BEFORE THE

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:

Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code

Part 214, Sulfur Limitations,

Part 217, Nitrogen Oxides

Emissions, and Part 225,

Control of Emissions from Large

Combustion Sources.

)

DOCKET R 15-21

(Rulemaking-Air)

Public hearing held, pursuant to notice, on Wednesday, July 8, 2015, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. at 1021 N. Grand Avenue East, Springfield, Illinois, before DANIEL ROBERTSON, duly appointed Hearing Officer.

L.A. REPORTING SERVICE (312)419-9292

REPORTER: LAUREL A. PATKES, CSR #084-001340

```
Page 2
 1
     BOARD MEMBERS:
 2.
         DEANNA GLOSSER, Chairman
         JENNIFER A. BURKE, Presiding Board Member
 3
         CARRIE ZALEWSKI
         JERRY O'LEARY
 4
         JERRY KEENAN
 5
         JASON JAMES, Board Attorney
 6
     BOARD'S TECHNICAL UNIT:
 7
         ANAND RAO
 8
         ALISA LIU
 9
     APPEARANCES:
10
         DANA VETTERHOFFER
11
         IEPA Assistant Counsel
         1021 N. Grand Avenue East
         Springfield, Illinois
12
         (217)782-5544
13
         Dana. Vetterhoffer@illinois.gov
14
                         appearing on behalf of IEPA;
15
         ABBY ALLGIRE
         Legal Counsel
16
         215 E. Adams Street
         Springfield, Illinois 62701
         (217)522-5512
17
         aallgire@ierg.org
18
                         appearing on behalf of Illinois
                         Environmental Regulatory Group;
19
20
         SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
         STEPHEN J. BONEBRAKE
21
         6600 Sears Tower
         Chicago, Illinois
22
         (312)258-5646
         sbonebrake@schiffhardin.com
23
                         appearing on behalf of Midwest
24
                         Generation.
```

•		Page 3
1	EPA STAFF:	
2	DAVID BLOOMBERG RORY DAVIS	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

,			Page 4
1	INDEX		
2	WITHING C		DAGE
3	WITNESS		PAGE
4	DAVID BLOOMBERG EXAMINATION BY:		
5	Ms. Vetterhoffer Mr. Bonebrake		15 29
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS BY:		4.0
7	BOB JORGENSEN CHRIS KRUSA		43 45
8	VIRGINIA WOULFE-BEILE FAITH BUGEL		47 48
9	JOYCE BLUMENSHINE SUSAN MURRAY		55 60
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17	EXHIBITS		
18		MARKED	ADMITTED
19	Agency Exhibit A Agency Exhibit B	10 13	10 13
20	Agency Exhibit C	13	13
21			
22			
23			
24			

	Page 5
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Good
3	morning, everyone.
4	My name is Daniel Robertson,
5	and I have been appointed by the Board to serve as
6	the hearing officer in this proceeding entitled In
7	the Matter of Amendments to 35 Illinois
8	Administrative Code Part 214, Sulfur Limitations,
9	Part 217, Nitrogen Oxides Emissions, and Part 225,
10	Control of Emissions from Large Combustion Sources.
11	This proceeding is listed as
12	R15-21 in the Board's docket.
13	With me today to my right is
14	the presiding board member, Jennifer Burke, and next
15	to her we have members of the Board's Technical Unit
16	Anand Rao and Alisa Liu, and also with us today to
17	my left we have the Board's Chairman, Deanna
18	Glosser.
19	Next to her, we have Board
20	Member Carrie Zalewski, Board Member Jerry O'Leary,
21	Board Member Jerry Keenan, and also an attorney for
22	the Board, Jason James.
23	First, thank you everyone for
24	coming out today. It looks like we have quite a

July 8, 2015

Page 6 1 sizeable crowd. We appreciate you all taking the 2 time out of your day to come and be a part of this 3 proceeding. 4 This rulemaking was filed 5 pursuant to Sections 4, 10, 27, 28 and 28.2 of the 6 Environmental Protection Act. 7 On May 7th, the Board granted 8 the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's 9 motion for expedited review and proceeded to first notice without substantive comments on the merits of 10 11 the proposal. 12 This is the first of three 13 public hearings that the Board will hold. 14 The second will take place in 15 Joliet on July 29th, and the third will take place 16 in Pekin on August 4th. 17 All of this information is 18 also available on the Board's website at any time. 19 The purpose of today's hearing 20 is to hear testimony from the proponent, the 2.1 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. 22 The Agency was the only one 23 that prefiled testimony for today. However, the 24 Board and the Illinois Environmental Regulatory

July 8, 2015

Page 7

Group also filed questions for the Agency, and yesterday afternoon, the Agency did file three documents.

