the Agency's possession upon which it reasonably should have relied, the applicant may also submit such information to the Board for its consideration."

MR. GRANT: And I agree that we're not totally limited to the record. Again, my concern in filing the motion -- and $I$ wrote it in an hour, so $I$ don't know if Mr. Harsch saw it, but I had some typos in mine, too.

It really had to do with defining what the relevance, the scope of the hearing was going to be, whether it was the Agency's letter or something else. So I made my point on that. So that's fine.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any

1 response, Mr. Harsch?

3 then --

5 Exhibit $C$, also administrative notice, the 6 testimony of Gregory Droessler and the 7 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

1 Carroll's resume, that should go with his written testimony.

MR. HARSCH: Mr. Carroll's. We can hold out Mr. McFall's resume because I intend to call him as a witness.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. We'll clean this up a little when we take a break. I think that's about it.

MR. GRANT: I have one -- just for clarification, Mr. Harsch and I spoke about it, but I'm wondering do I need to move the record into evidence or is the record already in evidence? If not, I'd like to move that the record be put into evidence.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch.
MR. HARSCH: There's only one document that I have no idea what it is, where it came from, and that's the Washington, Indiana PowerPoint regarding the Washington, Indiana CSO project.

MR. GRANT: For the record, we're talking about Bates stamps number 848 through 866.

```
                                MR. HARSCH: In the electric number
```

1 that $I$ got, it did not bear an Agency exhibit number.

MR. GRANT: It's not? I'm sorry?
MR. HARSCH: It did not bear an Agency exhibit number.

MR. GRANT: I don't -- we didn't put those Agency exhibit numbers on it. It was included because it was a document that Illinois EPA included among those that it relied on in making its final decision.

My understanding is that it was part of a USEPA online educational thing. We included this as an example.

MR. HARSCH: So I would have no problem with the introduction of everything in the record with the exception of that document. We might have some questions of the Agency witnesses regarding it.

MR. GRANT: It may or may not come in. So that's fine. If we're going to use it, we'll move it at that time.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So as it stands, the record is admitted into evidence except for Exhibit 9, and we'll address that

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.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Respondent's Exhibit 1 through 8 are admitted.

MR. GRANT: Actually, the entire record is here. We only took some excerpts from the records for the exhibits that you have in front of you. So the record would be -- has been filed with the Board. They have --

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Right. You said is the record into evidence.

MR. GRANT: Yeah. I wasn't sure whether I need to move it in. It is in?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes.
MR. GRANT: In its entirety?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let me bring

1 back Respondent's Exhibit 9. Is this in the 2 record?

MR. GRANT: Yes.
MR. PETTI: It's all stuff that's in the record. We just pulled things out for clarity, for expedience, instead of flipping to page 700 and back to page 100.

MR. GRANT: We'll try to clarify when we use it. This is in the record. This is not. If we use this, we'll refer to it again and then move it in separately if we need to.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Was that all?

MR. GRANT: Also, I spoke to Mr. Harsch. There's two other things that are not currently in the record that we would like to move in.

One is Respondent's Hearing Exhibit No. 3. It's the NPDES permit for the facility. We'd like to move that in. I don't think Mr. Harsch objects.

MR. HARSCH: No, I do not.
MR. GRANT: And just to save time, the second one we have is $I$ have the curriculum

1 vitae of William Buscher who will be a witness
2 for us today. And that's Respondent's Hearing
1 vitae of William Buscher who will be a witness
2 for us today. And that's Respondent's Hearing 3 Exhibit No. 7.

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.

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

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

The basin as proposed, it was intended

1 to be a sustainable or green infrastructure as 2 opposed to a concrete basin or synthetic lined 3 basin. It would be used under worst case model assumed conditions using a 10 -year storm event, which in and of itself was conservative, once per year where flows would be directed to that basin when flows exceeded the amount that the treatment plant was capable of accepting, and those flows would be retained in the basin until those flows reduced where the flows then would be pumped back to the treatment plant for 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

1 pleasing to the area and that it would have a
2 use during the time period when it was not
3 being used for the storage of storm water.

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

1 as proposed when it's storing untreated
2 wastewater would not result in an increase in
3 contaminants in the groundwater. proceeded ultimately to issue the denial which is the present permit appeal.

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.

2 Mr. Harsch. Mr. Grant. be, per se, water pollution. petitioner refused to do that.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you,

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

The Agency worked hard and tried to cooperate with the District and suggested that they install a liner to prevent this. At one time an installation of a liner would have prevented migration of raw sewage and contaminants associated therein into the groundwater into the Rock River. However, despite a really very small expense compared to the expense of operating the facility, the

And without the installation of a liner and other appropriate permit conditions, the law required that Illinois EPA deny this permit on the basis this it would result in water pollution.

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Thank you, Mr. Grant.

Before we proceed, I'm looking at the exhibits. And since the Agency had marked their exhibits numerically, I think that's what we'll do with petitioner's, Mr. Harsch.

So Vir. Huff's testimony and attachments will be exhibit -- Petitioner's Exhibit 1, the testimony of Carroll Petitioner's Exhibit, 2, and then the testimony of Gregory Droessler Exhibit 3, Petitioner's Exhibit 3. Thank you. Mr. Harsch, you can call your first witness.

MR. HARSCH: My first witness will be Mr. Carroll.
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may proceed, Mr. Harsch.

DANA CARROLL,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. I'm going to provide Mr. Carroll with a copy of your prefiled testimony, what has been marked and accepted into evidence as Petitioner's Exhibit 2.

Is that a copy of the prefiled testimony that you've prepared?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I'd request that Mr . Carroll read his prefiled testimony.

MR. PETTI: No objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Harsch?

MR. HARSCH: That he read his --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure. Go
ahead. I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: My name is Dana L.
Carroll. I am an engineering manager of the Rock River Water Reclamation District,

1 Rockford, Illinois. I received a bachelor of 2 science in civil engineering in 1976 from the

3 University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.
4 I'm a registered professional engineer in 5 Illinois. 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 professional publications including as principal author for the Control of Infiltration and Inflow in Private Building Sewer Connections published by the Water Environment Federation in 1999 and as a technical reviewer of the Wastewater Collection Systems Management, Manual of Practice Number Seven, published by the Water Environment Federation in 1999. A complete resume is attached as Attachment $A$.

My current responsibilities at the Water Reclamation District are as manager of an 18-person engineering department involved in collection system and treatment plant upgrades and expansion engineering as well as overseeing the District's service connection program. The District's annual capital improvement program 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.

The project team includes as prime consultant Clark Dietz \& Associates represented by Mr. Greg Droessler, project manager, for civil engineering design and permitting.

Significant sub-consultants include Huff \& Huff, Incorporated, represented by Mr. James Huff for environmental impact, wetland design, and permitting assistance and Orchard, Hiltz \& McCliment, Inc., OHM, for hydraulic modeling, not testifying at this hearing.

I will be testifying to the District's general policies and practice for the development of this project, the others to their individual areas of expertise. Specific testimony related to treatment plant operations can be provided by Mr. Larry McFall, plant operations manager, upon request or in response to questions where he is better suited to respond. My resume has been provided in attachment A.

The project is briefly described as an excess wet weather flow pump station that will intercept excess flows at the headworks of the

1 treatment plant and pump those flows into an 2 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.

Our experience has shown that we can successfully manage flows greater than that with the current facilities. However, by the 2002 Compliant Commitment Agreement, attachment $B$, with IEP, we are obligated to control and 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

1 the 80 mgd threshold within four to six hours 2 in a major event and we will be able to empty

3 the basin within 48 hours of first flow being 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 $C$.

10 Sanitary District Act. The District currently serves about 230,000 people in seven municipalities plus unincorporated areas totalling 85,000 service accounts.

The District owns and operates the entire collection system including local lateral sewers. The system consists of approximately $1,100 \mathrm{miles}$ of sewer, 24,000 manholes, 31 pump stations, and two wastewater treatment plants.

A significant portion of the collection system is over 80 years old. The project is located at the Kishwaukee Street treatment plant. Therefore, the entire system is tributary to it, thus it would benefit all the

1 rate payers of the District.

The United States Protection Agency and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in a conjunctive effort have made excess wet weather flow within separate sanitary sewer systems a priority issue for several years.

There has been an active effort at the federal level to propagate a separate sewer overflow control policy for several years. This effort is ongoing. USEPA held a workshop with stakeholders in July 2011 to continue the discussion and express its concern on this issue.

IEPA's biennial report published in September 2011 highlights their efforts. A copy of this report is attached as attachment D. The District has found that IEPA aggressively enforces environmental regulations relative to SSOs including issuing notices of violation.

The District, like all older communities, has excess wet weather flow issues given the age of the infrastructure and the manner in which it was designed and
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.

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

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 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.

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

The District entered into a Compliance Commitment Agreement with IEPA in 2002 and referenced as attachment $B$. That agreement required that the District evaluate its interceptor system and treatment plant ability to handle a 10 -year storm event and to make any 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

1 pump station and a 25-million-gallon vegetated 2 retention basin to ensure 10-year, 24-hour

3 storm event hydraulic treatment capacity in the 4 collection system and treatment plant.

5 The pump station would draw off flow in
6 excess of the wastewater treatment plant
7 hydraulic capacity and hold those flows in the 8 basin until the treatment plant can receive 9 them.

10 Based on modeling with 38 years of
11 rainfall data, it was determined that the
12 10-year, 24-hour event would proauce a peak
13 flow rate at the treatment plant of 145 mgd .
14 The treatment plant's current hydraulic
15 capacity is 80 mgd . flows to the treatment plant as soon as influent rate decreases below 80 mgd . The District estimated the time from beginning of transfer to complete draining of the basin to be no more than 48 hours in a 10-year, 24-hour event.

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.

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

Therefore, the District looked at design solutions that would be flexible and conducive to such occasional use. One typical design element that seemed nonefficent nor practical was concrete. In this case the concrete in the basin will sit exposed to the elements of heat and cold extremes. This will promote cracking in a material that is inherently inclined to crack and, therefore, cause excessive routine maintenance for it to perform its intended function -- intended purpose.
A flexible liner geo-textile was

1 considered. However, these materials also
2 suffer from deterioration from exposure to 3 sunlight. Worst of all, a flexible liner,

4 either clay or geo-textile, is very difficult 5 if not impossible to design against flotation 6 pressures from below as is the case here even 7 if protected by a layer of soil.

It was estimated during the design process that a flexible liner basin may have to be elevated six to seven feet to avoid the flotation pressures during river flooding.

This approach wouid have required significant offsite fill material at great cost. At this point the constructed wetland concept was proposed.

The District is working to implement green or sustainable features in all of its current and future projects. This is good public policy, good environmental policy, and cost effective. Additionally, it is published USEPA policy to promote green solutions, please see Strategic Agenda to Protect Waters and Build More Livable Communities Through Green 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.

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

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

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

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.

This quote tells us that IEPA
understands that sewer overflows and storm water are intermingled, that green solutions should be applied, and that groundwater interaction is to be expected.

This recommendation recognizes what every septic system designer and installer understands, which is that soil provides natural water treatment processes for raw wastewater that are beneficial and cost effective. Please see record page 40.

The District for its part requires all new or upgraded pumping stations to have an energy audit of the design. The District has implemented cogeneration to produce its own electricity from treatment by-products and is working to expand its production of bio-gas.

Finally, the District has implemented a native landscape plan within the storm water pollution prevention plan at the treatment

1 plant.

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 concrete;

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

C, the location of the proposed project is already a natural setting. The District has reclaimed the area from a blighted urban condition and performed land reclamation work;

D, the constructed wetland will provide greater environmental benefit over a traditional basin. For example, it will provide habitat for waterfowl using the Rock River and it will increase vegetated area in an urban environment. These are all in addition to the use for final polishing and infiltration

1 of a portion of the District wastewater 2 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 28 th, 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

1 permit and routine groundwater monitoring to
2 demonstrate our goodwill and allow for
3 verifiable evaluation of the design claims that June 28 on page 189 of the record.

Permit plan set, which was left out of the record, sheet number $C 4.1$ 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 28 th letter.

The IEPA has denied this permit based on inconsistent policy and bias by the groundwater section. I support this statement as follows.

MR. GRANT: I'm going to object at this point. I mean, these aren't facts. He's here to testify to facts. As far as opinions about how bad the Agency is, $I$ don't know that that's appropriate.

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.

MR. GRANT: It's more like final
argument. It's something he can put in his post-hearing brief. I don't see the point of having the witness testify to it under oath.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, he's almost done, Mr. Grant.

MR. GRANT: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: May the record reflect your objection.

MR. GRANT: Thank you. 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

1 are contaminants in storm water. The
2 wastewater storm water professional community
3 has accepted that storm water contains
4 significant potential contaminants such as BOD,
5 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 $25,000 \mathrm{CFU}$, 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
project.
MR. HARSCH: I have a few additional
follow-up questions.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may.
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. 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?
A. No.
Q. Is Mr. McFall -- was he present at the District at the time?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Would he be a better witness then for me to --
A. Yes.
Q. You've described in some detail all of the projects that the District has carried out to rehab or rebuild its sewage collection

1 system.

Will that have an impact on the amount of flows reaching the treatment plant during wet weather events in the future?
A. We expect it to have a significant impact over time.
Q. Would you explain what that impact would be?
A. The impact would be reduced rate at which these wet weather flows would come to us and then also reduced volume in the longer term.
Q. The modeling that was performed that you've testified to was based on historical flow rates, was it not?
A. And historical flow data to the treatment plant and historical rainfall, all from record.
Q. Do I understand correctly then as you -- as the District continues to make these improvements, then the amount of flow from a specific storm that the treatment plant would receive should be less?
A. Yes.

MR. PETTI: Objection. Speculative. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch.

MR. HARSCH: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the basis.

MR. PETTI: Speculation. And also this is not information that was presented to the Agency that is part of the record.

MR. HARSCH: I will withdraw the question and start over again. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Based on your professional engineering opinion and experience that you've testified to, will the sewage treatment plant receive less flows as the collection system is lined, manholes rebuilt, and the other types of projects --
A. That is our expectation, yes.
Q. That's your professional opinion?
A. Yes.
Q. That would occur?
A. Yes. In my opinion that will occur.
Q. And is that an accepted professional opinion in your -- in the environmental engineering professional community?
A. Yes, I believe it to be accepted generally.
Q. If such improvements would result in less flow from a given storm event, does that translate to the likelihood of the use of the basin being reduced in your professional opinion?
A. Correct. Over the long term, we would expect the need for the basin to be dramatically reduced.
Q. Can you describe in greater detail the efforts that the District and -- both the park District have done in the area that this basin is being located?
A. Well, the area was originally developed. It was a very low income area. It had fallen on really hard times over time. Many houses were abandoned. Some had burned. The neighborhood has had serious crime issues.

So the District in recognizing its need for land as the demands on us grow for processes that we must perform, we've acquired the land, we've cleaned it up, removed the old debris, the old houses, and isolated it from
certain bad elements that exist in the area.
Q. Had the District proposed this project based on a five-year storm event, would there be any changes in the project?

MR. PETTI: Objection. Relevance. It wasn't proposed on a five-year storm event. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. Could you keep your voice up, too, please?

MR. HARSCH: Sure. I'll withdraw the question and start over.

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. 'Ihe preliminary plan that was prepared for this project was part of a facility plan that was prepared by the District?
A. By a consultant for the District, yes.
Q. And was that facility plan provided to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency?
A. The section of it relating to this excess flow basin was put in the record, yes.
Q. And it's contained in the permit record?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that facility plan, portion of the facility plan show differences in design that

1 would be required based on a five-year and a
2 10-year storm event?
A. It does briefly discuss that, yes.
Q. What would be the size of the project if it would have been designed on a five-year storm water --

MR. GRANT: Let me just object for a second, but $I$ really just want to ask Roy can you refer us to a document? I'm not saying that it wasn't provided.

THE WITNESS: It's in my testimony. I'll find it. Record pages 105 through 114.

MR. GRANT: Thank you. Sorry. I lost track. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. What would be the impact on the size of the basin had it been designed on a five-year storm event?
A. I don't specifically remember the values stated in that, but I recall it being approximately one-quarter or one-fifth of what we were proposing. I think Mr. Droessler can testify to that.
Q. And currently the basin was proposed for approximately 2.3 million gallons?
A. 25 .
Q. Excuse me. 25. Sorry.

Would Mr. McFall be a better witness to ask questions regarding how the District would make a decision when to utilize the basin?
A. Yes.

MR. HARSCH: That's all the questions that I have.

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

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PETTI:
Q. Mr. Carroll, my name is Robert Petti. I'm with the Attorney General's office. I'm going to ask you some questions.
A. Sure.
Q. If I accidently call you Mr. Beck, forgive me. That's the nameplate that's in front of you. My eyes just might go to that. I've done it a couple times already in my head.

In your -- the written testimony that was read into the record, if we could refer quickly to page 3 at the bottom. You discuss a

1 separate sanitary sewer system.