2.0

2.1

They filed responses to IERG's prefiled questions, responses to the Board questions, and also a second motion to amend the proposal, and all of these, for anyone interested, we do have copies on the desk by the door. Please help yourself.

During the hearing I ask that you please note any question asked by a board member or staff is intended to help build a complete record for the Board's decision and not intended to express any preconceived notion or bias.

Also today, anyone who did not prefile testimony or questions will still be allowed to offer either with time permitting.

Likewise, any members of the public who wish to speak on the record will be given an opportunity to offer public comment later, and if you do not wish to offer a public comment, I mean, if you do not wish to speak today but wish to offer a public comment, you can also file a written comment with the Board.

So today we will begin with

testimony from the Agency followed by prefiled questions of IERG and the Board.

2.1

At that point, anyone else who wishes to specifically ask questions of the Agency will then be given the opportunity to do so, and once the Agency has completed testifying, anyone else who wishes to testify will also be allowed to, and once testimony is complete, time will be provided for anyone who wishes to offer a public comment on the record, and we do have sign-up sheets on, again, the table by the door for anyone who wishes to sign up to either testify or offer public comment. We'll begin with the people who sign up, and then anyone else in the room will still be allowed to speak afterwards.

Can everyone hear me okay in the back? Just checking. Okay. Thank you.

Giving testimony, I just ask if you wish to ask a question, please put your hand up and just wait to be acknowledged, and once acknowledged, if you can state your name and if you represent anyone before beginning your question.

Also, please speak loudly and

July 8, 2015

Page 9 1 clearly so that the court reporter is able to get 2 down everything that you have to say. 3 Before we start, are there any 4 questions just on any of the procedural matters? 5 Seeing none, would any members 6 of the Board like to make any opening statements? 7 Seeing no statements, at this 8 point, I'd like to ask the Agency to please introduce itself and its witnesses for the record. 9 10 Thank you. 11 MS. VETTERHOFFER: Good morning. 12 My name is Dana Vetterhoffer, and I'm assistant counsel for the Illinois Environmental Protection 13 14 Agency. 15 With me today to my left are 16 David Bloomberg who is the manager of the Air 17 Quality Planning Section in the Illinois EPA's 18 Bureau of Air, Rory Davis who is an environmental 19 protection engineer in the Air Quality Planning 2.0 Section, and Jeff Sprague who is the Modeling Unit 2.1 Manager in the Air Quality Planning Section. 22 To my right is Jackie Sims who 23 is the Regulatory Unit Manager in the Air Quality 24 Planning Section.

July 8, 2015

Page 10 1 Mr. Bloomberg, Mr. Davis and 2 Mr. Spraque are available today to answer questions 3 regarding the Agency's rulemaking proposal which is intended to control emissions of sulfur dioxide in 4 5 and around areas designated as nonattainment with 6 respect to the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient 7 Air Quality Standard. 8 Before proceeding with 9 questions, I'd like to move that Rory Davis's 10 prefiled testimony be entered into the record as an 11 exhibit as if read. 12 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: 13 there any objections to the motion? Seeing no objections at this 14 15 time, I'm going to enter the prefiled testimony of 16 Rory Davis as Agency Exhibit A to this proceeding. 17 (Whereupon Agency Exhibit A was marked for identification as of 18 19 this date.) 2.0 (Whereupon Agency Exhibit A was 2.1 admitted into evidence at this 22 time.) 23 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Would 24 the Agency like to make any opening statements at

	Page 11
1	this time?
2	MS. VETTERHOFFER: No, not at this
3	time. Thank you.
4	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: And is
5	there anyone else that would like to introduce
6	themselves at this point for the record?
7	Anyone else who may want to
8	make an opening statement?
9	Seeing none, we'll now move on
10	to testimony starting with the Agency so you may
11	proceed.
12	MS. VETTERHOFFER: I don't believe
13	any of the panel intended to give any statement, but
14	they are ready to answer any questions that anyone
15	might have, and because there might be one or more
16	that could answer the same question, it might be a
17	good idea to swear them in as a panel, and then the
18	appropriate person can answer.
19	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Would
20	the court reporter please swear in the witnesses?
21	(Whereupon the witnesses were
22	sworn by the reporter.)
23	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Did the
24	Agency wish to enter any of yesterday's findings as

•	Page 12
1	exhibits?
2	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Yes. The Agency
3	wishes to enter both its responses to IERG's
4	prefiled questions, the Illinois Environmental
5	Regulatory Group.
6	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Would
7	you mind trying to speak up a little bit louder for
8	the people in the back?
9	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Sure.
10	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank
11	you.
12	MS. VETTERHOFFER:
13	We'd like to move as an
14	Exhibit our responses to the Illinois Environmental
15	Regulatory Group's prefiled questions and the
16	Agency's responses to the Board's prefiled
17	questions.
18	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Are
19	there any objections to the Agency's motion?
20	Seeing none, do you have
21	copies?
22	And I again note there are
23	copies of these on the table in the back there.
24	MS. VETTERHOFFER: I will most

	Page 13
1	likely have to get a copy off the back table also.
2	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Okay.
3	(Whereupon Ms. Vetterhoffer
4	handed a document to the Hearing
5	Officer.)
6	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: At this
7	point, I will make the Agency's responses to IERG's
8	prefiled questions as Agency Exhibit B.
9	(Whereupon Agency Exhibit B was
10	marked for identification as of
11	this date.)
12	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: And I
13	will make the Agency's responses to the Board's
14	prefiled questions as Agency Exhibit C.
15	(Whereupon Agency Exhibit C was
16	marked for identification as of
17	this date.)
18	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: And
19	copies of these are also available on the Board's
20	website.
21	(Whereupon Agency Exhibits B and
22	C were admitted into evidence at
23	this time.)
24	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: At this

	Page 14
1	time, I'd like to move to IERG and see if you had
2	any follow-up questions that you would like to ask.
3	MS. ALLGIRE: Good morning, Hearing
4	Officer Robertson, Chairman Glosser, and Presiding
5	Board Member Burke. I'm Abby Allgire with the
6	Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group.
7	Thank you for the opportunity
8	to provide questions and follow-up questions.
9	Just to ask in advance, will
10	the Agency witnesses be available at the next
11	hearings for more questions?
12	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Yes;
13	Mr. Bloomberg will be and Mr. Davis will be.
14	MS. ALLGIRE: Okay. Thank you.
15	And thank you to the Agency
16	for filing your answers to our questions in advance.
17	(Mr. Bloomberg will be answering
18	the majority of the questions so
19	he will be given the Answer
20	symbol, and when another staff
21	member needs to answer, his name
22	will be filled in.)
23	
24	

Page 15 1 DAVID BLOOMBERG 2 called as a witness herein, having been previously 3 sworn on his oath, was examined and testified as follows: 4 5 6 EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. VETTERHOFFER: 8 Starting with question 4, there was a Q. Part A and B. 9 To follow up with that, were there 10 compliance measures in place prior to this rule 11 requiring records like these to be kept? 12 Α. I'm not sure off the top of my head. 13 I can't recall any, but I would need to look at the 14 rules to double check. 15 There might have been federal 16 requirements that I just don't know right now. 17 Q. Okay. Could you have maybe an answer 18 for that then at the next hearing for us? 19 Α. Yes, or we will respond in writing 2.0 before then. 2.1 0. Great. Thank you. 22 And also, to follow up with 23 that, so if a facility has a 100-gallon tank and the 24 only record in their possession indicates that they

2.1

Page 16

received or they purchased 90 gallons in the last few years that are for sure at the ultralow sulfur diesel fuel, would that be indicative of compliance even though there could be ten gallons that maybe aren't in there or that we're unaware of?

- A. The recordkeeping requirement begins

 January 1, 2017, so it's not clear to me that should

 an inspector visit such a source, they would even

 necessarily look at the older, but if it were new,

 then the inspector would look at that and, you know,

 base their compliance determination on the available

 records.
- Q. So the inspector is only going to look for records that are in their possession specifically as of January 1, 2017, anything that they might have prior?
- A. I can't say specifically what an inspector will look for.

In my experience, you know, an inspector will look at available credible evidence, but what the rule requires is that they monitor their compliance using, or demonstrate it, using the records of the fuel purchase.

Q. Okay. Let's move on to question 7.

Page 17 1 So to follow up with the answers 2 you already provided, were the continuous emissions 3 monitors an option for compliance when the 1972 rule 4 was promulgated? 5 I don't know. Α. I'm not sure when 6 sulfur dioxides CEMS became in common use. 7 Different types of CEMS have come into being or come 8 into common use at different timeframes, and I just don't know. 9 10 Okay. Could you also file, you know, Ο. either submit an answer or let us know an answer for 11 12 that at the next hearing? 13 Α. We'll see what we can find out. 14 Q. Okay. Thank you. 15 Do you know of other test methods that were used when the rule was proposed in 16 17 1972? 18 Α. I do not. 19 So for our purposes, the only thing 2.0 we for sure know was used at that time was the stack 2.1 test? 22 I can't say that I for sure know Α. 23 I would say it's probable, but that's the 24 best I can give you.