Can you describe what that is for me?
A. A separate sanitary sewer system is one that would have no known direct storm water connections.
Q. Direct connections to what, if I may?
A. Storm sewer, inlets in the street, recognized storm water intakes.
Q. And that is what the system is at the Rock River?
A. Ours is classified as a separate sewer system, yes.
Q. And similarly, could you describe for me what a separate sewer outflow system or outflow control would be?
A. A separate sewer overflow control policy, the $S$ SO policy.
Q. What is separate sewer overflow here?
A. Okay. Separate sewer overflow would be a backup in the system that might come out of a manhole top, might back up in someone's basement.
Q. And those backups would occur due to storm water?
A. Correct.
Q. And could you describe for me the difference in your opinion between storm water and wastewater, if there is one?
A. The probably recognized definition difference is wastewater includes waste discharges from occupied buildings. Storm water doesn't necessarily include direct wastewater from occupied buildings.
Q. 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?
A. Correct.
Q. And that is for treatment of wastewater, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, to your knowledge, can a facility or a person or anybody in the industry get a separate permit that would be classified as a storm water treatment permit?
A. Yes.
Q. At your facility, do the storm water and wastewater comingle in the influent to the
facility?
A. It comes to us commingled from the 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.
Q. So what we're dealing with in the proposed overflow basin is wastewater, correct?
A. It's wastewater.
Q. I want to turn to page 4 of your testimony. At the bottom, you have a listing, a number of steps that have been taken by the District to address the wet weather flow including 93 miles of mainline sewer lining, 16 miles of mainline sewer repair replacement, 1700 feet of private services line, 77,000 feet of private services repaired or replaced, and 1,170 manholes given major rehab or replaced, and there's one more, 50 miles of sewer cleaned and televised annually.
Am I reading that accurately?
A. Yes.

1 Q. How much did all of that cost?
2 A. Total expenditure over the life of the 3 program, I'm sorry, I don't have that number.

4 Q. Could you make an estimate?

6 of confidence. your knowledge? done as well --
A. Probably. correct?
A. Correct. liner?
A. Not one that $I$ would have a good level
Q. Would Mr. McFall know that number, to
A. I don't know. You'd have to ask him.
Q. I ask because you've deferred some items to him. I thought I'd ask.

So you've done all this stuff, these six different items, at least these six different items that are culled out in the testimony. I'm sure there was more that was
Q. -- to address wet weather flow, but you don't want to build a liner on this basin,
Q. And why don't you want to build a
A. It's not cost effective. It's not

1 money well spent. We believe every one of
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. parameter -- different hydraulic physical conditions to be met. This station happens to share some of those particular conditions as far as high volume and low head, low total

1 dynamic head.

And the other similarity is, as I
stated here in my testimony, this station's going to be used one day a year, which is very similar to the storm water pump station.
Q. But it's going to be used for pumping wastewater, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, dealing with the storm water wastewater issue, at the bottom of page 6, you discuss a number of initiatives that have been pushed in the last few years, and included in that is IEPA's June 5, 2010 letter to the general assembly concerning Public Act 96-26.

Do you see where I'm at?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And you have a quote, I assume pulled from that regarding performance standards?
A. Yes.
Q. Addressing storm water?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Are performance standards of the nature referenced here different than performance

1 standards that may be referenced for
2 wastewater?
A. I guess not really when you're talking about the concept of performance standards, okay.
Q. What type of performance standards are we referring to here, just so that we're clear?

Performance of pumps, performance of retention basin?
A. We're talking about performance standards for green projects. That's what this is talking about.
Q. Okay. What --
A. Green sustainable whatever term you like there projects. That's what this performance standard is talking about. It's not talking specifically about storm water projects. It's talking about policy statements being made by the Agency to promote and consider all the benefits of green sustainable practices.
Q. So we're not discussing a specific set of parameters like a numerical standard? We're not discussing a numerical
standard?
A. No. It's a performance standard which is far broader than a numerical standard.
Q. That's kind of what $I$ was guessing.

And you said that those performance standards are for green or sustainable projects?
A. Yes.
Q. What's a description of a green project in your mind?

What does that encompass?
A. As you recognize, Counselor, it's a very broad concept in our society today and has a lot of definitions by a lot of people.

I think in my mind what it means is it is a project that utilizes all the technological knowledge available to try to find the most long lasting and durable, reduced maintenance, reduced capital expenditure approach to the solution needed for that project. And I guess I want to emphasize and using all the technical knowledge available, not some of it.
Q. Does that complete your answer?
A. I think so.
Q. You state that reduction of capital expense is a component of green infrastructure and green construction?
A. It's one component of it.
Q. Moving outside of your -- the written testimony, you were asked some questions regarding future performance of the District's pipelines and the overall performance of the District system and how your expectation is through some of the repairs and improvements made to the piping and other components you expect there to be less of a need for or perhaps less of a need is misstating it, but there will be less volume of overflow that would reach the facility.
Am I stating that at all correctly?
A. What we expect to happen as we improve the collection system and work to eliminate extra flow out of that system is that the peak rates coming to us will be reduced. So we will see fewer and fewer events over time where we would exceed that 80 mgd number that I talk about in here.
Q. Okay. As you make those improvements to some of the -- I assume the older parts of the system, the system as a whole, are there other parts that may fail?
A. May fail? I mean, there's lots of influences out there in the world we have no control over, construction by other parties, you know, grease through intrusions. So when you say fail, I need, I guess, a clarification.
Q. Sure. I'll try to ask some more specific questions. That's fine.

Pipes may collapse?
A. I would say that our current and the designs and construction standards that have been in place for at least the last 30 years for most of the duration of my career are focused around and really strive to provide systems that are good for 100 years.
Q. But it does happen?
A. It can happen.
Q. And there are breaks in lines other than just collapses?
A. There are.
Q. There are other -- they get dirty.

1 They get gunked up. You need to constantly
2 keep them clean.
3 That's something that is chased over
4 time?

5 A. Correct.

7 page 9, your written testimony -- I'm sorry --

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. response to Mr. -- in your opinion, would it be fair to say that the response to Mr. Huff's letter was the denial of the application?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because it did not address the issues that were put to us and the responses that Mr. Huff gave as to why those responses were

1 not adequate in the eyes of the Agency.
Q. Did the Agency ask for a liner to be included in this project?
A. It did.
Q. Were you going to put a liner in?
A. It depends on the circumstances.
Q. Describe the circumstances in which you would have put a liner into the project.
A. Where it made sense to prevent groundwater pollution.
Q. Define groundwater pollution for me, please.
A. I'll pass that definition to Mr. Huff.
Q. Okay. As proposed to the Agency and the application that is on appeal today, was a liner part of that proposal?
A. No.
Q. At the beginning of the examination, we discussed briefly that your facility operates under an NPDES permit.

Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of -- pursuant to your permit,
is it permissible for you to shut that facility

1 and allow a million gallons untreated
2 wastewater to discharge through your effluent

MR. HARSCH: Object to that question.
MR. PETTI: Basis?
MR. HARSCH: It asks for a legal conclusion of the witness.

MR. PETTI: I'll ask it again. BY MR. PETTI:
Q. In your professional opinion, having knowledge of the permit in this case as an operator of the facility, is it permissible to shut down the facility and allow a million gallons of untreated wastewater to discharge through the effluent pipes?

MR. HARSCH: Object to the question unless you want to define what facility you're referring to.

MR. PETTI: I think I defined the facility earlier as the treatment facility. And the witness agreed that that's the facility we've been discussing.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think Mr. Carroll can answer. He's been around the
block in his professional career. So objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: Could you clarify for me, Counselor, discharge to what?

BY MR. PETTI:
Q. Through your effluent pipes.
A. Through our effluent pipes.
Q. Let a million gallons of untreated wastewater run through the facility and out the pipes.
A. Out the --
Q. Effluent pipe.
A. -- the treatment plant outfall?
Q. Yes.
A. Shut the treatment plant down and allow a million gallons untreated to go out the outflow of the treatment plant?
Q. Yes. Is that permissible?
A. I'd have to defer that answer to Mr. McFall.
Q. Okay. Would you recommend it?
A. It would depend on what the circumstances are, what other damages could occur if we didn't.
Q. Assume none. Assume you're just shutting it down for the day and allowing it to run through.
A. Well, that's politely an unreasonable basis for making the comment and a decision. Assuming there's no reason to do it, just do it arbitrarily, I can't answer that question. I don't deal, sir, in that sort of fantasy world.
Q. Okay. Then we'll make it a more real world. Assume there's a high rainfall event.
A. 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.
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
speculation.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I totally
agree. Move on, please.
MR. PETTI: Okay. Nothing further.
HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Mr. Harsch. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. When you reference in your testimony the 80 million gallon per day limit, that's the designed maximum flow rate set forth in the permit, the rated capacity?
A. That's the permit rated hydraulic capacity.
Q. That's not necessarily the maximum practical flow that can be treated?
A. No.

MR. HARSCH: That's all I have.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti.
MR. PETTI: We're good.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step down or aside, as the case may be.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I

1 Call Mr. McFall.

8 BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. McFall, would you please state your full name, please?
A. Larry D. McFall.
Q. And did you provide Mr. Carroll a copy of your resume that he included along with your prefiled testimony?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I show you this document. Tell me what that document is.
A. This is the resume I provided to Mr. Carroll.

MR. HARSCH: Mr. Hearing Officer, I'd like to move that this be introduced into evidence. We took it out of the Petitioner's Exhibit 2. I would move for it as Petitioner's Exhibit 4.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any objection?

MR. PETTI: No.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, I have Exhibit 4 -- Petitioner's Exhibit 4 is admitted. Thank you.

Will I get a clean copy of the written testimony in the attachments?

MR. HARSCH: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Is this resume true and accurate, to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Would you please describe what position -- strike that.

What is your educational background briefly?
A. I have a B.S. degree in chemistry from Pittsburgh State University, Pittsburgh, Kansas. That degree was ACS certified, American Chemical Society certified.

And then I have several hours

1 postgraduate work in organic analysis and 2 analytical analysis techniques.
Q. How long have you been employed at the District?
A. I've been employed at the District for just short of 15 years.
Q. What is your present position at the District?
A. Plant operations manager.
Q. What does the plant operations manager do?
A. The plant operations manager has multiple duties, essentially overseeing the operations staff, the maintenance staff for the plant, and the maintenance staff for the lift stations.

The operation manager also has responsibility for oversight of the industrial pretreatment program as well as oversight of the industrial commercial governmental building.
Q. When it comes time to operating the wastewater treatment plant, are you in charge of that operation?
A. I am the manager of the operation, correct.
Q. Were you involved in the events that led to the issuance of the Compliance Commitment Agreement Mr. Carroll testified to?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And was that Compliance Commitment Agreement issued in response to a notice of violation?
A. That would be correct.
Q. And what did that notice of violation cover?
A. There were storm events that occurred in June of -- I'm sorry, I don't have the documents in front of me -- I believe 2002. The storm events occurred June 4th and 5th, 2002.
Q. Did you prepare a response to that notice of violation in a proposed plan to deal with it after a meeting with the Agency?
A. That would be correct.
Q. Do you have a copy of that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. This would be the standard letter.

This is the violation list.
Do you have a copy of the letter that you sent to the Agency?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry. I misspoke. This is actually that letter.

You were involved with the meetings with the Agency that gave rise --
A. Yes.
Q. That are referenced in this letter? And it's your understanding that the plant's Commitment Agreement in $W 2002-00140$ was based upon the agreed-upon plan that you submitted to the Agency in your letter of November 27, 2002?
A. That would be my understanding. MR. HARSCH: I'd mark this as Petitioner -MR. GRANT: Do you know if that's in the record?

THE WITNESS: It is not in the record. MR. GRANT: Do you have a copy of it? MR. HARSCH: I'm in the process of providing one. This is Petitioner's Exhibit 4.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think Petitioner's Exhibit 4 was the resume.

MR. HARSCH: All right. Exhibit 5. I'd move for the admission of Petitioner's Exhibit 5. It sets forth the basis upon which the Compliance Commitment Agreement was issued, and the Compliance Commitment Agreement is in the record.

MR. PETTI: No objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. Petitioner's Exhibit 5 is admitted. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. McFall, is it your understanding based on the meeting and discussions that you had with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency that it would have been allowable at the time to base the improvements that you were agreeing to on a five-year similar event?
A. That would be correct.
Q. Why did the District choose not to use a five-year event and instead use a 10-year event?
A. To the best of my memory, the District 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.
Q. Do you agree with Mr. Carroll's opinion that had you used a five-year design the basin would have been much smaller?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can you explain if the basin would be permitted and installed how you would decide to utilize that basin?
A. The operation staff are expected to give full treatment to everything that they can pump into the plant and would strive to pump everything into the plant not going to the basin until such time as we saw other occurrences that would result in either backing up homes or would result in other exceedences [sic] of our permit; example, washing out the salts from the aeration basin such that our

1 treatment would be hindered.

It would be difficult to give a full range of circumstances, but the short answer is just that, that we would evaluate each circumstance and utilize the treatment plant to the utmost until such time as we deem a problem in other areas. And then we'd go to the basin as the backup for the water effluent treatment at that time.
Q. The NPDES permit at your plant, you're familiar with that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Your plant's rated as design average flow of 40 million gallons per year?
A. $\quad 40$ million gallons.
Q. And has a design maximum flow rate of 80 million?
A. 80 million.
Q. What happens when the flow rate reaches 81 million gallons currently?
A. The design maximum of 80 million is an engineering number. And based on circumstances that can occur in the plant, many things may happen either before that number is reached or

1 on occasions that number could be exceeded 2 without causing problems.

Is that the number $80,81,82 ?$ That's dependent on everyday circumstances.
Q. So the designed maximum flow rate is an engineering calculated number; it's not a hard and fast number?
A. It is not a hard and fast number.
Q. The permit contains language regarding utilizing a treatment plant for the -- to treat the maximum practical flow; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And that's the concept that allows you to look at how the plant is operating and to determine how much you could handle without having the problems you referred to, an effluent violation, for example, or a sewer,

1 something like that?
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 that we have sustained, flow rate is between 130 and 135 million gallon.
Q. If the basin, again, were to be constructed, the plant was sitting there with all of its units in operation, nothing had been shut down for maintenance or repair, you could reasonably expect to address flows greater than 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

1 conditions, but we would strive to not utilize 2 the basin wherever possible.
Q. And if you looked at the -- you're familiar with the flows that you've received over the past two years?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your opinion, would you have used the basin in the last two years based on the flows that you actually received?
A. No.
Q. Do you agree with Mr. Carroll's assessment that long-term flows should reduce as continued improvements are made to the collection system that you've testified about?
A. In my opinion, yes.
Q. And do you agree with its assessment that that would impact the likelihood and frequency of utilizing the basin?
A. It's my expectation as time goes forward and continues improving the system, we would use -- we would use the basin less and less.

MR. HARSCH: I have no additional questions at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant or Mr. Petti.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PETTI:
Q. Mr. McFall, my name is Rob Petti. You may have heard me introduce myself before.

You stated that you are the operations manager for the facility; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're familiar with the NPDES program for the facility, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You stated -- and correct me if this statement is misstating your testimony in any way -- that your staff facility expects the full treatment to everything going to the plant.

I wrote that down. I had to write it down quickly. If you could correct my statement.
A. My staff expects to strive to treat everything that comes to the plant.
Q. Would you consider the wastewater that is diverted to the retention pond at issue in
this matter to have arrived at the plant?
A. I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?
Q. I'll back up a little and break it down.

You're familiar with the design of the overflow basin that is at issue in this matter, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And as part of that design, the wastewater would be diverted before it enters the treatment works, for lack of a better term on my part, to the overflow basin, correct?
A. Most of the treatment works. There would be a preliminary screening.
Q. And could you describe what that screening would be?
A. The screening is to take out very large debris that has been washed into the sewers.
Q. So would you consider that screening part of the treatment facility and part of the treatment that you were striving for all water or is there more treatment involved?
A. There is certainly always more treatment involved.
Q. So your staff and you as the operations manager would be striving to achieve treatment of all of the water that entered the wastewater basin, correct?
A. That would be correct.
Q. I'm not as familiar with your permit obviously as you are, so I have a couple questions on the permit.

The permit requires you, in fact, to treat all the wastewater that reaches the plant before it's discharged; is that correct?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. And you also testified that over time you expect the overflow basin to be used less and less?
A. Correct.
Q. But you certainly expect that it will be used in the future, correct?
A. Yes, I would expect at some point in the future it will be used.

MR. PETTI: That's all I have. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Petti.

Mr. Harsch?
MR. HARSCH: No further.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step down, sir. Thank you. Let's take five.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
(Whereupon, a recess was had.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Today is November 28th, 2012. I'm not sure if I mentioned that at the top of the hearing or not.
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.) GREGORY DROESSLER, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. You have before you a copy of your prefiled testimony?
A. Yes.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you state your name, please, for the record and spell it?

2 Droessler.
BY MR. HARSCH:
A. Yes.

THE WITNESS: My name is Gregory J.
Q. You have before you a copy of what's been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 3, your prefiled written testimony as an exhibit?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you prepared this testimony?
Q. Would you please present -- read your testimony today?
A. Sure. My name is Gregory J. Droessler. I'm a senior project engineer and project manager for Clark Dietz, Incorporated, an engineering consulting firm founded in 1953.

I received a bachelor's of science degree in industrial technology management in 1995 from the University of Wisconsin, Platteville. I am a registered professional engineer in Illinois and Wisconsin.