	Page 18
1	Q. Moving on to question 8, has the
2	Agency considered that some facilities have CEMS
3	calibrated to a more stringent standard?
4	A. The Agency has been made aware of
5	that. The Agency has not been provided with
6	specific evidence that this would bias a CEMS
7	reading in any way.
8	Q. So if a facility with the continuous
9	emissions monitors has the CEMS calibrated to
10	determine compliance with the more stringent SO2
11	standard or SO2 limit, how would the Agency
12	determine compliance in relation to the SO2
13	standard?
14	A. Again, we have not been provided
15	specific evidence that this would interfere with
16	determining compliance with the 2000 ppm level.
17	Q. Okay. We'll move on to question 9,
18	please.
19	So in regards to your response
20	to question 9, is it the case that the Agency must
21	approve all stack test plans used to establish
22	compliance with 214.301?
23	A. The Agency has the opportunity to
24	approve such stack test plans. It is not a mandate

that	the	Agency	approve	it.

2.1

Q. So in part of your response to question 9, you stated that a source could opt to perform a five-hour stack test, but that would not mean that compliance is determined on a 15-hour block average basis.

Wouldn't the Agency have to approve a stack test plan that proposed to perform three five-hour stack tests to show compliance with 214.301?

A. Again, we wouldn't have to approve it. The source is required to submit it to us. We review them as we can, and...

I'm sorry. Could you repeat the rest of the question?

- Q. Wouldn't the Agency have to approve a stack test plan that proposed to perform three five-hour stack tests to show compliance?
- A. So I answered most of it, but if a source had a good reason for doing it over a lengthy time period, then I doubt there would be a reason to object to it.
- Q. So has the Agency ever received such a proposal?

	Page 2
1	A. I don't know.
2	Q. So if the Agency doesn't submit a
3	formal approval of that plan but also doesn't submit
4	a formal objection, then is it considered approved?
5	A. No.
6	Q. So what would the procedure be there?
7	If you didn't submit a formal approval or a formal
8	objection for the plan, what would happen?
9	A. The source would be expected to
10	continue to do their stack test.
11	It is the source's
12	responsibility to perform the stack test properly
13	using the proper methods.
14	So, for example, if someone sent
15	us a plan and put something that went against the
16	regulations within that plan and the Agency didn't
17	notice it, that is not an excuse for the source to
18	go against the regulations and requirements.
19	Q. So then what would be the I guess
20	hour limit for the stack test that they would fall
21	back on at that point?
22	So if I'm not using my three
23	five-hour stack test since I haven't received a

formal approval, how many hours long would my stack

24

test be?

2.1

- A. It's a minimum of one hour. I am not specifically aware that there is a maximum, not anything that has come up at least to my level.
- Q. If it's a minimum of one hour, my five-hour stack test though would fall in that, correct?
- A. Yes. Five hours is more than one hour.
- Q. So if I submitted this three five-hour stack test plan and I haven't received an approval or a rejection so I follow three five-hour stack tests because that is more than one hour, are you able to then deny the results to that stack test since you didn't approve the five hours?
- A. The reasons for rejecting a stack test would include that it was done improperly.

So, for example, if you as a company decided you were going to do it for five hours because you knew that the first hour and a half and the last hour and a half of whatever process you were testing have much lower emissions, than the middle couple of hours, then it is possible we would reject that because the purpose of you

	Page 22
1	going five hours was basically to try and trick us,
2	and the idea of a stack test is to test at your
3	maximum usual operating conditions.
4	Q. So is the standard that the Agency is
5	proposing at 214.301 only to apply to maximum
6	operation?
7	A. We're not proposing a new standard in
8	214.301. That's an old standard.
9	Q. So does that old standard then only
10	apply to your maximum operations because I know you
11	said the test is for the maximum?
12	A. The standard is your I mean,
13	that's the requirement that you stay below that, so
14	certainly, if your maximum operations went over
15	that, you need to make changes.
16	Q. So is there a scenario in which you
17	could envision the Agency approving someone's plan
18	that was three five-hour stack tests?
19	A. I could imagine it, yes.
20	Q. I think that's all on that question
21	so we'll move to question 10.

The Agency responded to IERG's question 10(b) in part by stating USEPA's response acknowledges that a stack test, when properly

22

23

24

July 8, 2015

Page 23

performed, is still an adequate estimate for a unit's emissions rate, but USEPA did not indicate that a stack test is an appropriate method of determining compliance for units with CEMS.

2.1

Is it correct that the footnote IERG references in its question is in a section titled "Averaging Times for SO2 Emissions Limits" of a USEPA document referenced in the Agency's technical support document?

A. Yes, but it was talking about a different type of averaging. The type of averaging that we believe they were talking about there relates to modeling.

So, for example, there is one source in this rulemaking that has a 30-day average, and because of that in the modeling, we had to model at a significantly higher pound per hour emission rate to account for the fact that they were averaging.

It is our understanding that that footnote relates to a situation like that where someone may have asked USEPA, whether external or internal, if someone is doing three stack tests and averaging them, does that mean that whatever that

stack test emission rate is, it has to be bumped up for the modeling.

2.0

2.1

And so that was USEPA clarifying no, that is not the purpose of that type of averaging.

- Q. So the point of our question I guess, is it correct that the, I guess the USEPA in that document was not relating stack testing to CEMS?
- A. I do not believe they were trying to equate that.
- Q. Is it also correct that the footnote was appended to a sentence that states, "Therefore, as a general matter, the EPA would expect that any emission limit with an averaging time longer than one hour would need to reflect a downward adjustment to compensate for the loss of stringency inherent in applying a longer term average limit."

A. I don't know.

Q. In this context then, would you argue that USEPA's footnote is not about the suitability of stack test results over CEM results but instead conveys the message that the approximately three-hour average results from stack tests can be used in dispersion modeling runs as a one-hour

	Page 25
1	average as opposed to needing a downward adjustment
2	to compensate for the loss of stringency inherent in
3	applying a longer term average limit?
4	A. I believe what you said is the same
5	as what I said, I think.
6	Q. Then last is question 11.
7	After 11(c), is the Agency aware
8	of any instance where the 2000 ppm standard was the
9	basis for a modeled emission?
10	A. (By Mr. Sprague) The answer is yes,
11	but I can't cite you a specific example at this
12	time.
13	Q. Could you give us a specific example
14	to file in writing or bring to the next hearing?
15	A. (By Mr. Sprague) Yeah, we can track
16	that down for you.
17	Q. Thank you.
18	The Agency responded to IERG's
19	questions 11(d) and 11(e) in part by stating that
20	the 2000 ppm limit is a concentration limit and may
21	be more stringent than other applicable SO2
22	emissions limits.
23	Do you have an example of a
24	process where the 2000 ppm limit promulgated on

April 3, 1972 is more stringent than the other applicable state or federal SO2 limits?

2.1

- A. (Mr. Bloomberg answering again) The examples we were thinking of were trying to compare -- for example, if your permit has a monthly limit of SO2 and let's say that monthly limit is 30,000 pounds and something happens and you emit 20,000 pounds in one hour due to some sort of malfunction, emitting 20,000 pounds through a single stack is going to be higher than the 2000 ppm but you haven't exceeded your monthly limit, so it balances in that way.
- Q. So in your view, is it possible that a 2000 ppm sulfur dioxide concentration measured at maximum permitted operating capacity for a process could have a higher corresponding pound per hour emissions rate than a 2000 ppm sulfur dioxide emission rate measured at 50 percent capacity?

A. Could you repeat that?

Q. Is it possible that a 2000 ppm SO2 concentration measured at maximum permitted operating capacity for a process could have a higher corresponding pound per hour emissions rate than a 2000 ppm SO2 emission rate measured at 50 percent

capacity?

2.1

- A. I'm not sure where the capacity comes in, but because 2000 ppm is concentration-based, you can, if you're putting more air through, you can have two different sources both of which have 2000 ppm but one of which has a higher pound per hour limit or, I'm sorry, emission than the other.
- Q. So could the same source with a stack test at 2000 ppm measure differently than the same source using a CEM that has a lower rate on it or a lower standard?
 - A. I don't understand the question.
- Q. So for a stack test, if a source is operating at maximum, the 2000 ppm limit, could that same source, using their CEMS, be at 50 percent capacity and have different outcomes?
- A. I'm still not quite sure I understand the question but I'm going to take a shot at it.

The CEMS measures continuously, so it is certainly possible, since the CEMS is measuring in theory 24/7/52, that it will have a different reading at some given time than a particular one time stack test which is a snapshot.

I'm not sure if that answers

Page 28 1 your question. 2 Q. Okay. So could the concentration, 3 the pound per hour be higher? 4 Α. Pound per hour isn't concentration. 5 Well, okay. Q. 6 So could the pound per hour be 7 higher on a stack test that's running at the maximum 8 and falls at the 2000 ppm than the same source 9 running at 50 percent for a CEMS testing at 2000 10 ppm? 11 Α. It may be theoretically possible. 12 can't think of a situation like that. I can't say 13 it would never happen but I can't say it would. MS. ALLGIRE: 14 I think that's all 15 the follow-up questions we have. Thank you. 16 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank 17 you. 18 At this stage, does anyone 19 else have questions specifically for the Agency as 2.0 witnesses? 2.1 Go ahead. 22 MR. BONEBRAKE: Good morning, 23 Hearing Officer Robinson, Presiding Board Member 24 Burke and the rest of the board members and staff.

July 8, 2015

Page 29 1 My name is Steve Bonebrake, and I'm with the law 2 firm of Schiff Hardin. I represent the company 3 Midwest Generation. 4 I have just a couple follow-up 5 questions that relate to questions raised by the 6 IERG attorney. 7 8 EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. BONEBRAKE: 10 The first question relates to Section 214.301, Chairman, and there was some 11 12 discussion about this provision in the prior 13 questions and answers, and my question for IEPA was 14 simply, what was the purpose of adding the one-hour 15 period reference to that sentence? 16 Α. There's a combination of reasons. 17 For one, just to clarify because 18 the stack test methodology has a minimum one-hour 19 timeframe. So when people would ask, you know, 20 what's our averaging time, it related back to the 2.1 stack test in general.