My work experience includes over seven years with Town and Country Engineering in Madison, Wisconsin serving as a design technician in both the municipal and wastewater
engineering departments.
In 2003 I joined Clark Dietz as a senior technician and was promoted to staff engineer upon completing my professional engineering exam in 2004. And since joining Clark Dietz, I've been promoted to senior project engineer, project manager, and now department manager for the civil/environmental engineering department in the Kenosha, Wisconsin office.

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

1 project, as $I$ have sealed the documents
2 submitted to the IEPA as part of the
3 construction permit application. excess flow facility. The Clark Dietz team proposed a dual function wetland system to be used first for a polishing filter during most of the year as part of the secondary effluent and, second, a short-term excess flow temporary storage basin during the most intense storm events. The District liked the approach that our team -- liked the approach of our team and was awarded the contract for the project.

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:

Clark's Dietz role for the project was leading the overall project design and provide project management. Clark Dietz completed the project permitting, site layout and design, site utilities, excess flow basin design, and 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.

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

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.

2 to predict the 10-year, 24 -hour storm event and
3 that it would produce a peak flow of
4
OHM's model included 38 years of data 145.4 million gallons per day at the plant.

The plant's rated peak capacity is 80 mgd. The excess flow pump station sizing was established at 65.4 mgd. OHM further utilized the model to predict a total of 25 million gallons of storage would be required to store this design storm event.

The excess flow project consists of a pump station rated for a maximum flow of 65.4 mgd and a 25 -million gallon excess flow storage constructed of native soils to temporarily store the 10-year, 24-hour storm. The pump station draws off flow in excess of 80 mgd and temporarily transfers this flow to the excess flow basin. The stored flow is then returned to the front end of the wastewater treatment plant within 48 hours of the event for further treatment.

The intent of the excess flow basin's design is to use a green or sustainable design in an effort to control project costs and to
minimize the environmental impact to the area.
The basin was designed without a clay or synthetic liner for these very reasons and the design allows us to use the native groundwater along with the treated plant effluent to create a thriving wetland environment. This is evident by the fact that the floor of the excess flow basin is established at only two feet above the normal groundwater level in the area.

The District submitted a formal construction permit application on April 4th, 2012 for this project. In addition to the normal construction permit application forms and design documents, the District's application also included extensive documentation concerning the preliminary discussions and meetings and responses to various points that occurred while the project was initially discussed with the IEPA prior to formal application. All this material was received by the IEPA and assigned log number 0317-12 on April 6th, 2012.

The IEPA issued a letter of denial to

1 the District for the project, again log number 2 0317-12. In the denial the IEPA stated that 3 the two technical requirements -- excuse me. 4 In the denial the IEPA stated that the two 5 technical requirements for the Illinois

6 Recommended Standards for Sewage Works were not 7 met.

9 required at the bottom of the embankment of the 10 excess flow storage basin per section 370.930 d)2D0 of the Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works. This seal shall have a permeability of less than one to the tenth power to negative seven centimeter per second. Provisions shall be made in the specifications for demonstrating the permeability of the seal after completion of the construction and prior to filling the basin.

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

1 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. 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.

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

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

1 applies to waste stabilization ponds and
2 aerated lagoons. Neither of the terms are
3 defined in the water pollution regulations.
4 Section 370.110 e) references the glossary -
5 water and wastewater control engineering to 6 define terms used within section 370.

Waste stabilization is defined by this document as follows: Waste stabilization is the treatment of organic matter removed from a waste so as to make it innocuous. A copy of this definition from the glossary is included 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.

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

This section defines this as follows: Groundwater contamination, the requirement of the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act shall be taken into account in the siting of ponds. Ponds shall not be located proximate to water supplies and other facilities subject to contamination or location in areas of porous 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.

5 located near the southwest corner of the excess 6 flow basin. These monitoring wells are

7 believed to have been installed in the 1990s to 8 monitor the groundwater management zone in that 9 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.

The IEPA also stated that the District has not shown that the project will result in water pollution and thus they are precluded from issuing the requested construction permit.

While Mr. Huff will address this issue, I was present at the first meeting that was held to discuss this project with the IEPA prior to the submittal of the final application, and $I$ prepared the summary of

1 meeting notes for the meeting.

5 needed. All of the relevant information from
6 this meeting, my draft summaries, responses to
7 my e-mails from the EPA, and my final summary
Prior to summarizing -- prior to
finalizing this summary, I sent it to the
attendees for their comment and correction, if
needed. All of the relevant information from
this meeting, my draft summaries, responses to
my e-mails from the EPA, and my final summary
were submitted as part of the permit
application. This is found in the permit
record at IEPA Exhibit No. 3 to No. 9.
And I was not aware of any actual
response to the information that Mr: Huff sent
following our last meeting with the IEPA on
June 28 th, 2011 that responded to various
points raised by Mr. Buscher as to why the
project would in his belief threaten to cause
water pollution.
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.
A clay or synthetic liner is not
suitable for this application due to the high

1 groundwater table in this area -- in the area
2 reclaimed by the District adjacent to the
3 headworks of the treatment plant where the
4 basin is proposed to be located to receive
5 flows from the main interceptors leading into
6 the plant. also inhibit the creation of a constructed

11 wetland.
established a green initiative to be more sustainable, yet a bias towards this project

15 due to the potential exfiltration from the
16 basin statistically used one day per year
17 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 24,000 cubic yards of clay to form a liner for

1 the basin.

Our approach lowers the overall construction cost of the project by over \$1 million due to the financial savings experienced from reusing the existing material in lieu of importing clay and thus saves the District's customers the financial burden of dealing with this seldom-seen problem.

The constructed wetland is an innovative sustainable approach to an age-old problem. It will cut the cost of the project by over a million dollars and would create a more natural-looking basin for storing excess flow during these storm events.

The District and Rockford Park District have each heavily invested in the area to reclaim the property north of the wastewater treatment plant. The area has been restored to a more natural environment and plans exist to continue a scenic bike path along the river almost immediately alongside the project area.

The natural habitat that is created by the wetland blends much more readily with the area than a 25-million gallon clay, synthetic,

1 or concrete lined basin.
Q. A couple of follow-up questions.

You've been involved in a number of projects that utilize storm water modeling for predicting flows?
A. My firm has done a lot of storm water modeling. I myself have focused primarily on wastewater treatment.
Q. Can you describe the level of -- strike that.

The modeling that was performed as part of this project, does it involve the use of conservative assumptions?
A. Yeah. The modeling was established using 38 years of historical data. Whenever you use a model and you use it to project -- a statistical model to project conditions, you have choices as to how that projects through limited data points. And in all cases in my opinion we projected very conservatively.
Q. And what is the result of being -using the conservative approach?
A. By using a conservative approach, we've upsized the pump station and we had trajections

1 anywhere from 17 million gallons to 25 million gallons for a storage capacity on the basin, and we erred or chose the most conservative option of 25 million gallons.
Q. What would the annual average projected volume be for this project?
A. Based on our model, the annual use of this would happen one day per year, and that annual event would be 7.4 million gallons. And that is based on the assumption that Mr. McFall and our District staff would only run 80 million gallons through their plant which is their design peak flow.
Q. So once per year on an annual average basis, the flows would be in excess of that 80 million gallons by 7.5 million gallons?
A. By 7.4, correct.
Q. If Mr. McFall from the District was capable of running the plant at 90 million gallons per day, a rate on that day, do I understand that the basin wouldn't be used? MR. PETTI: Object to speculation. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Overruled. He can answer if he's able.

THE WITNESS: Potentially not. Again, when we look at flows to the plant, we're using a daily average flow. There is a possibility of an instantaneous peak where they may divert for an hour, for example, to shave off the peak flow to the plant. But again that's a case-by-case scenario, and every storm event is very different.

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Do you agree with the testimony of Mr. Carroll and Mr. McFall that you could expect a lessening of the flows reaching the treatment plant as a result of various improvements to the wastewater collection system Mr. Carroll testified about?
A. Yes.

MR. HARSCH: No further questions at this time.

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Mr. Petti.
MR. PETTI: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PETTI:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Droessler. If you could refer to page 4 of your written

1 testimony, please.

In the bottom, second-to-last paragraph, you state that this -- the excess flow basin as proposed in the permit application does not provide any level of treatment of organic matter.

Am I reading that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. So any waste that were to escape this basin through, you know, infiltration of the groundwater would be untreated wastewater, correct?
A. As defined, we have not designed any level of treatment.
Q. So that would be a correct statement on my behalf, that it would be untreated wastewater?
A. In my opinion, yes.
Q. And you go to great length to state that this is not a waste stabilization pond or an aerated lagoon.

How would you define this pond?
A. In my opinion, this pond is merely a wide spot in the pipe, if you will. It's

1 basically allowing us to temporarily store this
2 flow and then bring it back for treatment
3 through the treatment facility.
Q. Does the water flow through the pipes unlined?

There's no pipe; it just flows through the ground?
A. No. Each pipe has either clay or concrete or PVC material, yet they all leak, the same as this basin would.
Q. So you're saying this basin would leak at the same rate as proposed as it would if it was proposed with a concrete liner?
A. No, sir.
Q. Or a PVC liner?
A. No. I'm simply stating that each of those would leak.
Q. But not at the same rates?
A. Correct.
Q. If you could prevent those pipes -- let me rephrase this.

If you could design a system where those pipes leaked at a lower rate or no rate, would that be preferable?
A. Yes.
Q. You stated in your testimony -- and I apologize, I don't have the specific section -that if a clay liner were required for this site -- or a clay liner is unsuitable for the location of this site; is that accurate?
A. I stated that basically a clay liner would heave due to the groundwater potential.
Q. Making the clay liner unsuitable for the site?
A. The clay liner, while we could compact it initiaily, because of the groundwater uplift, it would leak over time.
Q. But there are ways to prevent that?
A. By raising the entire basin potentially.
Q. Go ahead.
A. But by raising an entire basin, we also could not provide a green product.
Q. How does raising the basin preclude you from providing a green product?
A. We're creating a constructed wetland. Mr. Huff will expand further on that and what that includes. But by creating that wetland,

1 we need the natural groundwater there for the wetland plantings to survive.

If we raise the entire basin the three to four feet that we would be required to to minimize the potential uplift, no deep-rooted plants are going to be able to survive in that environment nor would they survive necessarily in clay.
Q. Have you designed systems like this before or been a part of a team that designed systems like this before?
A. No, I have not.
Q. In your professional opinion, which is more important to you as a professional, facilitating the roots for the deep-rooted plants or protecting the groundwater?
A. As I look at it, we are doing both. We are protecting the groundwater, yet we are also providing a green product.
Q. What steps are taken in this project to protect the groundwater?
A. Mr. Huff has shown and will testify later along the lines that we're able to meet the groundwater standards established by the

1 State at the 25-foot setback mark.
Q. Okay. But I'm asking a different question. I understand that.

But what design measures, what methods are being implemented to protect the groundwater?
A. The selection of the plantings themselves have a high level of nitrate uptake. They need certain nutrients that are provided by wastewater, if you will, same as you would put fertilizer on your lawn.

If we were to look at putting grass out there and fertilized it to keep it green, we would have the same environmental impact as we would providing a wet water or a storage basin.
Q. Outside of your written testimony, you testified a little bit about the parameters that were selected for the model, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And were those parameters selected by your firm or part of the project team or were those parameters given to you by Illinois EPA?
A. The modeling parameters?
Q. Yes.
A. Those were selected by my firm in conjunction with our sub-consultant partner.
Q. And the results of that modeling selected by your firm were the ones presented to the Illinois EPA, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And those assumed the 80 million gallons a day of treatment, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And under that modeling, there was a potential for a one-day event of 7.4 million gallons exceeding the 80 million?
A. Correct.

MR. PETTI: That's all I have. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, any redirect?

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Your experience that the use of the design, the permitted values like the designed maximum full rate specified in the permit are normally used in designs that are presented to Illinois EPA?

MR. GRANT: Can we ask him to speak up? BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Strike that. I'll restate it.

Is it your experience that the use of
the design maximum flow rate, in this case 80 million gallons, is a parameter that normally would be used in designs presented to the Illinois EPA?
A. Yes, sir. MR. HARSCH: That's it.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti. MR. PETTI: I'm good. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step down. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let's go off the record for a second.
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

JAMES E. HUFF,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. Huff, would you please state your full name for the record?
A. James E. Huff, H-u-f-f.
Q. And do you have a copy of your prefiled testimony in front of you?
A. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. And that's been marked and accepted in evidence as Petitioner's Exhibit 1.

Did you prepare this prefiled testimony?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Will you please read your testimony into the record?
A. My name is James E. Huff, and I am senior vice president and part owner of Huff \& Huff, Inc., an environmental consulting firm founded in 1979.

I received a bachelor's of science in 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 41971.

6 in Illinois. My work experience includes two
7 years with Mobil Oil as an advanced
8 environmental engineer during the construction
9 and start up of the Joliet Refinery.
10

11
After leaving Mobil in the fall of 1973, I was employed for three years at IIT Research Institute in the chemical engineering department working on advanced wastewater treatment projects. I then spent four years with the Armak Company, now called Akzo Nobel Chemicals, where $I$ was the corporate manager of environmental affairs responsible for regulatory compliance and engineering design of environmental systems at nine chemical plants 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.

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 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. 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

Background: In the summer of 2010, I had an informal discussion with Al Keller, permit manager of the Bureau of Water at the permitted.

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

The District had been acquiring lots

1 adjacent to the treatment plant which are also
2 adjacent to the Rock River that was to be used
3 for the basin. Under an agreement with the
4 Agency, the excess flow basin is to prevent
5 backups in the sewer system for up to a 10-year 6 storm event.

7 While the hydrologic modeling was being 8 developed by others on our team, Huff \& Huff 9 installed a datalogger in a monitoring well in 10 the vicinity of the proposed basin to monitor 11 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.

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

1 river.

3 the establishment of a viable wetland community 4 because of the inability of the roots to 5 penetrate a compacted clay soil. In addition, 6 clay is not available in the Rockford area, so 7 the cost of securing clay adds significantly to 8 the cost.

A clay liner would not be conducive to

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

1 diversion of 25 million gallons, and this value 2 was selected for the design capacity. The 3 floor elevation was set at 690.0 feet above 4 mean sea level, three feet above the normal

5 level in the Rock River and two feet above the 6 normal groundwater elevation.

Based on nine soil borings, the soil encountered were fine grained sand consisting of silt and clay with 35 percent sand ranging

10 from 1.5 to nine feet in thickness.

Below this initial zone, sandy soils were encountered. After excavation for the basin, the predominant soil type would be the sandy soils. 12 inches of topsoil would be placed on the floor of the basin for supporting the wetland plants. This topsoil and the leaf litter that will rapidly develop will be the 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

1 7,700 pounds per event which would occur once 2 per year. The 125 milligram per liter BOD five 3 assumption for the excess flow concentration is

4 a conservative assumption. My experience with
5 excess flow BOD five concentrations is
6 typically in the 30 to 50 milligram per liter 7 range.

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

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.

On March 10, 2011, the District and its design team met with the Illinois EPA to present the preliminary engineering report. The Agency's initial response to the design seemed positive based on the initial meeting.

Al Keller asked about nitrates and suggested that these be specifically addressed in the engineering report as the Agency's

1 groundwater section will be reviewing any 2 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.

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

After our meeting, the groundwater section was asked by the permit section to review and comment on the preliminary engineering report. An April 2011 draft memo from Bill Buscher to Al Keller was provided to the District. A copy of this memo is attached as attachment two and also is in the record Bates stamped 168. This memo contains a number of problematic comments as summarized below.

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
425 feet from the edge of the impoundment. It's
5 noted in 35 IL Adm. Code Part 620.505;

6

7

Two, based upon the information that is provided, it is expected that a liner to the wetland may be necessary in order to not exceed existing background concentrations in groundwater;

And, three, six rounds of sampling from the proposed monitoring wells would be required for a list of inorganic parameters prior to putting the wetlands in service.

A subsequent meeting requested by the District was held with the Agency on June 6th, 2011 to discuss the April 2011 draft memo from Mr. Buscher. At that meeting Bill Buscher explained that this project would have to demonstrate it meets the groundwater standards for more than nitrates and fecal coliform. It would have to show the down gradient monitoring wells achieve background, or non-degradation. This would apply to all 620 parameters

1 including chlorides, sulfates, and total
2 dissolved solids.

Mr. Buscher provided a copy of Richard Cobb's testimony and R08-18 from May 2008 and explained that this testimony would provide an understanding of the non-degradation standard the District would be held to on this project.

A copy of what was provided by Mr. Buscher is included in attachment three. Mr. Buscher did not offer that the Board rejected this same argument in R89-14 or that this was still a pending regulation before the Board.

The District asked whether a 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 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.

This Agency-issued construction and operating permit for a truck washing facility utilizing percolation ponds for the treatment of truck washing water and storm water and the permit required installation of monitoring wells after the operation began and limits the parameters to be tested to the pollutants associated with the operation which were only 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;

And, three, petition the Board for an adjusted standard as provided in 35 Il Adm. Code Section 620.260 or section 28.1 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act.

The above permit conditions are what I expected the District permit would contain for the proposed wetlands prior -- wetlands approach based upon my experience in working with the Agency.

There were no permit conditions regarding non-degradation, and the Agency provided reasonable options should the groundwater become impacted.

The denial of the District's application and the record in these proceedings are clearly inconsistent with the Agency's historical approach.