And the second reason is that the 2010 sulfur dioxide standard is a one-hour standard.

22

23

24

Page 30 1 0. In a related question as far as stack 2 testing, let's assume a three-hour stack test, is it 3 the Agency's intent to compare the composite 4 three-hour average against the one-hour standard or 5 is each hour of the stack test to be compared 6 against the one-hour standard? 7 I need you to clarify the question. Α. 8 There would never be a single 9 three-hour stack test. There might be three 10 one-hour stack tests or more, or three three-hour 11 stack tests. 12 Q. Okay. 13 Α. So I wasn't sure what... 14 Q. Let's assume three three-hour stack 15 tests. 16 Α. Okay. 17 In that scenario, would the composite Q. 18 three-hour average from each stack test be compared 19 to the one-hour average or would each hour of the 20 stack test be compared against the one-hour average? 2.1 Α. It would be the composite. 22 For a facility using the CEMS, is Q. 23 each hour of the CEMS data compared against the 24 standard?

2.0

2.1

- Q. So does that effectively mean that CEMS yield a more stringent standard than a stack test?
- A. It would be a more accurate reading because CEMS are ongoing, as I said earlier, 24/7/52 in theory, but the standard itself is the same.
- Q. The standard itself is the same, but the averaging periods between the CEMS and the stack test could be different?
- A. (By Mr. Davis) I think to clarify, we're not comparing three one-hour test runs to three hours of a CEMS because a CEMS has every hour recorded.

When you start talking about stack test, the stack testing methods allow for a minimum of three one-hour test runs, okay? So you could have a greater length of time, say an hour and a half or two hours or five hours as a hypothetical. You could have four test runs.

So the number of test runs and the length of those test runs are set in order to have an adequate measure of what the emissions are from that source and not necessarily meant to be a

three-hour average of what those emissions are.

2.1

So the result of the stack test is what the Agency would assume are the emissions from that unit in, well, it's hours going backward, but in all the hours going backward, it's an adequate test for what we can assume the emissions were in the hours before the stack test because compliance is based on the stack test and not a number of hours from that test.

So our hypothetical of a greater number of hours just would point to -- you would think that a greater number of hours or a greater number of test runs would increase the accuracy of your test. So an increase in accuracy should not be equated with the loss of stringency if you were to have CEMS.

So if you did five hours of testing, we would think that was more accurate than three hours but not necessarily that a CEMS should then be allowed a five-hour average because they're not related in our opinion.

A. (By Mr. Bloomberg) Let me add to that. When he said, you know, a five-hour average would be considered to be more accurate, that is

presuming a consistent emission rate.

2.1

In the example I gave earlier where a source had lower emissions at the beginning and the end, the Agency would frown upon trying to use a longer stack test to sneak in under the limit.

Q. I had another question pertaining to a different section of the SO2 rule proposal, and it's 214.603. It's again related to timing, and I would ask that someone from the Agency just describe for us what was meant by the reference to clock hour in the introductory sentence in 214.603.

HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Sir, could I ask that you speak up? People in the back can't hear the questions.

Thank you.

A. (Mr. Bloomberg answering again) A clock hour would be an hour on the clock, from 12 to 1, from 1 to 2.

So, for example, when it's referred to as a calendar day, it would be, you know, a specific day on the calendar.

Similarly, a clock hour would be a specific hour from the top of the hour to the end of the hour.

	Page 34				
1	Q. And let me present the hypothetical				
2	just to make sure I understand the answer.				
3	Let's say a unit were to start				
4	up at 11:50 a.m.				
5	In that case, would the pounds				
6	of emissions from 11:50 a.m. until noon be compared				
7	against the pound per hour standard?				
8	A. Yes.				
9	Q. And then the next full hour from noon				
10	to 1 would be comparing to pound per hour standard?				
11	A. Yes.				
12	Q. Thank you for that clarification.				
13	And then a general question for				
14	the Agency and I saw some related questions.				
15	Does the Agency have an				
16	understanding of the total number of sources in				
17	Illinois that would be regulated under the proposed				
18	SO2 rules at issue today?				
19	A. So you're asking not just the ones				
20	listed in 603 but also the fuel standard?				
21	Q. That's correct.				
22	A. The total number would be				
23	approximately those listed in Appendix A of the				
24	technical support document.				