The non-degradation stance that the groundwater section is taking is particularly troublesome. No storm water basin, cattle grazing area, fertilizer application, wastewater spray irrigation, or sludge application can meet the non-degradation standard that was being imposed on the

1 District.

On June 28th, 2011, I submitted a memo to the Agency responding to the six comments in the draft April 2011 memo from Bill Buscher Bates stamped 168 as promised in our meeting with the Agency in June.

A number of key elements from the June 28, 2011 letter are summarized below:

One, fecal coliform upstream on the Rock River exceeds the water quality standard during wet weather. The river's recharge under high flow is contributing fecal coliform to the groundwater;

Two, the proposed wetland basin is located within the southeast Rockford contaminated plume for chlorinated solvents, so groundwater is not suitable for water supply;

Three, the annual BOD five loading from this wetland basin is equivalent to the amount of $B O D$ five excreted by one cow in Illinois onto the ground;

Four, the requested expensive testing is far more excessive than the District monitors for on its effluent, and most of the

1 parameters are not associated with domestic 2 wastewater. Monitoring six times prior to 3 placing the basin into service is not 4 practical.

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

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

MR. PETTI: I'm going to object. Last month. That's not possibly something that could have been considered as part of the -HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We'll grant it, but this is already let in.

MR. PETTI: Yeah, I know. I think we forgot about this.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We'll note your objection. There was also something in there as recent as september as well. In any event, your objection is noted.

You may proceed, Mr. Huff.
THE WITNESS: The Illinois EPA last month held a series of public meetings to present its concept of requiring the infiltration from the first 1.3 inches of precipitation without surface discharge for all construction activities greater than one acre. This requirement would then apply to the operation phase after construction is completed.

Storm water from urban development contains many pollutants. The impact this will have on the chloride level in our groundwater

1 will be significant, and how the Agency can
2 support this while raising the non-degradation
3 issue on this matter seems totally
4 inconsistent. See attachment six. rises and no excess flow is being diverted, the 23 hydraulic pressure on the 7.27-acre floor will 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.

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

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

1 provided documents submitted as part of the 2 preliminary engineering discussions and 3 meetings.

The Agency issued a denial letter,

Specifically, the denial letter notes, one, a seal in accordance with section $370.932(\mathrm{~d})(2)(\mathrm{D})$ of the Illinois Recommended Standards; and, two, an appropriate groundwater monitoring system for 35 Il Adm. Code $370.930(\mathrm{~b})(4)$. 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
1370.930 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.

Therefore, the Agency must have concluded that the proposed wetland basin fixed the definition of a waste stabilization pond. The definition of waste stabilization pond from the USEPA is as follows: Stabilization pond, quote, receive raw, untreated wastes and usually consists of two or more cells. Most stabilization and oxidation ponds stabilize organic waste through a complex natural process involving sunlight, oxygen, water currents, algae, and bacteria action, end quote. And this is from the operations manual stabilization ponds USEPA document 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

1 cells, and it's not intended to treat the 2 wastewater.

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

1 the engineering report, end quote.

The preliminary engineering report, the June 28th, 2011 letter, and the permit submitted did address these issues with respect to achieving the groundwater numerical standards, but also noted that the non-degradation requirement the Agency believes is necessary could not be achieved here or at any other basin in the state.

When Illinois adopted the Recommended Standards for Sewage Works, it recognized that 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.

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

1 of wastewater treatment processes should not be 2 construed as precluding their use, emphasis 3 added in quotes. Unfortunately, this section 4 was not relied upon by the Agency based on its 5 denial letter. forth in the Agency's draft letter dated April 2011, attachment two and Bates stamped 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

1 properties of any waters of the state or such 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 9 animals, birds, fish, or other aquatic life, 10 end quote.

MR. GRANT: Excuse me. Can I interpret and ask him to give us a citation for that, please?

THE WITNESS: That's right out of the Environment Protection definition.

MR. GRANT: Can you read it again, please?

THE WITNESS: Is such alteration of a physical, thermal, chemical, biological, or radioactive properties of any waters of the State or such discharge of any contaminant into any waters of the state as will or is likely to create a nuisance or render such waters harmful or detrimental or injurious to public health,

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.

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 9 ongoing at the exact same time the District was 10 trying to secure a construction permit.

In R2012-09 the Agency proposed that CCDD faciiities 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.

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

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

1 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.

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

There will be no nuisance or render such waters harmful or detrimental or injurious from this project. It should be further noted the City of Rockford has routinely adopted groundwater use restriction ordinances under the Leaking Underground Storage Tank and Site Remediation Program. And footnote three notes that the Illinois EPA website lists 15 groundwater use restrictions approved ordinances in the City of Rockford.

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

1 Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works 2 that is clearly inappropriate for the proposed 3 wetland basin.

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

The Agency's decision to deny the application based upon alleged failure to show that the project will not result in -- will result in water pollution is based on the groundwater section's belief that this project should be denied because it cannot demonstrate it will achieve of non-degradation criteria of no net increase in any pollutant, the criteria that the same Agency groundwater section elected not to apply to the CCDD facilities in the Agency's proposed regulations and certainly

1 the Agency does not apply consistently on other 2 projects.

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

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

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

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

If the basin empties, the Rock River will become higher than the elevation and the basin, and a significant fraction of the water infiltrated out of the basin will reverse direction and leach back into the basin or basically the 2.4 million gallons, the same as what leaks out of the sewers in one day in the 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

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.
(Whereupon, a recess was had.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're back on the record. It's approximately 1:25, November 28th, 2012. Mr. Harsch is continuing his direct with Mr. Huff, his fourth witness. You may proceed, Mr. Harsch. MR. HARSCH: Thank you. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. Huff, can you explain in a little more detail and maybe less technical terms how the introduction of the pumped flow from the interceptor to the basin will occur relative to the -- that portion that you've estimated will infiltrate and how that relates to the elevation in the Rock River?
A. I'd be happy to. So there's -- the flow comes into an influent sump, and complete treatment is provided for everything up to whatever the maximum flow is that they can 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 going 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

1 does that relate to the -- some assumed
2 elevation in the Rock River?
A. Well, that's a good question. So the Rock River under normal flows approximately three feet below the Rock River. And so until that Rock River comes up at least three feet, they're not dependent on one another.

The top of the operating level in that basin, which is at approximately 700 feet mean sea level, is basically at the 100 -year flood off the Rock River. So the highest we'd get in that basin is equivalent to the 100 -year flood.

I'll point out there's also a three-foot curb or dike above the flood stage so that the Rock River is not going to overflow back into this basin unless you have probably a once in 500 -year type of integrator.
Q. And these -- this elevation is an interrelationship in the data and reports that you submitted to the Agency?
A. Yes, sir, it was.
Q. So for those periods of time when the Rock River elevation is below the bottom of the basin, is that when it would be -- the basin

1 through infiltration would drain some portion 2 of its contents?

4 assuming that the basin had freestanding water 5 in it.
Q. And if the Rock River level then increases and you've used the basin and you've 8 had infiltration of so many inches that you've 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
negligible compared to the hydraulic pushback.
Q. And once that water had gotten back into the basin, is there -- why would the District continue to pump or drain that back into the treatment plant?
A. The design calls for wetland plants, and we specified wetland plants that can stand a short-term 48 hours of submergence.

So the design concept would be that to the extent when that Rock River is at flood stage condition where you have infiltration coming into the basin, they will need to drain that water out to basically maintain the viability of the wetland plants.
Q. It's your opinion that there's no doubt this basin would function in a manner that the groundwater quality standards would always be met through the monitoring wells 25 feet from the basin?
A. The groundwater standards, yes, that is my opinion.
Q. You're familiar with the e-mail that Marcia Wilhite sent to me in May regarding the recitation of their concerns over this project?
A. I've read that e-mail, yes.
Q. I'll show you what's in the Agency record as 179. That's that e-mail.
A. Yes.
Q. That e-mail refers to the Agency's concerns over degrading the groundwater, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you explain -- they list a -Marcia lists a number of parameters where the Agency has concerns.

Did you address those specific parameters in your written submittals to the Agency?
A. Yes, I did. And those specific parameters that are referenced in here specifically are nitrates and chlorides, which were specifically addressed in both the preliminary engineering report and in the permit application and the June llth memo.
Q. And can you summarize briefly what the response was to the nitrates?
A. Sure. So under high-flow conditions, the influent to the wastewater treatment plant,

1 the nitrogen is in a reduced form. So that 2 would be either ammonia nitrogen or organic 3 nitrogen.

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.

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

The volatile organic compounds migrate

1 at a much higher velocity. There's no
2 retardation, and the degradation of those
3 compounds is a fraction of the degradation
4 rates on the ammonia compounds.
5 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.

So if you put 100 pounds of chlorides into the groundwater, it would be diluted, but those 100 pounds are then going to migrate to wherever the outlet is for that groundwater whether -- in this case the Rock River or it 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

1 winter months, and then that actually will
2 continue to contribute significant chlorides
3 based on recent work done on the DuPage River
4 and Salt Creek through much of the summer.

6 statewide. It's an issue nationally because

1 not designed to provide any treatment?
A. If I could expound on that, it's just like the maximum wet weather flow. The facility was designed for maximum wet weather flow of 80 million gallons a day, but that doesn't mean that's the maximum they can put through the plant. That was the design.

And Mr. Droessler was exactly right when he said that this equalization basin was not designed for treatment. It was designed as an equalization basin.

If your question is will there be treatment associated with the water that's put in there, then there is, indeed, treatment that's associated with it. It was just not contemplated as part of the design.
Q. And that treatment would -- is it treatment or is it simply that less pollutants reach the groundwater because of the natural conditions?
A. Well, it would be treatment in my mind. I mean, we need to get pollutant specific. As I said, chlorides, there really would be no treatment there.

2 originally by the cationic exchange capacity of 3 the soils, and, ultimately, it would be either 4 taken up by the plants, possibly nitrified, the 5 nitrates under dry conditions only.

Ammonia nitrogen would be taken up

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.

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

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

1 had -- exceeds what's in that basin, that
2 infiltration rate would go to zero. And as I
3 indicated earlier, typically, the infiltration
4 rate is controlled by the least permeable zone. In this case, that topsoil will be the topsoil that's on the site. And there's enough clay in there and enough silt that if you go back and design this as septic systems are, this would be classified as what's called a class five or six soil. And the percolation rate that would be used on a septic field with this type soil would be 1.2 inches per day. 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 20 percent of what we have predicted in the way of infiltration would be infiltrated into the groundwater.
Q. And the soil types in this information

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

1 and trying to get approval or a denial which, 2 frankly, we never got. And we had to go through the cost of putting together the detailed design to force the Agency to give us the denial that was apparently coming.

MR. HARSCH: At this point in time, I don't have any further questions.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. Mr. Petti?

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PETTI:
Q. The six inches per day, the 48 hours that you were discussing, that's the leakage rate of the basin, for lack of a better term, correct?
A. Worst case.
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Well, it's also the case that you presented at your June -- the June 28th, 2011 letter; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.
A. So, again, a design type of number.
Q. Yeah. Well, that's the number you presented to the Agency as your -- as you said, the worst case estimate of what the leakage rate would be, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And that led to or based on the estimation would lead to, according to your letter, two million gallons of wastewater from the basin entering the groundwater, correct?
A. Two million gallons of wastewater that also includes a high percentage of storm waters that's in there. Okay. That's not pure domestic sewage.
Q. Well, it's the wastewater that was pumped to the facility and then up into the overflow basin, correct?
A. Gravity flows into the wastewater treatment plant and -- but what comes in also includes a significant amount of infiltration and likely some sources of inflow that's directly attributed to a significant storm event.
Q. Sure. But once it's entered the stream of wastewater, it's wastewater; it's no

1 longer -- it's not -- you don't have two separate pipes feeding the basin, correct?

There's not a wastewater pipe and a storm water pipe?
A. There is not two separate pipes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And that two million gallons receives no treatment from that -- that doesn't receive pretreatment from the facility of any form, correct?
A. No, sir, you're not correct.
Q. I'm not correct?
A. You're not correct.
Q. Please correct me.
A. It goes through a bar screen as pretreatment ahead of the wetland basin.
Q. And I believe that's the bar screen that we discussed earlier today with, I think, it was Mr. Droessler?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that's the only treatment that is received by the water before it enters the basin?
A. Before it enters the basin, you are

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
6 is held in the basin for up to 48 hours, it
7 will also be treated by the basin through
8 natural --

9 A. No, that's not accurate.
10 Q. Yeah. I may have misunderstood that
11 then.

12 A. So the rain events will typically last 13 about a 24-hour period of time.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. So the second 24 hours is really dewatering of that basin, meaning that you're gravity flowing that water back into the headworks of the plant to provide complete treatment.

So that then says that you have this leakage rate theoretically of a million gallons that is basically infiltrated into the top part of the topsoil where the wetland plants are, and that will receive significant treatment.
Q. How?
A. 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 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.

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.
Q. You asked me to show you the testimony, and I --
A. Fine. So then I don't agree with that blanket statement. I was trying to clarify what he was referring to.
Q. Okay. In your own testimony -- and this may be just because it's written and I need to understand it better -- on page 9 right in the middle before -- right after the part you've pulled out of stabilization, it says, "As Mr. Burba noted in one of our meetings, the wetland basin is an equalization basin. It clearly does not have two or more cells, and it is not intended to treat wastewater."

Was that a statement you attributed to Mr. Burba or is that your statement, that it is not intended to treat wastewater?
A. That was mine. The --
Q. Okay.
A. Mr. Burba's -- I attributed that he simplified after our meeting that, well, basically what you're proposing is an equalization.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, you're -- I've
asked this question of pretty much everybody, and I'll ask it of you.

You're aware that the treatment facility operates under an NPDES permit, correct?
A. The Rockford wastewater treatment plant, yes, sir.
Q. Yes. That's -- and have you reviewed that permit in your preparation of materials for the application and the discussions you had with Illinois EPA prior to the application --
A. No, sir, on both accounts.
Q. Were you involved at all in the discussions for the cost of the overall plan for implementation of the basin and installation of the basin and the wetland?
A. To the extent we provided the cost for the wetland planting, that would be the sum extent of our involvement.
Q. Okay. When you set out to put together the overall plan for the overflow basin, was the goal at the outset to create the overflow basin or was it to create the wetland?

Which was the ultimate goal?
A. Well, I think that's really a question more appropriate for the client.
Q. What was your goal?
A. Our goal was to design what we felt was a greener sustainable approach to the traditional equalization basin by maximum use of a wetland as part of that.
Q. Thank you. In doing that -- and there's been a lot of discussion already about the installation of a liner and how that was not really feasible according to some of the testimony because the hydrologic pressure would push it up or bow it, and I think it was in your testimony as well that it would damage any liner that may be put in; is that accurate?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it's your belief that a liner of any kind that would be placed under this basin is not feasible for this location; is that correct?
A. Not feasible, I'm not sure I agree with that statement.
Q. Could you explain?
A. Well, sure. I think it's a question of

1 how one would do that and the associated cost 2 for that versus the benefits that you get. I mean, could we put a clay liner in there? Absolutely. Would it fail? That's a second question. What would be the life of that?

But we may have to put in massive dewatering pumps underneath that to keep that groundwater from heaving that -- the floor on there which would just absolutely make this project cost prohibitive.
Q. Was that ever -- was a cost analysis of a system like that ever performed, to your knowledge?
A. My understanding is that Mr. Droessler looked at what it would cost to add in a clay liner of two feet in here. So it's my understanding he did look at that.
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

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?
A. To put in a clay liner --
Q. But eliminate --
A. -- but eliminate the plants. So you're looking at --
Q. Eliminate the plants and eliminate the need to reroute some of the effluent to water the plants.
A. You know, rerouting that water, the effluent is a very green positive thing.

That's an environmental good. We're taking water out --
Q. That's not my question, though. I'm asking --
A. Well, I just want to make sure that you understand it.
Q. I understand. I understand. I'm asking about costs.
A. I don't believe those costs are

1 significant. And the overall -- the -- your
2 other question on the wetland plants, I believe 3 we had a budget on the order of $\$ 30,000$ per 4 acre.

5
Q. And I understand that about the plants.
A. Okay. So I think that answers your question.
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. If I could just clarify that as well. If you don't have plants in there, are you just going to have a bare earthen clay liner? And if you are going to do that, how are you going to keep it from cracking during dry period?
Q. That question is better asked to people smarter than me.
A. Well, my point is that it's not as simple as what you're alluding to, that you just put in a clay liner.
Q. Well, okay. Okay. Obviously, this facility is a wastewater treatment facility, correct?
A. This facility, again, is the Rock River --
Q. Yes.
A. -- wastewater treatment plant.
Q. Yes. And it's the District that runs that facility --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that's seeking to install this overflow basin and the constructed wetland?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's not a CCDD disposal site, correct?
A. It's not a CCDD?
Q. Disposal site, correct?
A. Disposal site, it is not.
Q. And it's not a truck wash?
A. It is not.
Q. And it's not a leaking underground storage tank property?
A. It is not.
Q. Not a feed lot?
A. Nope.
Q. Okay. You know, and I just wanted to briefly touch on the permit that you cited in your testimony for the truck wash.

You're familiar with what I'm talking

1 about?

10 know.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Was that -- that truck wash was an existing facility, was it not?

Before that permit -- the permit section that you cited in your testimony was included in the facility's permit?

That facility already existed, correct?
A. I can't answer that question. I don't
Q. You don't know? Okay.
A. I don't know.
Q. Clearly, the overflow basin here is not an already existing site; this would be a new construction?
A. The overflow basin?
Q. The overflow basin that we're talking about for the Districts.
A. But not the existing excess flow that they're trying to remediate.
Q. Well, no.
A. That exists today.
Q. Yeah. I understand that.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm talking about the construction of the facility, the basin; that would be new construction?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So am I correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you talked a little bit in your testimony about livestock waste, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That was discussed.

And those lagoons are lined pursuant to regulations, correct?
A. Which lagoons? I'm talking about the cattle that are just out grazing.
Q. You're not talking about the waste lagoons?
A. Nope. I'm talking about the cattle themselves.
Q. Okay. Then I think possibly we're talking about different things.

You testified that the facility -- and there's been other testimony on this -- that the facility already leaks 2.4 million gallons a day of untreated wastewater, correct?
A. The facility, no.
Q. The District itself, the entire system.
A. The sewer system of the laterals, not the mains, but just the laterals.
Q. Okay.
A. I just -- I put that in to give you a relative perspective of the volume we're talking about.
Q. Okay. And would you say that the maintenance goal of the District on all the sewer lines are to reduce the amount of leakage?
A. That leakage rate I gave you is what IEPA expects from new pipe. So they would be thrilled if they could probably get down to that level throughout their system. That's new piping.
Q. Is the goal to increase leakage?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. So if they can get down to that level, they would be better off.
Q. Also, in your testimony you discussed or expressed disappointment that section
$1370.520(b), i t ' s$ on page 9 of 10 of your testimony, you were critical that the Agency did not rely on this section. But that section addresses treatment.

And am I wrong in the reading of that?
I mean, I assume you've quoted it accurately here. I don't have it in front of me, but I'm assuming you quoted it accurately saying that "It encourages rather than obstructs the development of any methods for treatment of wastewaters."

That's accurate, correct?
A. To my knowledge, that's accurate, yes, sir.
Q. But there is -- this basin isn't for treatment, correct?
A. I think you're dead wrong on that, sir.
Q. Well, there's testimony from yourself in here that says it wasn't treatment, and there's testimony that we heard earlier today that says it -- treatment -- this isn't part of treatment.
A. I'd be happy to clarify.
Q. Please.
A. So what you're citing here are the Illinois Recommended Standards for treatment, correct?
Q. I'm citing what you're citing.
A. Well, that's what this is from.
Q. Okay.
A. And what you're implying is that if I put in an equalization basin $I$ don't need to get a construction permit from EPA because it's not treatment and I'm not -- with all due respect, you can ask the Agency permit group whether they concur that we could put in an equalization basin at the front end and that not be deemed treatment under the Illinois Recommended Standards.

It's absolutely treatment under the Illinois Recommended Design Standards.
Q. The overflow basin is considered --
A. It's part of a wastewater treatment system. It has to be permitted and the same regulations on the Illinois Recommended Design Standards.
Q. So as part of the treatment process, does this basin fall under the NPDES standards?
A. So NPDES relates to the discharge and the limits on that. What you're really talking about -- in Illinois, we have a separate set where you have to get a construction permit.
Q. Sure.
A. And this absolutely falls, I believe, under a construction permit or we wouldn't be here.
Q. You also have in your testimony -- and I apologize, I don't know where it was, and if I misstate, feel free to correct me, of course -- that there were three components that you -- this may have been in your June letter -- that you were looking to monitor, and they were based on the effluent that's monitored from the facility, correct, the BOD, fecal coliform, and pH, I believe?
A. I'm having trouble.
Q. All right.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. That's fine. Just so we're looking at the same thing.

It says, "Bates 187." It's the June 28th, 2011 letter, is that accurate, your

1 letter to --
2 A. Yes, that's my letter.
3 Q. Okay. The letter to Alan Keller. On page 3 of that letter, Bates 189

5 under section two, test for host of inorganics 6 and for six times before start up, in that 7 paragraph, you discuss that the Rock River 8 Water Reclamation District discharges about 930 million gallons a day to the Rock River, and 10 it is not required to monitor this intensively

11 for any of these parameters except BOD, fecal 12 coliform, pH.

And you're referring back to parameters 14 that were listed in a draft memo from Mr. Buscher?
A. That's absolutely correct.
Q. Okay. And later on in here, it says -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?
A. Well, I think you're misreading that statement. There was a list from Mr. Buscher,

1 and those were the only three that are even remotely related to municipal wastewater.
Q. At the end you state that the -- "has no problem monitoring for the parameters associated with municipal wastewater but believe this requested list is excessive."

In your testimony you also stated that there -- I believe the number was 620 -additional -- on page 5 right near the middle.
A. That was referring to section 620 of the 35 Il Adm. Code.
Q. Got it. All 620 parameters, not 600 and --
A. Correct.
Q. Section 620 parameters, not 620 parameters?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. That's what I needed to clarify. Have you reviewed the denial letter in this matter?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And can you show me where -- can you point out where in the denial letter you believe that the non-degradation is discussed

1 where there is a mention of the 620 regs?
A. I think that was covered in my testimony. If you want to give me a copy of that letter or show me, I'll walk you through.
Q. Sure. It's number one, under tab number one. It's Bates number 846 of the record, August 1, 2012 letter to Steve G-r-a-c-e-f-f-a, District director.
A. Well, I believe it's in the second paragraph. Sections 12 and 39 of the Environmental Protection Act 415 ILCS 5/12 and 39 prohibit the Agency from issuing a permit from a facility which would threaten, cause, or allow the discharge of contaminants which might cause or tend to cause water pollution in Illinois.

I believe that is the issue right there on the non-degradation.
Q. So it's your testimony that that's referring to the 620 regs?
A. I think that's a key part of it. MR. PETTI: Thank you. I don't have anything further.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?

2 BY MR. HARSCH: overflows?
A. Yes, sir. plant.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. Mr. Huff, throughout this project that you've been involved in, you understand that you do not -- that the District is striving to comply with the Compliance Commitment Agreement and eliminate existing sanitary sewer
Q. Where do those sanitary sewer overflows occur now; do you know?
A. Only in general terms. My understanding is that they have adequate transport capacity to the wastewater treatment

So when the pumps can't keep up, they have two choices. They can allow it to back up through the main interceptor resulting in street flooding as well as basement backups, and they also have the capabilities to bypass the plant in order to protect it.

And so they would have raw sewage basically bypassing the treatment plant discharging to the Rock River under those

1 extreme conditions.
Q. Or an overflow from a manhole --
A. Right.
Q. -- an interceptor at the treatment plant?
A. Right.
Q. And the use of an interceptor to -excuse me.

The use of a basin, full equalization basin to temporarily store excess flows, is that a common means of addressing overflows, sewer overłlows?
A. Both in sanitary and combined sewer communities, yes.
Q. And the purpose of that is to hold the material so that you can get it to the treatment plant for treatment?
A. Your alternative would be to greatly increase the size, the capacity of each of the unit operations at the treatment plant that you would use one or two days a year in the case of Rockford.

So it's a much more cost effective way than to try to expand the treatment plant to a

145 or 155-million-gallon-a-day capacity.
MR. HARSCH: I have no further questions.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Petti?
MR. PETTI: Briefly.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PETTI:
Q. In holding that wastewater before it gets to the treatment plant, you're not trying to discharge that material that's being held though; you want it to all get to the treatment plant, don't you?
A. You're talking specifically about our proposed wetland?
Q. I'm talking about in an overflow basin, the goal is to still get all of the wastewater treated by the treatment plant?
A. I guess I would say your goal is to maximize how much you can get treated through the treatment plant.
Q. And minimize the amount of wastewater that's lost to groundwater or backup overflow, correct?
A. Or bypass, sure.

MR. PETTI: Okay. Nothing further.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any
reredirect, Mr. Harsch?
MR. HARSCH: Nope.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Huff.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

FRANCIS ROBERT BURBA,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. Burba, would you please state your full name for the record?
A. My name is Francis Robert Burba.
Q. Can you explain your role with regard to the application that was submitted by the Rock River Water Reclamation District and the ultimate denial by the Agency of that application?
A. I was assigned as the permit review engineer for the construction permit.
Q. And what does a permit review engineer do when they review a permit?
A. Basically, we review the project against the standards -- the Illinois standards, recommended standards for sewage works.
Q. And when you -- do you have a work product or something that -- when you review it, do you prepare anything?
A. No. I review what's been submitted to me. I don't try to do anything independent of that.
Q. How do you communicate the results of your review?
A. If there's no deviations found, I draft a permit. It's later reviewed and approved through my unit manager to our permit section manager. Anything to do with sewage treatment plants requires the permit section manager.
Q. You participated in the initial meetings between the District and the Agency before the permit was filed; is that correct?
A. One meeting, yes.
Q. The very first one?
A. I don't know that. All $I$ know is the one that I attended.
Q. You were here when Mr. Huff testified earlier. I believe that you had characterized this as a flow equalization basin?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you agree with that, his recollection of your statement?
A. Correct.
Q. In your mind, what's a flow equalization basin?
A. Flow equalization means that you take above the maximum flow that the treatment plant can handle, divert it, and later bring it back online to the treatment plant for full treatment.
Q. Did you prepare the denial letter?
A. Correct.
Q. When did you determine that this project as proposed was either an extended aeration basin or a waste stabilization project?
A. I didn't. The project is not designed as that.
Q. So in your opinion it's neither one of those two?
A. Correct.
Q. This is Respondent's Exhibit 1. That's the denial letter?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. In the denial letter, what is cited as being the deficiency in terms of what provisions of the design standards are not being met?
A. Part 370.930 (d) (2) (D) of the Illinois Recommended Standards for Sewage Works, and it specifically indicates the seal shall have a permeability less than one times ten to the minus seventh power centimeters per second.
Q. Do you know what this -- offhand without looking what this -- what portion of the rules that citation is to?
A. Rules? This is in our standards.
Q. Yes. What portion of the standards, what type of unit it applies to?
A. It's under sewage works. The heading

1 probably -- the broad heading is waste
2 stabilization aerated lagoons. I think that's
3 the broad topic. I can see it.
Q. I can show you a copy.
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that the rule that's basically cited?
A. Right. That's out of that section.
Q. If I understand your prior answer, this is not a waste stabilization pond or an aerated lagoon; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. In your opinion, is what is proposed actually subject to this rule?
A. Yes. That's the most ample technology for this basin.
Q. Can you explain that?
A. The purpose is to build a basin large enough for the hydraulic flow and to contain that flow.
Q. So you're applying this rule by analogy?
A. By direct examination. I looked at the plans, and they don't provide for a seal.
Q. And it's your opinion that despite the rule being entitled waste stabilization pond or aerated lagoons and it's neither of those that this rule is applicable?
A. Correct.

MR. HARSCH: I'd like to mark a copy of the rule as Petitioner's Exhibit 6, I believe, since we've referred to it and have it introduced into evidence.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
Any objection?
MR. GRANT: None.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Petitioner's Exhibit 6 is admitted into evidence. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. If this would have been a project for a clarifier, for example, and it was proposed with an overflow rate double the rate in the rule --
A. I wouldn't approve it.
Q. -- how would the denial letter read?
A. It exceeded the standards.
Q. Would the denial letter also reference the other provisions that are contained in this

1 denial letter in terms of the Act?
A. Those are pretty much stock language.
Q. So, again, if we're looking at Exhibit 1, this is potentially a form in which you'd fill in then where the specific provisions does not meet or fulfill the requirements of 309.241 and then you'd list the specific rule that you believe was not being met?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you attend any of the meetings with Marcia Wilhite and Sanjay Sofat where this permit application was discussed?
A. No.
Q. Would you normally have seen all of the materials that the Agency relied upon in making its decision at some point, you know, during your review of the application?
A. Anything that probably took place prior to the actual construction permit I probably would have.
Q. I'm going to show you what has been put in the Agency's permit record at Bates stamped 848.

Can you tell me what this document is?
A. This page or this page (indicating)?
Q. All of them. The subsequent pages.
A. Okay. The top page says, "Washington, Indiana combined sewer overflow (CSO) system using green technology to stay green," and then four dollar signs.
Q. Mr. Burba, are you -- you've seen that document before?
A. No.
Q. So you clearly didn't rely on it in writing the denial?
A. Correct.
Q. Besides yourself, was anybody else involved in the Agency determination to rely upon the cited sections from the Illinois standards?
A. The second page, the first paragraph reads, "Also an appropriate groundwater monitoring system must be proposed according to Illinois administrative code $370.930(b)(4) . "$ That comes right out of the same section in the standards.
Q. And who else at the Agency, if anyone,

1 was involved in that determination that this --
2 that the cited rules apply? standard?
A. I feel that it will qualify as water pollution.
Q. On what basis?
A. Anything that leaks that's untreated.
Q. And what would -- is that then any increase above background in the groundwater?
A. I don't look at it as a background. I know that it's not incidental. It's designed not to leak.

MR. HARSCH: I have no further questions at this time. Thank you very much. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant?

MR. GRANT: I was going to call Mr. Burba as a witness.

Do you want to go through your case and do it separately or do you want to open up the lines of inquiry?

MR. HARSCH: Let's just quickly get through our side.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Thank you, sir.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Mr. Burba, who do you report to?
A. I report to Amy Dragovich.
Q. Okay. And before you send out a denial letter, do you consult with her?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know if Ms. Dragovich saw that PowerPoint presentation printed out regarding Washington, Indiana?
A. I don't know. I've heard, but that's hearsay.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, she didn't directly tell me that.
Q. Okay. That's fine. All right. If the Agency -- based on your knowledge of the Agency -- well, first off, let me say is it your understanding that the Agency can't grant a permit if it constitutes a violation of the Act or the regulations?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. If the Agency was denying a permit that -- based simply on water pollution, somebody was seeking a permit that would result in water pollution, would they need to say anything more than section 12 of the Act?

In other words, if the liner standards weren't implicated, but it simply -- the denial was based just on that it was going to cause water pollution, would it be necessary to put anything besides section 12 and 39 of the Act?
A. I don't think so.

MR. GRANT: That's all I've got.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch, anything further?

MR. HARSCH: No.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

AMY DRAGOVICH,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Would you please state your entire name for the record?
A. Amy Louise Dragovich, D-r-a-g-o-v-i-c-h.
Q. And since we all know what your position is at the Agency, would you very briefly explain what involvement you had with this permit application?
A. I am Francis's supervisor, so I oversaw the -- his review of the permit application and the denial letter.
Q. Did you participate in the series of meetings that the District had with the Agency?
A. I did.
Q. And that participation and e-mails were shown throughout the permit, right?
A. Right.
Q. How would you characterize the project that the District proposed -- excuse me. Strike that.

Mr. Burba testified that he characterized this project as a, quote, equalization basin.

Do you agree with that assessment?
A. It is, but it is also untreated wastewater that is going to infiltrate into the groundwater.
Q. And was the Agency's concerns about
that untreated wastewater which Marcia Wilhite put in a memo to me, e-mail to me that gave rise to the June 2011 meeting; do you recall?
A. What was the question?
Q. Is that concern from the water that would leak out, as you put it, was the basis for her concern that she expressed to me in that e-mail?

You met with Marcia Wilhite before that -- she sent that e-mail to me, did you not?
A. I was included in discussions with -HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you speak up, please? Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I was included in discussions, but I don't know if I actually met with Marcia.

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Those were discussions with the groundwater folks, Bill Buscher and --
A. And Al.
Q. So when you reference the Agency's concerns over the leaking, that's the concern she's addressing here?
A. It is.
Q. Do you agree with the previous testimony that this is not a -- as proposed, it is not a waste stabilization pond or aerated lagoon?
A. I do.
Q. Who made the determination that that section of the Agency's design standards apply?
A. I think it was a group decision.
Q. I'll ask you the same question.

Are you familiar with what was included in the Agency record starting at Bates stamped $480--440 ?$
A. I am.
Q. And can you explain what it is?
A. It was a webinar that USEPA put together for green infrastructure showing how a wetland could have a liner system.
Q. And did you attend that webinar or watch it?
A. I did.
Q. And when was that webinar?
A. I think in June.
Q. Of this year?
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 overflows?
A. Correct.
Q. So that is basically the boilerplate
denial?
A. Right.

MR. HARSCH: Thank you.
Mr. Grant?
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRANT:
Q. If the basis for denial was water pollution, just water pollution, just putting in contaminated water and causing water pollution, would it be necessary to put anything besides section 12 and 39 in the denial letter?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And why don't you turn to the last exhibit? This is the webinar.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is it your understanding this was an overflow capture system that was actually constructed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And was it built with a liner?
A. It was.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you to turn to page 861 down at the bottom.

And does it also contain wetland plants?
A. It does.
Q. Embedded in the soil layer?
A. Right.
Q. Is that correct?

And then underneath it it mentions here a 45 mill EP -- actually, it just spells it out, ethylene propylene diene monomer liner, which I'll refer to as a EPDM liner; is that correct?
A. 'That's correct.
Q. Okay. Would a liner like that be acceptable to Illinois EPA in a situation such as what Rockford proposed?
A. Yes.

MR. GRANT: Okay. At this point I'm going to move that this -- any sort of restriction I'm using -- and it's already in the record -- any sort of restriction be removed from it.