	Page 35					
1	Q. And do you recall what that					
2	approximate number is, Mr. Bloomberg?					
3	A. I believe it's around 700.					
4	Q. So the Agency found it necessary and					
5	appropriate to regulate 700 some odd sources to make					
6	an adequate submittal to USEPA for attainment					
7	demonstrations, is that correct?					
8	A. For the attainment demonstration and					
9	for the other reasons discussed such as in some of					
10	our responses to the questions that we filed					
11	yesterday.					
12	MR. BONEBRAKE: I had a question					
13	relating to IEPA's answer to No. 28 of the Board's					
14	questions, and I didn't mean to preempt the Board's					
15	follow-up on its own question, so I could ask the					
16	question now or wait for whatever follow-up the					
17	Board staff may have.					
18	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: You can					
19	go ahead and ask the question now.					
20	Q. BY MR. BONEBRAKE: With respect to					
21	the answer to No. 28, I just wanted to make sure I					
22	understood correctly that the IEPA is currently					

assessing other areas in the State of Illinois for

potential additional requirements for SO2

23

24

att	aır	nmer	ነተጉ
all	аті	. 111110	ıu.

2.1

- A. We are currently assessing areas to determine whether we will recommend to USEPA that they be designated as nonattainment or not.
- Q. And how many areas are currently being assessed?
- A. (By Mr. Sprague) Five areas plus we'll be conferring with adjoining states on several power plants that they have in terms of the recommended attainment or nonattainment status for those areas.
- Q. And can you tell us which or identify for us, please, those five areas?
- A. (By Mr. Sprague) If I can recall from memory here, the Hennepin Power Station in Hennepin, the SIPCO Power Plant in Marion, the Joppa Steam Plant down in Joppa, the power plant over in -- oh, the Wood River Power Plant as well down in Alton or East Alton, and then in Jasper County...what's the name of it. I always forget this one. Oh, the Newton Power Plant in Jasper County.
- Q. And are those areas currently being assessed pursuant to the consent decree between

	Page 37
1	USEPA and the Sierra Club?
2	A. (By Mr. Sprague) Yes.
3	Q. And has USEPA dictated to the IEPA
4	that it make such assessments?
5	A. (Returning to Mr. Bloomberg
6	answering) I don't believe they told us
7	specifically we have to make the assessments, but if
8	we don't, they will.
9	Is that correct?
10	MR. SPRAGUE: Yeah.
11	Q. And has that communication been in
12	writing?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And is that writing publicly
15	available?
16	A. I believe so. I believe, if I'm not
17	mistaken, that the USEPA posted the letters on their
18	website at one time. I'm not a hundred percent
19	certain of that.
20	Q. When you say the USEPA website, do
21	you know specifically or more specifically what
22	website?
23	A. No.
24	Q. And IEPA has provided a summary of

the	timefr	ame	for	futi	ıre	anticipat	ted	designati	on
deci	sions	in	respo	nse	to	question	28,	right?	

A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. And does IEPA anticipate that in addition to the five areas that had been identified that it will assess other areas in the state as well for potential nonattainment designations?
- A. After the consent decree areas, then yes, there will be other areas based on the final data requirements rule when that comes out from the USEPA.
- Q. And do you have an understanding of when that rule may come out from USEPA?
- A. (By Mr. Sprague) Sometime later this year.
- Q. So do you have a sense of when that additional designation decision would be made beyond the five that you already identified?
- A. (Returning to Mr. Bloomberg answering) I think January 2017 is our understanding unless that changes for USEPA. We have to submit the new recommendations based on any further modeling.
 - Q. And IEPA's answer on page 16, and

it's the fourth bullet down following the January 2017 reference refers to new monitoring sites.

Do you see that, Mr. Bloomberg?

A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. Does IEPA plan new monitoring sites at this point in time?
- A. We do not. Any new monitoring would be organized by sources if they choose to go the monitoring route.

A little bit of background for those who may not know, there is the option for determining the new nonattainment areas of either using monitoring or using modeling.

What the Agency has told sources is that if they went to use monitoring to determine it, then they need to approach us, and they will need to pay for the monitors, and we will work together to ensure that the monitors are properly cited. That is an option.

One source has indicated that they may go that route. Nobody has committed that they will definitely go that route.

Q. And has USEPA communicated to IEPA that in the absence of additional monitoring sites

Page 40 1 that designation recommendations will need to be 2 made based upon modeling? 3 Α. Yes. 4 And Mr. Bloomberg, are you aware of Q. 5 any legal challenges to the use of modeling to make nonattainment designations? 6 7 I am not specifically aware of legal Α. 8 challenges. 9 I do know that there are some 10 companies outside the State of Illinois that have 11 made claims that in certain situations, the models 12 overestimate emissions. 13 I have not seen any 14 documentation or evidence of those claims. I am 15 just aware of them. 16 Thank you. I have MR. BONEBRAKE: 17 no further questions at this point. 18 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank 19 you. 2.0 Does anybody else have any 2.1 questions for the Agency's witnesses? 22 Seeing nobody, do any members 23 of the Board or Board's technical staff have any 24 questions?