MR. HARSCH: I don't have an objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So to clean it up, Respondent's Exhibits 1 through 9
are admitted into evidence.
MR. GRANT: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
MR. GRANT: That's all I have.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. To the best of your knowledge, that document was never provided to Rock River Water Reclamation District, was it?
A. I don't know that.
Q. What was the date of the denial?
A. August 1st, 2012.
Q. That document did not exist at the time we met with the Agency in 2011; is that correct?
A. Correct.

MR. HARSCH: Are you intending to call this witness?

MR. GRANT: No. Actually, all I wanted to do was to authenticate that document and then get the fact that there was a liner and that the liner, if it was used, it would have been acceptable to Illinois EPA because it wasn't it vinyl or clay or anything we talked

1 about. It was EPDM rubber.
2 BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Are you aware of any response to Rock River Water Reclamation District regarding the Agency's decision that this project would actually result in water pollution following the Agency's review of the June 2011 submittal?
A. The Agency denial letter is the response.
Q. Are you aware of any documents, memorandums, e-mails regarding the anti-degradation issue that Jim Huff has testified to that he addressed in the June -in his June 2011 submittal letter?
A. Are you referring to the groundwater memo?
Q. Anything to do with the degradation issue.

Are there documents back and forth at the Agency regarding --
A. Not that I'm aware of. MR. HARSCH: No further.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRANT:
Q. We've been referring to the material that you stored in this basin as wastewater, but you could equally call it untreated sewage, couldn't you?
A. Yep.
Q. Okay. Does the Agency believe that the direct discharge of untreated sewage in the groundwater flowing into the Rock River constitutes water pollution?
A. Yes.

MR. GRANT: Okay. Thank you. REDIRECT-EXAMINATION BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. What is the basis for that determination?
A. Untreated wastewater contains pathogens, contaminants that are known to contribute to pollution.
Q. Is water pollution a defined term in the Environmental Protection Act?
A. I don't have a copy.

MR. HARSCH: No further.

MR. GRANT: Thanks.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
Thank you, Ms. Dragovich.
Do you intend to call Mr. Buscher?
MR. GRANT: Yeah.
MR. HARSCH: I have no further.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. GRANT: I'll call Mr. Huff back as a rebuttal witness to Amy Dragovich.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure.
You're still under oath, Mr. Huff.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. JAMES E. HUFF,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Mr. Huff, have you reviewed the PowerPoint presentation of Washington, Indiana?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Do you agree that it's a similar project to that proposed by Rock River?
A. Well, I believe it's different.
Q. And why?
A. In our case, as it's been discussed, it's really an equalization basin. That's really a treatment basin with discharge into the receiving stream. So they are discharging combined sewer overflows through that basin and then discharging that water.

So it's not getting complete treatment at the wastewater treatment piant. That's the only treatment that's being provided by the constructed wetland.
Q. And is the flow linearly through the wetland also -- is there a difference?
A. It is. That's correct. It flows through the wetland from the beginning and then exits at the end. It's a plug flow type wetland.
Q. Were you ever provided as the point person for the District with any rebuttal to your June llth submittal?
A. I was not.
Q. Are you -- at any of the meetings, were you ever provided any information where anybody at the Agency had a basis for including that the discharge would, in fact, result in a problem in the groundwater?
A. I believe the June 2011 meeting was prepared as a direct response to concerns raised by the Agency regarding the non-degradation term which I've interpreted as meaning water pollution.
Q. Are you aware of any other instance where the Agency applies a rule by analogy?
A. This is the first time that $I$ have ever experienced this.

MR. HARSCH: No further questions. RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Mr. Huff, in your June 28th letter, you state that the outside limit based on your estimate of direct discharge to the groundwater was 2 million gallons during a 48-hour period; isn't that correct?
A. I believe that's correct, yes.
Q. And we're talking about untreated raw
sewage, correct?
A. We're talking about highly diluted raw 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.
Q. Okay. And the numbers that I heard -and correct me if I'm wrong, let's find the right one -- during periods of expected heavy 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?

1
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

1 groundwater with groundwater flow toward the Rock River, it surprises you the Agency believes that that's water pollution?
A. I believe it's inconsistent with the Environmental Protection Act.

MR. GRANT: Okay. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?
MR. HARSCH: No further.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may step down, Mr. Huff. Thank you. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Any further witnesses then, Mr. Harsch?

MR. HARSCH: No, sir.
MR. GRANT: Okay. I'm going to -- he can -- I'll allow him latitude for outside the scope on Mr. Buscher since he's going to do that.

MR. HARSCH: Can you give me five minutes?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yeah. Let's take five minutes, guys. Thanks.
(Whereupon, a recess was had.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. We're back on the record. The petitioner has rested in his case in chief.

And respondent, first witness up.
Please raise your hand, and she'll swear you in.
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

WILIIAM BUSCHER,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Can you state your name for the record, please?
A. William Edward Buscher. That's $B-u-s-c-h-e-r$.
Q. Mr. Buscher, your $C V$ is in the record as Exhibit No. 7, and I assume it's accurate; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Just tell me a little bit about your educational experience, what your top 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.
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.
A. Yes.
Q. And if you could review it.

Does this accurately represent the basis for denial of the permit application?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And was it denied on the basis of water pollution?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Okay. As far as -- can you describe which waters would be affected by it, by this project?
A. Waters that would be affected by this project include groundwater, and I suppose that's it.
Q. Okay. How about the river that would accept the groundwater?
A. The groundwater and then where it would eventually flow to, the Rock River.
Q. Okay. What would cause the pollution?
A. The deposition of raw sewage in the basin and it's not being contained in that basin.
Q. Okay. Is there any doubt on the behalf of Illinois EPA that the discharge of raw sewage into groundwater and into the Rock River

1 would cause water pollution?
A. No.
Q. Is there any question on the part of Illinois EPA that the deposit of sewage solids
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.

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

MR. HARSCH: I might make a statement.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure. For
the record.
MR. HARSCH: There was no response to my comment that there's nothing in this record that discusses the deposit of sewage solids in that basin, and Mr. Grant didn't respond to that.

MR. GRANT: Well, we disagree. I'm not going to go through the record right now. It's 800 and some pages, but it's in there.

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Mr. Who didn't respond?

MR. HARSCH: Mr. Grant did not.
HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Okay.
MR. GRANT: My response is it is in the record.

MR. HARSCH: When he responded to my motion.

MR. GRANT: And, you know, this is testimony and, you know, I will have to prove that it is in the record in my post -- if we're going to say that's the problem.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Your

1 objections are noted on the record, Mr. Harsch. cause infections as well as other waste that could be in the stream from nonhuman sources.
Q. Okay. Let me turn to -- have you turn to Exhibit No. 2. And why don't you go to page number 4? This is in the record. You can take a look at it.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you know what this is?
A. This is information on the water quality coming into the sewage treatment plant, I believe, influent.
Q. Okay. And if you look to the right where it says influent, do you see those?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And do you see the parameters -well, first, let me ask you was this prepared by Rock River Water Reclamation District?
A. I believe it was and turned into the Agency.
Q. Okay. And do you see the constituents up at the top?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Grease, BOD, TSS, ammonia-N. Do you recognize all those --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- those things in there?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you consider them to -- if discharged in the groundwater to create water pollution?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit No. 4? Exhibit No. 4 is in the record.
A. Yes.
Q. If you can take a quick look at that.
A. Okay. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Did you prepare this memo?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Please look to the second page which is record page 169.

And you see under paragraph four?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. You proposed a liner?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Why did you propose a liner?
A. To prohibit the movement of the contaminants in the basin into groundwater and into the Rock River.
Q. Okay. How did you come up with a two-foot-ten-to-the-minus-seven-centimeters-per -second liner?
A. That's in the regulations of the Agency's.
Q. Okay. Are those the regulations that Mr. Burba applied; do you know?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. Do you believe that this is the minimum required to prevent migration of the untreated sewage in the groundwater?
A. I agree that it's appropriate, yes.
Q. Okay. Did the Agency ever ask for a

1 concrete liner?
A. No, sir.
Q. And would you have asked for a concrete liner?
A. No, sir.
Q. Why not?
A. Because concrete is prone to crack, and it would, therefore, not sufficiently contain the material in the basin.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the District's claims that the groundwater would rise and iloat the liner?
A. I am.
Q. What's your reaction to this issue?
A. It's a concern that needs to be taken into consideration in the design of the facility.
Q. Okay. Do you believe based on your experience with the Agency and as an engineer that there are engineering solutions to this problem?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Has the District refused to install a liner?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. I think you heard the testimony today.

There was some testimony regarding the groundwater management zone; do you recall?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Can you explain what a groundwater management zone is?
A. Groundwater management zone is contained in the 620 regulations of the Agency's, and it's designed to provide an opportunity when a facility is out of compliance to mitigate the problem that they have through an approved corrective action to bring the facility back into compliance.
Q. Okay. Do you consider it to be part of a remedial program?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Does Illinois EPA consider creating new groundwater management zones to be desired?
A. Where appropriate, you know, they -- if they're addressing an environmental problem, it would be appropriate.
Q. When you're talking about environmental problem, you mean a preexisting environmental problem?
A. A preexisting environmental problem.
Q. Would Illinois EPA normally consider granting a groundwater management zone as part of a new problem; in other words, as a condition of creating new contamination and a groundwater management zone?
A. No, sir, it would not.
Q. Okay. Based on your education, experience, and review of the District's proposal, would granting the permit in question in this place have resulted in an increase in human pathogens, industrial waste, and other constituents of untreated sewage into the groundwater under the basin?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. GRANT: That's all I've got. HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thanks, Mr. Grant. Mr. Harsch.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Looking, again, at Exhibit 4, paragraph 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 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

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.

It's always important when you do this type of work to make sure that you know what the existing conditions are before you begin the operation of your basin as to make certain that if an environmental problem arises you can positively identify whether it came from the operation of the facility or whether it may 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.
Q. The question I'm trying to -- it's fairly simple.

How much of an increase? If you can't address it on -- generally, then maybe we can do it on specific --
A. Well, it would determine -- it would be based upon the background water quality at the particular facility. So you would need to have that information to appropriately assess the situation. That's why we requested the six --
Q. Is one milligram per liter of chloride 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.
Q. You can't recall any?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Huff, I believe, provided information to the Agency in response to this memo that it would not be statistically possible to show the chloride was not increased; is that correct?
A. I believe that's what he said, yes.
Q. And you agree with his statement?
A. I did not take issue with it.
Q. And that's irrespective in your opinion of what water quality standards would be met 25 feet from the basin?
A. Could you repeat the question?
Q. And the increase in chlorides, they're going to constitute water pollution because you can't show there's going to be no increase in --
A. Well, it would depend, once again, upon what your background water quality was there, and if, indeed, based upon the statistical analysis it exceeded the value, that that would be correct, but it's a site specific call.
Q. What is a statistically significant

## 1 increase?

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
11 would be determined.
There then would be a factor provided there that would increase that value based on statistics of what you could expect to find in that well. It would be natural variation.

If it exceeded what is expected, the statistically significant increase would be if the value you came up with based on the information you had at the particular location was exceeded.
Q. And if you increase -- if your value was greater than that, in your mind that's water -- in the Agency's view, that's water pollution? pollution? pollution. I wonder if we can -can redirect if you'd like. BY MR. HARSCH: yes. other than groundwater?
A. That is correct.
A. That would be a violation of the water
Q. That's a violation -- that's water

MR. GRANT: Okay. We're talking two different things. He didn't answer your -- he didn't -- you know, he's saying groundwater monitors standards and he's saying water

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, you

MR. GRANT: Okay. All right.
Q. The statistical significant increase, if that's shown, would that be water pollution?
A. Groundwater is the water of the state,
Q. And that's irrespective of any use
Q. That also would be irrespective -your -- the conclusion that the statistically significant increase is water pollution is also irrespective that that increase is still below

1 the groundwater standards?
A. Below -- well, actually the standards include the non-degradation provision so if -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?
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

1 permit for a permitted sewage treatment
2 facility versus cows in a field someplace.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I sustain the objection.

Move on, please.
MR. HARSCH: I'd like to note for the record that the whole issue of anti-degradation was a major issue as testified to by Mr. Huff and others in the dialogue, and $I$ think it was a reasonable question.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: The record so notes. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Do you have any training or expertise in wastewater?
A. I provide expertise to the permit sections of the Agency. I also work in groundwater with Public Water Supplies, what we do with bacteria and pathogens.
Q. Do you have any training or expertise in wells?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any reason to disagree with Mr. Huff regarding his testimony about the
ability of the soils under the basin, the wetland plants, root zones, etcetera, in reducing the pollutants that would be contained in the water that infiltrates?
A. My expectation is there's some treatment for it.
Q. Are you asked to review water pollution permits, approvals of land application of wastewater discharges?
A. My section looks at those, yes.
Q. Do you apply the same sort of analysis in those reviews to those land application of wastewater?
A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
Q. Does that mean that the land application of wastewater is shown not to have a statistically significant increase in groundwater contaminants?

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: Could you speak up?

THE WITNESS: That would vary site to site.

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Have you ever given the advice to
permits that they should deny permit application for land application of wastewater?

MR. GRANT: I'm going to object because that has no relevance to this permit. This is not a case where we have land application of wastewater.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you want to read the question back, please, Sue? (Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I overrule the objection. You may answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe I have. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Are you aware that the Agency permits a land application of sewage sites?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you ever been asked to review the approval of the application of sewage sites at the land?
A. I don't believe I've been involved with that.
Q. Have you ever been involved in the permitting of the application of water supply

```
    1 treatment solids in land?
```

A. I don't recall. It's not something we do on a regular basis.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Could you please speak up, please?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall. It's not something I do on a regular basis. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. Have you ever been asked to provide any review of permit application to construct a new wastewater collection system?
A. As in the piping?
Q. Yes.
A. No, sir.
Q. Earlier today there was testimony that those various activities that I've just asked you about all would result in some discharge to groundwater.

Do you agree with that?
A. There is that potential.

MR. HARSCH: No further questions.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant?
MR. GRANT: I think I'm fine.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.

You may step down. Thanks.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. GRANT: And my next witness is Francis Burba.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Burba, you're still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may proceed, Mr. Grant.

FRANCIS BURBA, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Mr. Burba, can you state and spell your record for the record, please? You already did that.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. So I think you stated that you were a permit engineer with IIlinois EPA Bureau of Water; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you're familiar with this
permit?
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 experience with -- well, first off your 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 different states.
Q. How long have you been with Illinois EPA?
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

1 you review permits for wastewater treatment 2 facilities?

3 A. Correct.
4 Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the 5 technology and the engineering of these types 6 of facilities?
A. Yes.

1 Q. What is the purpose of excess flow facilities?
A. Excess flow is designed for when it exceeds the maximum flow through the treatment plant for full treatment. You can divert the flow, bring it back online such as flow equalization, which that's what this basin was intended to do.

In other words, as the flows reduce or go down in the treatment plant, they can bring a portion of that back online for full treatment.
Q. Is the purpose of an excess flow facility to capture 100 percent of the excess flow or nearly 100 percent of the excess flow and then feed it back into the treatment facility?
A. 100 percent.
Q. Without leaking?
A. Correct.
Q. And without the diversion of untreated wastewater to groundwater or surface water?
A. Correct.
Q. Are you familiar with other districts
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.
Q. It sounds like an expensive facility?
A. I would imagine. Long before my time.
Q. You mentioned a concrete basin. And earlier today in one of the testimonies, one of the witnesses for the District that we had asked them or we had suggested a concrete basin.

Would you recommend a concrete liner for an excess flow facility for this plant, for the Rock River plant?
A. You have two options there. You can either use a concrete basin that has been sealed or you can use a synthetic liner, and it serves the same purpose. All you're doing is limiting the amount of leakage.
Q. So in the permit denial, I think you testified about this earlier, you didn't ask for anything specific.

I believe that you testified that you were just looking for a seal; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the options, there are a number of options that could be presented?
A. Correct.
Q. Has the District up to today ever proposed an adequate liner for this basin?
A. No.
Q. Let's see. I want to get a little bit into the alternate basis that's in -- let me take you to No. 1 to we're all dealing with the same thing. Exhibit No. 1, it's in the record.

It's the denial letter.
Alternatively, it was denied on the basis of Section $370.930(\mathrm{~d})(2)(D)$, which $I$
think you described were the recommended standards, construction standards.

First question, are those recommended or mandatory?
A. Mandatory.
Q. Okay. Why do they say recommended; do you know?
A. Before my time. I don't know how it arrived, but -- and that document's actually promulgated by the Illinois Pollution Control Board. Now it's our standard.
Q. And the standard that was applied was for waste stabilization ponds or aerated lagoons; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there a published standard for overflow basins such as what was proposed here?

Is there a heading that says overflow basin?
A. No.
Q. And I think you said -- and correct me

1 if I'm wrong -- that you applied this section
2 by analogy because it was the most appropriate;
3 is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you give me a little more explanation as to why you thought it was appropriate?
A. The purpose of the basin is to hold the raw sewage prior to bringing it back to the plant. The same concept holds true even though you're talking in terms of waste stabilization or aerated lagoons. The purpose there is to contain it for the treatment.

So based on this -- call it temporary storage. It still has to serve the same purpose. It has to contain it.
Q. So aside from the name of this section, you believe that it's appropriate; is that an accurate way to characterize your statement?
A. Correct.
Q. You've -- I think you've been here today.

Have you heard the District's statements that a liner would be problematic

1 because the groundwater flow to the -- the liner would float when groundwater increased?

Did you hear that?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what's your reaction to that?
A. There's other alternate constructions that will minimize that problem.
Q. Can you give me just a few examples of things that come to your mind?
A. Raising the elevation for the bottom of this basin so that you're above the normal groundwater. Groundwater will seek its own level. It will be running out of the surface around the lagoon and not into the lagoon if the lagoon is high enough.
Q. Okay. I wonder if could you look at Exhibit No. 3 which is in evidence.

Do you recognize this permit?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Were you involved in the granting of the permit?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I direct your attention to page number 6, section $C$ at the bottom, heading

1 monitoring requirements?
A. Correct.
Q. And there's a list of chemicals and compounds that are on page 6 and page 7 .

Do you see those?
A. Correct.
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
discharge to the domestic sanitary sewers.
It all shows up at the treatment plant. So they want to know what's coming in the plant, what's going out because there's very few treatment processes for some of these both metals.

Some of them are both dissolve. Some of them are solid. You can remove some of the solid, but you can't remove all of the dissolved unless you put in a coagulant, something that will attract that metal.
Q. To your knowledge, have they been in compliance with this testing requirement?
A. Yes. Otherwise, I wouldn't have drafted this permit for the renewal without a problem. Obviously, there was no objection to
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
to limit what they will test for. I don't think that's acceptable.
Q. Does this permit allow discharge of untreated sewage from anywhere else from anywhere?
A. No.
Q. And does it allow for other discharge besides -- in other words, discharge of treated effluent into the river?

Is there only a single point?
A. There's a single discharge.
Q. And is the District required to disinfect prior to discharge during the summer months?
A. Yes.
Q. For at least some months of the year?
A. It's a seasonal disinfection.
Q. I don't know. You were, I believe -heard the testimony of the witnesses. We were talking about potential lining of the system to reduce infiltration and an inflow and thereby reduce the hydraulic load on the plant.

## Did you hear that?

A. Yes.
Q. Now, if new users were added to the system, in other words, if the District was to add new users, would that actually increase the inflow?
A. That is correct.
Q. Are you aware of any current applications for people to -- for the District to take on new users?
A. They have a facility plan which $I$ reviewed to pick up Winnebago.
Q. When you say "Winnebago," do you mean the city of Winnebago?
A. The city of Winnebago.
Q. Is that still pending with the Agency?
A. I've approved that. I think I'm at the very first part of the new sewer interceptors and lift station in Rock River to potentially pick this up for the future.
Q. And based on your experience in permits, would you expect that to increase the amount of inflow into the Rock River sewage treatment plant?
A. Yes. Because it's a sewer system like Rock River. It's probably aged. It's not new.

So I would expect I \& I to be in that system as well.
Q. When you say I \& I, do you mean infiltration and inflow?
A. Correct.

MR. GRANT: That's it.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. You're aware that the District did propose a monitoring system as part of the permit application?
A. I'm aware of the location of the monitoring wells, but I never reviewed the system.
Q. I believe you responded that the design standards, as they're referred to as the recommended standards, are promulgated by the Pollution Control Board.

Do you mean that they're part of the Pollution Control Board rules or actually adopted by the Board?
A. We adopted those as standards from the Illinois Pollution Control Board.
Q. By "we," you mean the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency?
A. Correct. That's part of our standards.
Q. And they're part of the Pollution Control Board's published rules?
A. Correct.
Q. Have you reviewed permits for CSO communities, combined sewer overflow communities?
A. Are you talking about a construction?
Q. NPDES permit.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you generally familiar with the USEPA requirements on combined sewer overflows?
A. Correct.
Q. And under that USEPA policy or regulations, those communities are allowed to discharge up to four events per year?
A. I don't remember that specifically. I don't remember the number.
Q. And we're talking about a discharge here, a flow equalization basin to eliminate a sewer overflow with a frequency of probably less than once per year, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the current -- without the construction of this basin, I think you heard testimony earlier today that during certain size storm events, you would get an overflow from basically the manhole at the headworks; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that would be onto the ground adjacent to the treatment plant?
A. That may very well be.
Q. In the general vicinity of where this basin is proposed to be located?
A. Sanitary sewer overflows are prohibited.
Q. I understand. It's an existing overflow; is it not?
A. Then there has to be some remedial action.
Q. And earlier today there was testimony regarding the Compliance Commitment Agreement and the investment by the District to carry out what they'd agreed to as part of the Compliance Commitment Agreement; is that correct?
A. I don't know what was in the agreement.
Q. If the existing overflow is at the locations -- is at the headworks, then that would be an existing condition, would it not?
A. Correct. But it would also be a violation.
Q. I understand. And you understand that the project that's being proposed is a project that's being proposed to eliminate that overflow?
A. That very well may be.
Q. Is the -- I believe $\operatorname{Mr}$. Huff testified that he believed the Agency utilized a five-year storm event for purposes of permitting.

Do you agree with that?
A. What?
Q. For design purposes.
A. For an excess flow basin?
Q. For sewage treatment plant units.
A. No, I'm not aware of that.
Q. You have to use some -- for treatment units and for sewer systems, you have to use some flow figure to project it?
A. Right. But we do it on a capacity, not on a storm event.
Q. Is it possible due to rainfall events for the flows to exceed the capacity that the treatment plant can handle what it's designed for?
A. Correct.
Q. Is the permit -- do permits routinely contain bypass language that allows the bypass of untreated wastewater to protect the plant?
A. In case of an emergency.
Q. And this permit in question, special condition 15 has such a condition?

MR. GRANT: Is that the CFR reference?
THE WITNESS: Right. I know the provision you're saying. BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. I don't know if it was Mr. Buscher's testimony or your testimony. Someone testified that wastewater always gets treated.

That's not necessarily the case?
A. There's a distinction between treated or untreated. It's treated to a certain extent.

MR. HARSCH: No further. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. Mr. Grant.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Does Illinois EPA have any objection to the concept of a basin, an overflow basin at this facility, Rock River?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any objection to the concept of a wetland?
A. No.
Q. The only objection you have is to the lack of a liner; isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

MR. GRANT: That's all.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Harsch?
MR. HARSCH: No further questions.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thanks. You may step down, sir.
(Whereupon, the witness was
excused.)
MR. GRANT: We're done. We rest.

HEARING OFFICER HALIORAN: All. Right. Terrific. Mr. Harsch, any rebuttal? Let's go off the record for two minutes.
(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Back on the record. Mr. Harsch would like to call a rebuttal.

Mr. Huff, you're reminded you're still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. JAMES E. HUFF, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARSCH:
Q. There was testimony put on in the Agency's case about the discharge of materials that got into the ground under the basin reaching the Rock River.

Do you agree with that?
A. I do not. Specifically, Mr. Buscher identified three pollutants in human waste that

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. ammonia. So none of those pollutants would get to the Rock River.

He identified something called human waste which is a generic term that $I$ assume we're identifying those three specific compounds there as well as pathogenic organisms, which the fecal coliform is an indicator of.

As I testified earlier, those organisms

1 are very effectively filtered out. Wetlands
2 are very effective at reducing the
3 concentrations of fecal coliform and other 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. there they'd be destroyed if we put them on

1 beforehand.

Second, the list is not the same list that's in the NPDES permit that Mr. Burma seemed to indicate they were the exact same list. It's a more extensive list than what is monitored on their flow which averages 25 to 30 million gallons a day versus what we're going to put in at 7.4 gallons for the year.

I think the District's reservations was not so much in monitoring. It wasn't so much in most of the parameters on there. It was the extensiveness of this, the six times prior to the year and that list just seemed excessive relative to domestic wastewater.
Q. Was the purpose of your chloride modeling, you said that you performed, to show that there would be a statistically significant increase in chloride concentrations?
A. The Agency required that we model in order to show that there would be no increase 25 feet downstream.

And the problem with any kind of model where you have a wide width on this basin, 25 feet down effectively there's going to be no

1 dilution and attenuation or minimal dilution 2 and attenuation.

So the intent of that was to really show -- we did the R26 equation under TACO, T-A-C-O, and then we also just did a simple box model assuming that groundwater is flowing at five feet per day and that this water infiltrated through what the net increase was.

And the box model is a more appropriate model because our 26 assumes an infinite source if that basin is full forever. And so the purpose of that is to show there is going to be an increase, but it's certainly going to be well below the groundwater standard contained in 620 for chlorides.
Q. And that would be -- that increase would be in your opinion a statistically significant increase?
A. Well, sure. I mean, if you monitor and you establish a background concentration, you go out shortly after one of these events, you would see an increase compared to the background. I suspect it would be statistically increased, certainly a very real
potential for that.
MR. HARSCH: No further.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Mr. Grant.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Mr. Huff, fecal coliform is just an indicator?
A. That's what $I$ said. Yes, sir.
Q. So it's just an indicator.

It's not -- while it may be considered a human pathogen, it's not the most dangerous human pathogen, is it?
A. I'm not even sure it's a human pathogen. It's an indicator of human waste.
Q. Right. So the pathogens that you would be worried about would be other bacteria and viruses and protozoans; isn't that correct?
A. Sure. But I would give you the same response on the ability to filter those out and the reduction that's achieved in very short order. And we had that in our permit application, that discussion.
Q. Isn't fecal coliform extraordinarily short-lived outside of a mammal's body?
A. Compared to these other organisms?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't believe that's a true statement. You have a range of organisms that have a longer life and viruses, others that are much shorter.
Q. Viruses like hepatitis A, that would be a concern, wouldn't it?
A. I suppose it would, yes.
Q. And human sewage?
A. Potentially, yes. Potentially.
Q. And protozoans like cryptosporidium and gardia, that sort of thing, that would be a big concern, right?
A. That would be a concern from a human health exposure point of view, yes, sir.
Q. Is it your testimony that these have the same life-span as coliform bacteria does?
A. No, that was not my testimony. My testimony was that if we -- the industry standard is to monitor fecal coliform. We do it in surface water. We do it in wastewater effluents as an indicator we use.

In the water supply side, they use

1 total coliform as an indicator of potential 2 pathogenic organisms there.
Q. To avoid testing for all those other 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 say -- in the famous letter from June 28th --
A. June 28 th .
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?
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

1 letter really was not too dissimilar from the 2 routine tests in the NPDES permit, is it?
A. Right.
Q. But, for example, a number of inorganic chemicals and metals are contained in both lists, aren't they?
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.

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

So you've got to say is that money well spent in that lost year when we potentially will have basement backups because we have to 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
would be a waste of time to do background sampling.

Isn't that essentially what it says in that June 28th, 2011?
A. Could you point me to that, please?
Q. Sure. Exhibit 5, I think page 3. It will save time.
A. Item number two? Test for a host of inorganics and for six times before start up.
Q. Yes.
A. It says, "The RRWRD discharges about 30 million gallons a day in the Rock River and is not required to monitor this intensively for any of these parameters except BOD, fecal coliform, and pH."
Q. That's treated sewage?
A. That's also in the raw sewage, sir.
Q. Excuse me. The BOD, fecal coliform, and pH , are you saying that's all that they're required to test for under the permit?
A. No. Those are the primary parameters that they test for that frequently.
Q. But there's a whole -- that frequently, 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

1 off the record.

2 (Whereupon, a discussion was

3

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. We're back on the record.

I do want to note for the Board there is an outstanding motion out there filed by Mr. Grant and company entitled motion to supplement the record. I think it was filed on November 2nd, and it's directed to the Board. So I assume the Board will take that up with the case.

We're going to talk about briefing schedules, but we're all going to get together -- Mr. Harsch, Mr. Grant, Mr. Petti and myself -- on Wednesday, December 5th via telephone and talk about the briefing schedule, and I'll get a written order out. I think that's about it.

I want to take a minute to thank the counselors for their professionalism. Above all I want to thank everybody for their civility and have a great upcoming holiday or holidays.

MR. HARSCH: On behalf of the District, I want to thank the Agency witnesses that made the trip up. Thank you very much.
(Which were all the proceedings had in the aforementioned cause this said date and time.)
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| 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 | I | 113:6115:7 |
| 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 | 253:20 | 142:14 156:3 |
| 231:11 232:4 | 91:20 | 203:12 205:10 | IEP 34:13 | 156:10 166:11 |
| 232:22,24 | hindered 80:1 | 205:13,16,22 | IEPA 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 | 43:5 45:5,10 | 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 | 47:2 48:14 | 191:16,21 |
| 259:22 264:16 | history 32:23 | 252:13 257:6 | 49:10 90:2 | 201:14 202:23 |


| 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 | 52:699:5,12 |
| impact 33:7 | inch 48:12 | 95:8 | induce 48:16 | 122:6134:19 |
| 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 | 92:193:16 | 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 | 105:10 118:18 | injurious 136:5 |
| implying 176:7 | 158:5 172:7 | increases 116:23 | 128:16 142:6 | 136:24 137:23 |
| important | 197:12,15 | 148:7 | 143:1,3,7,9 | 139:22 140:14 |
| 108:14 116:20 | 198:11 264:14 | incurring | 145:13,14 | inlets 57:7 |
| 119:23 158:23 | includes 7:6 | 158:24 | 146:1,12 148:1 | innocuous 96:10 |
| 223:13 | 31:6 33:1 58:6 | independent | 148:8 149:11 | innovative |
| imported 100:23 | 88:21 97:22 | 137:20 185:13 | 156:18 157:2,3 | 101:10 |
| importing 101:6 | 107:24 113:6 | Indiana 20:18 | 157:22 160:19 | inorganic |
| 129:18 | 160:11,19 | 20:19 191:5 | 209:14 244:21 | 122:13 262:1 |
| imposed 125:24 | including 12:14 | 194:7 199:6,8 | 246:4 | 262:12 264:2 |
| impossible 41:5 | 31:14 32:2 | 205:23 | infinite 256:10 | inorganics 178:5 |
| impoundment | 35:15 36:19 | indicate 255:4 | inflow 32:4 | 263:9 |
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| inquiry 193:17 | interesting | issuance 76:4 | 62:13 67:13 | 216:19 218:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| install 28:17 | 124:10 138:3 | issue 9:8 27:17 | 76:14,16 99:14 | 220:22 223:14 |
| 139:7 171:6 | intermingled | 36:6,13 42:10 | 122:16 126:2,6 | 227:7 239:10 |
| 219:24 | 43:7 | 61:6 62:10 | 126:8 129:9 | 239:11 243:3 |
| installation | internal 91:5 | 84:24 85:6 | 130:11 134:3 | 244:18 249:1 |
| 28:18 29:1 | interpret 136:11 | 98:20 129:3,12 | 135:15 139:14 | 250:15,18 |
| 124:5 166:16 | interpretation | 135:11 139:9 | 150:20 159:20 | 259:17 |
| 167:10 | 10:16 127:8,10 | 153:5,6,18,22 | 159:20 177:13 | knowledge |
| installed 79:14 | 127:12 129:12 | 180:17 203:12 | 177:24 197:3 | 49:14 58:18 |
| 98:1,7 116:9 | 135:20 | 203:18 219:14 | 198:23 203:7 | 60:8 64:17,22 |
| 142:13 192:8 | interpreted | 225:10 229:7,8 | 203:13,14 | 69:11 74:14 |
| installer 43:11 | 207:9 | issued 76:8 78:6 | 206:23 207:6 | 168:13 175:13 |
| instance 207:11 | interrelations... | 93:24 123:20 | 207:18 254:8 | 194:15 202:7 |
| instantaneous | 147:19 | 131:4 | 260:9,10 263:4 | 209:15 230:14 |
| 104:4 | introduce 5:24 | issues 5:20 |  | 243:12 |
| Institute 113:12 | 13:23 84:6 | 36:22 38:4 | K | known 57:4 |
| insufficient 81:4 | introduced 27:8 | 53:19 67:22 | Kansas 74:22 | 204:19 223:11 |
| intakes 57:8 | 73:21 189:9 | 134:4 | keep 54:8 67:2 | 262:12 |
| integrator | introduction | issuing 10:2 | 109:13 168:7 | knows 253:6 |
| 147:17 | 21:15 144:15 | 36:19 98:19 | 170:13 181:16 |  |
| integrity 95:4 | intrusion 37:4 | 131:8 180:12 | 261:10 | L |
| intend 13:23 | intrusions 66:8 | it'd 209:6,7 | Keller 46:22 | L 30:22 |
| 20:4 205:4 | invested 101:16 | item 94:8 263:8 | 115:5,9 120:22 | lack 85:11 99:21 |
| mitended 24:24 | investment | items 60:11,13 | 121:10, 19 | 99:21 134:23 |
| 40:22,22 133:1 | 248:22 | 60:14 | 178:3 212:19 | 159:14 251:15 |
| 165:14,17 | involve 102:12 |  | Kenosha 89:9 | lagoon 96:20,22 |
| 199:6 236:8 | involved 5:22 | J | key 126:7 | 96:24 105:21 |
| 237:15 | 32:14 76:3 | J 2:12 88:1,12 | 129:12 180:21 | 132:4 188:11 |
| intending | 77:7 85:22,24 | James 3:10 | kick 139:3 | 198:5 241:14 |
| 202:17 | 89:11 102:3 | 11:24 12:5 | kind 17:3 64:4 | 241:14,15 |
| intense 90:11 | 113:22 166:13 | 16:4 33:7 | 163:10 167:18 | lagoons 94:22 |
| 115:20 | 181:4 191:15 | 112:1,8,19 | 255:22 | 96:2 132:2 |
| intensively | 192:1 231:21 | 205:16 252:13 | Kishwaukee | 173:11,13,16 |
| 178:10 263:13 | 231:23 241:20 | jeopardy 116:21 | 35:22 | 188:2 189:3 |
| intent 92:22 | involvement | Jim 8:9 91:9 | know 10:1 12:22 | 239:17 240:12 |
| 132:5 164:1,3 | 166:19 196:3 | 203:12 | 14:1,6 17:1 | land 44:17 53:21 |
| 164:19 256:3 | 212:17 234:4 | joined 89:2 | 18:6,17 47:9 | 53:23 120:8 |
| intention 14:16 | involving | joining 89:5 | 60:7,9 66:8 | 127:21 142:4 |
| intentionally | 132:17 | joint 42:12 | 67:10 77:19 | 230:8,12,15 |
| 157:14 | ion 253:13 | Joliet 18:7 113:9 | 105:10 128:6 | 231:2,5,16,20 |
| interaction 43:9 | irrelevant 6:17 | judicial 13:1 | 169:2,14 | 232:1 |
| intercept 33:24 | 7:18 | 16:3 | 171:21 172:10 | landscape 43:23 |
| interceptor | irrespective | July 36:11 | 172:11,12 | language 81:16 |
| 38:16 144:16 | 225:11 227:18 | 262:24 | 177:10 181:11 | 190:2 250:9 |
| 181:18 182:4,7 | 227:21,24 | Jumping 67:6 | 186:3,3 187:18 | large 85:17 |
| interceptors | irrigate 26:6 | June 42:14 | 190:17 193:8 | 148:15 188:18 |
| 100:5 245:16 | irrigation | 45:19,21,21 | 194:5,8 196:1 | 223:21 |
| interested | 125:22 | 46:11,15,21 | 197:16 202:10 | larger 157:17 |
| 267:23 | isolated 53:24 | 47:1 48:20 | 215:20,21 | Larry 3:5 19:18 |
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| 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 |
| Iateral 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 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g } 9 3 : 2 2} 94: 1$ |
| 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:\% | line 38:8 59:18 | listing 59:13 | 64:18 75:3 |
| leakage 142:15 | 199:18 200:12 | 67:8 | iists 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 |
| 137:3 | 241:13 | 169:1,3,7 | Livable 41:23 | 29:8 169:10 |
| length 105:19 | levels 49:9 | 170:12,19 | lives 71:17 | 177:14,21 |
| lessening 104:12 | 116:19 153:16 | 192:4,7,10 | livestock 136:8 | 187:19 190:3 |
| let's 8:9 87:4 | liberal 157:14 | 195:1 198:18 | 137:3 173:8 | 199:13 222:3 |
| 111:17 193:18 | 157:18 | 200:21 201:9 | load 119:9 | 238:13 242:18 |
| 208:5,10,16,16 | lieu 101:6 | 201:10,13 | 244:22 | 261:15 |
| 210:22 238:21 | life 60:2 136:9 | 202:21,22 | loading 118:23 | looks 230:10 |
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| loss 94:24 95:21 | 90:21 91:2,3 | 95:4 101:5 | 246:3,20 247:1 | memorandums |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95:23 | 98:8 114:7,14 | 106:9 138:15 | 256:19 263:24 | 203:11 |
| lost 55:13 | 123:15 124:22 | 164:16 182:16 | meaning 162:16 | memory 78:23 |
| 183:22 262:16 | 130:12 140:6 | 183:10 204:3 | 207:10 | mention 180:1 |
| $\operatorname{lot} 9: 6,13,17,17$ | 220:5,8,9,20 | 219:9 | means 64:15 | mentioned |
| 10:14,15 11:4 | 221:6,9 | materials 41:1 | 97:15 133:23 | 87:10 237:20 |
| 14:5,5 64:14 | manager 19:19 | 95:13 100:19 | 182:11 186:14 | mentions 201:7 |
| 64:14 102:6 | 30:23 31:8 | 166:9 190:16 | 242:23 | merely 105:23 |
| 153:20 155:6 | 32:13,23 33:3 | 252:19 | measurable | met 61:22 94:7 |
| 163:3,5 167:9 | 33:18 75:9,10 | matter 1:12 5:5 | 119:16 | 120:18 149:18 |
| 171:19 | 75:12,17 76:1 | 7:11 8:3 10:8 | measured 120:6 | 187:12 190:9 |
| lots 66:5 115:24 | 84:8 86:2 | 79:2 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 |
| low 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 |
| 117:11 119:19 | 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 |
| M | 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 |
| M 6:2 | manholes 35:18 | 82:6 92:12 | 121:14,15 | 175:10 223:24 |
| Madiscai 98:23 | 38:9 52:15 | 110:22 111:5 | 122:2,15,18 | $\boldsymbol{m g d} 34: 17,19$ |
| main 100:5 | 59:20 | 133:5,9 144:23 | 123:19 126:5 | 35:1 39:13,15 |
| 181:18 | 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 |
| 174:4 | 132:19 | McFALL 3:5 | 26:18 45:5 | 152:13 253:7 |
| maintain 12:20 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { m a p }} 35: 4$ | 19:18,23 33:17 | 77:793:18 | migration 28:19 |
| 37:24 149:13 | March 45:12,14 | 50:16 56:4 | 127:24 128:14 | 218:21 235:13 |
| maintenance 40.2164 .19 | 120:17 | 60:7 70:20 | 131:3 132:23 | 235:15,18 |
| $40: 2164: 19$ 75.14 .1582 .12 | Marcia 149:23 | 73:1,4,9,11 | 165:11 185:23 | mile 48:13 |
| 75:14,15 82:12 | 150:10 151:19 | 78:13 84:5 | 190:11 196:9 | 142:16,20 |
| 174:10 | 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 71:5 107:9 190:16 | 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 |
| $\boldsymbol{m a n} 262: 12$ | 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 $10: 432: 8$ | master 113:1 | 194:11 199:2 | 254:11,13 | 151:7,16 |
| $10: 4$ <br> 48.1588 <br> 17 | 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 |


| 44:5 48:11 | misstate 177:11 | 246:14 255:10 | native 43:23 | neighboring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56:1 69:1,13 | misstating 65:14 | 260:22 262:10 | 92:14 93:4 | 49:7 |
| 70:8,16 71:13 | 84:14 | monitors 126:24 | 100:18 | neither 96:2 |
| 71:16 72:9 | 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 | $\boldsymbol{m o o t} 139: 19$ | 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 |
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| 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 |


| 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 |
| S | 265:17 | 96:4,6,22 97:6 | seepage 94:24 | services 38:7,8 |
| S | sc | 107:3 121:1,16 | 95:21,22 | 59:18,19 91:3 |
| S | 14 | 121:16 124:24 | seldom-seen | serving 88:23 |
| saf | 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 |
| 263:2 264:1 | 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 |
| - $36: 537: 3.48: 6$ | 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 |
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| 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 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }} 35: 141: 10$ | 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 |
| 9/: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 | standpoint | 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 | 55:2,6,18 57:4 |
| 72:1 103:22 | 42:24 48:13 | 65:2 73:9 | 102:17 127:5 | 57:7,8,24 58:3 |
| §peculative 5z: 1 | 63:16,23 64:1 | 74:21 87:23 | 225:21:227:14 | 58:7,21,23 |
| 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 | 79:190:11 |
| 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 |


| 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 59:14 |
| stuff 11:5 13:19 | suggested 28:16 | 160:23 167:21 | 35:15,16,21,23 | 97:9 108:20 |
| 23:4 60:12 | 120:23 237:23 | 167:24 169:20 | 37:2,15,21,22 | 155:1,4 219:15 |
| sub-consultant | suitable 99:24 | 177:5 180:5 | 38:1,16 39:4 | 226:3 267:18 |
| 110:2 | 126:17 | 183:24 205:12 | 43:11 48:10 | takes 14:4 |
| sub-consultants | Suite 2:5 | 215:2 223:14 | 51:1 52:14 | talk 65:23 |
| 33:5 91:4 | suited 33:19 | 256:19 257:13 | 57:1,3,9,12,14 | 155:11 265:13 |
| subject 24:21 | sulfates 123:1 | 257:18 259:5 | 57:20 59:3,4 | 265:17 |
| 27:22 97:11 | sum 166:18 | 263:6 | 61:3,4 65:10 | talked 8:14 |
| 131:18 188:14 | summaries 99:6 | surface 128:17 | 65:19,20 66:3 | 14:19 173:7 |
| 243:21 | summarize | 156:9 236:22 | 66:3 83:14,20 | 202:24 |
| submergence | 114:21 150:21 | 241:13 258:22 | 90:7 97:3 | talking 20:22 |
| 149:8 | summarized | surprise 209:18 | 104:15 106:22 | 63:3,10,12,16 |
| subuit 18:11 | 121:23 120:8 | surprises 269.21 | 115:17 110.5 | 63:17,18 |
| 158:13 | summarizing | 210:2 | 131:16 168:12 | 145:22 171:24 |
| submittal 45:6 | 99:2 | surprisingly | 174:2,3,16 | 172:17 173:1 |
| 98:23 203:7,14 | summary 98:24 | 116:12 | 176:20 191:5 | 173:13,15,17 |
| 206:23 | 99:3,7 | survive 108:2,6 | 191:20 198:18 | 173:20 174:8 |
| submittals | summer 115:4 | 108:7 | 199:9 200:18 | 177:2 183:13 |
| 150:13 228:6 | 153:4,19 | Susan 267:5 | 232:11 244:20 | 183:15 199:15 |
| submitted 8:6 | 244:13 | 268:7 | 245:2,23 246:1 | 207:24 208:2 |
| 11:24 17:23 | sump 144:21 | suspect $256: 23$ | 246:11,15 | 208:19 221:1 |
| 26:17 27:5 | 145:4 | suspended 49:5 | systems 32:8 | 227:5 228:24 |
| 77:14 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 | 41:17 44:9 | 142:4,5,6 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a n k }} 130: 16$ |
| 147:20 184:21 | supervisor 31:9 | 63:14,20 64:6 | 155:17 157:8 | 140:18 171:17 |
| 185:12 | 196:5 | 92:23 100:14 | 249:23 | 254:5 |
| subsection | supplement 9:3 | 100:21 101:10 |  | tasked 91:9,22 |
| 261:16 | 265:9 | 114:6 167:5 | T | team 33:1 89:20 |
| subsequent | supplies 97:11 | sustained 82:7 | T 4:2 | 90:6,13,13,15 |
| 122:15 191:3 | 140:11 212:12 | swear 211:5 | T-A-C-O 256:5 | 91:9,21 108:10 |
| subsequently | 229:18 | swimming | tab 180:5 | 109:21 114:9 |
| 28:11 | supply $126: 17$ | 237:13 | table 100:1 | 114:16 115:16 |
| subside 145:9 | 231:24 258:24 | sworn 29:22 | 254:16 | 115:22 116:8 |
| subsides 145:7 | 260:4 | 30:3 73:3,6 | TACO 256:4 | 120:18 124:14 |
| 164:20 | support 15:18 | 87:13,16 | take 6:20,20 | technical $32: 7$ |
| substantial 28:7 | 47:4 129:2 | 111:22 112:3 | 13:1 18:3 20:7 | 64:22 91:13 |


| 94:3,5 131:20 | test 178:5 244:1 | 88:6,8,11 | 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 | 234:10 238:9 |
| 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 | 253:6 255:9 |
| 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 | 265:9,18 |
| 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 |
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| 205:8,11,14,17 | wouldn't 103:21 | $262: 13,16$ $263: 24264: 1$ | $142: 18 \text { 175:1 }$ | 126:5 135:18 |
| 210:11 211:4,7 | 177:7 189:20 | $263: 24264: 1$ years 31:6,8,12 | 10-year 25:5 | 141:7 |
| 211:10 230:21 | 243:14 258:8 | years $31: 6,8,12$ $31: 1835: 21$ | $34: 1438: 17$ | 169 218:3 |
| 231:13 232:6 | write 84:18 | $31: 1835: 21$ $36: 6,938 \cdot 2$ | $39: 2,12,23$ | 16th 2:14 |
| 233:2,4,8,12 | writer 262:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 6,938: 2 \\ & 39: 1062: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $55: 278: 21$ | 17 103:1 |
| 250:15 251:22 | writing 191:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 1062: 12 \\ & 66: 15,1875: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 278: 21 \\ & 79: 192: 2,15 \end{aligned}$ | 17,000 38:7 |
| 252:11,14 | written 7:4,8 | 66:15,18 75:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 192: 2,15 \\ & 116: 517: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $170059: 18$ |
| 267:9,9 268:1 | 10:15 12:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 5,888: 22 \\ & 92: 1 \quad 102: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $116: 5117: 24$ $\mathbf{1 0 0} 23: 766: 18$ | 174 135:18 |
| witnesses 14:17 | 16:5,10,12 | $92: 1102: 15$ $113 \cdot 711.14$ | $71: 17 \quad 152: 11$ | 179 150:3 |
| 21:18 153:24 | 20:2 56:22 | $113: 7,11,14,21$ $117 \cdot 1921$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 17152: 11 \\ & 152: 13 \text { 236:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 18-person 32:14 |
| 210:14 237:22 | 65:6 67:7 74:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 19,21 \\ & 133: 8234: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 13236: 14 \\ & 236: 15,18 \end{aligned}$ | 1813:11 |


| 183 45:18 | 42:6 45:12,14 | 25-million 92:13 | 370.110 96:4 | $480198: 13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1843:15 | 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 |
| $1912: 5$ | 126:2,4,8 | 251 3:16 | 134:20 175:1 | $54: 942: 14$ |
| 191735:9 | 129:10 130:11 | $2523: 13$ | 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 |
| 1953:19 | 135:17 138:22 | $26138: 22$ | 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 |
| 197631:2 | 254:8,11 263:4 | $2777: 15$ | 370.932(d)(2)(... | 117:19,21 |
| 1979 112:22 | 2012 1:14 8:4 | 2846:11,15 | 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 | $500120: 7$ |
| 1990s 98:7 | 144:8 180:7 | $28.1125: 3$ | 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 | $2024: 5$ | 47:1 87:9 | 180:10,12 | $563: 4$ |
| 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 |
| 2 | 205 3:12 | 159:20 177:24 | 390.930(c)(2) | 5th 76:16 265:16 |
| 229.14 30:9 | 2673:12 | 267:10 260:9 |  |  |
| 45:10 48:11 | 20th 42:10 | 260:10 262:24 | 3rd 45:12 | 6 |
| 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 | 44:859:12 | 241:24 242:4 |
| $2.356: 1$ | 222 3:22 |  | 73:24 74:5,5 | 60 209:2 |
| $2.4142: 23143: 3$ | 230,000 35:11 | 3 | 77:24 78:2 | 600 179:12 |
| 143:8,18 | 233 3:16 | 3 23:19 29:16,16 | 104:24 139:14 | 60602 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 | $62010: 17,22$ |
| 20-foot 97:24 | 24-hour 34:14 | 241:17 263:6 | $4034: 637: 18$ | 12:11,23 13:2 |
| 200 3:19 37:7 | 39:2,12,23 | $3.545137: 12$ | 43:15 80:14,15 | 17:2,15 18:5 |
| 2002 34:12 | 92:2,15 162:13 | $303: 366: 15$ | 41 133:18 | 122:24 138:19 |
| 38:13 76:15,17 | 24,000 35:17 | 119:6 178:9 | 415 131:7 | 179:8,10,12,15 |
| 77:15 | 100:24 | 208:6,22,23 | 180:11 | 179:15 180:1 |
| 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 | 256:15 |
| 2006 38:20 | $2463: 17$ | $309.241190: 7$ | 132:21 | 620.240(e) |
| 123:20 | 25 56:2,3 92:9 | $3135: 18$ | $440198: 13$ | 124:24 |
| $2008123: 4$ | 103:1,4 118:1 | 312 2:7,16 | 45 201:8 | $\mathbf{6 2 0 . 2 5 0 ~ 1 2 4 : 2 4 ~}$ |
| 2009 42:16 | 122:4 130:5 | 33 113:21 | $4835: 3$ 39:23 | $\mathbf{6 2 0 . 2 6 0 ~ 1 2 5 : 3 ~}$ |
| 2010 42:14 | 139:12 141:12 | 209:11 | 92:20 133:10 | $620.301122: 3$ |
| 48:20 62:13 | 149:18 208:7 | $35118: 9$ 122:2,5 | 149:8 156:21 | $620.505122: 5$ |
| 90:4 115:4,13 | 208:21 225:13 | 124:23 125:2 | 159:12 162:6 | 628 9:21 |
| 2011 9:9 36:11 | 255:6,21,23 | 131:16 179:11 | 48-hour 25:16 | 65.4 92:7,13 |
| 36:15 41:24 | 25-foot 109:1 | 370 10:5 96:6 | 207:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65.4-million-g... } \\ & 38: 24 \end{aligned}$ |