	Page 41
1	MS. LIU: I guess I might just say
2	thank you very much for preparing the answers for
3	the hearing today.
4	MR. BLOOMBERG: You're welcome.
5	MR. RAO: I'd just like to let you
6	know we don't have any questions right now. It
7	looks like you've answered most of our questions,
8	but we're going to take another look at it, and if
9	we do have any, we'll send those questions to you
10	before the next hearing.
11	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Well,
12	seeing no more questions, thank you to the Agency
13	and its witnesses for your time today and
14	testifying.
15	Pardon me for a second while I
16	get the sheets in the back.
17	We have quite a few people
18	signed up for public comments but the testimony
19	sheet specifically is blank.
20	Before we get to public
21	comments, is there anyone else who wished to testify
22	today?
23	Seeing no one, let's just take
24	a quick ten-minute recess before we begin public

July 8, 2015

Page 42 1 comments. 2 It is 10:05. We'll be back at 3 10:15 and we'll begin public comments. Thank you all. 4 5 (Recess taken.) 6 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: 7 We're going back on the record. It is 10:17 or so. 8 We have completed testimony for the day, and we are 9 now going to move on to public comments. 10 I again note for the record we 11 have a number of people here. I thank you all for 12 coming in. 13 We're going to start with those who signed their names on the public comment 14 15 sheet. I apologize in advance. As you can hear, I 16 speak a bit funny. I might butcher the 17 pronunciation of your names. 18 After the people that have 19 signed up have spoken, we will then allow time for 20 any comments for anyone who has not signed up. 2.1 For the sake of the record, I 22 ask that when you offer public comment, if you can 23 step up to the podium over here on the right-hand 24 side and again just state your name, spell it if

2.1

Jorgensen.

July 8, 2015

Page 43

necessary, and if you are here on behalf of anyone, please state so too, and then just speak clearly and loudly so the room can hear you and also so that the court reporter can take down everything that you have to say.

So we'll begin with Bob

MR. JORGENSEN: I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'd like to thank the Board for taking public comment, something I always believe is very important to do.

Just very briefly, I do have health issues. I've had open heart surgery. I've had two valves replaced. I had a bypass. I have been in for two procedures to regulate the irregularities in my heart rhythm so I do have health issues that are related to pollution. Part of the pollution comes from these coal plants that we're talking about today.

I also wanted to say that I am the chairperson of East Peoria Green. I do live in a nonattainment area which is Tazewell County. I live in the City of East Peoria, and we're a group that works with the city on everything

July 8, 2015

Page 44

environmental.

2.1

things.

My problems are some things that other members have asked about already. I think we need exact dates. I think we need exact monitoring -- when are some of these different facilities going to put in pollution controls, what exactly are they going to do, what's going to be the first day that it's going to be monitored, instead of just having just a real nebulous, oh, yeah, we're going to get around to doing that. One of these days we'll be in attainment.

So I think we need exact

My other is with the 30-day averaging, you know, that seems crazy. If you're getting spikes like they said in the pollution, it's going to affect me. It's going to affect everybody if you take any number and average it out over 30 days, and my example would be that I'm on Coumadin for my heart problems. If I took all my medications and averaged them out over 30 days, that means I could take all of my monthly medications on one day and that it would average out over 30 days that I would have taken the right dosages, but of course

July 8, 2015

Page 45 1 I'd be dead from taking all my medications on one 2 day. 3 I just don't see that a 30-day 4 averaging is a good thing. I think it's harmful to 5 everyone's health as well as my own. So I thank you very much for the time to speak and your listening, 6 7 and thank you again. 8 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank 9 you, Mr. Jorgensen. 10 Next we have Phil Tool. 11 I'm going to waive my MR. TOOL: 12 comment for today. I'll see you later though. 13 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank 14 you. 15 Chris Krusa. 16 MR. KRUSA: I want to thank 17 Mr. Chairman and the Board for allowing us this 18 opportunity to give some comment. 19 My name is Chris Krusa. Last nem is K-r-u-s-a. 2.0 That's C-h-r-i-s. 2.1 My wife and I have been living 22 in Glen Carbon in Metro-East for the past several 23 I retired from the U.S. Maritime Administration, U.S. DOT in early 2006, and now I'm 24

2.0

2.1

July 8, 2015

Page 46

a member of the local Piasa Palisades Group of the Sierra Club, and I've been applying my expertise in dealing with critical emissions issues in Metro-East.

As a citizen of Metro-East, I know how important air quality standards are, and I'm here to request that you withhold approval of the proposed nonattainment plan for the one-hour Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards until the draft rule is strengthened in several areas.

I note EPA's website information that states, "Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2 (sulfur dioxide) ranging from five minutes to 24 hours with an array of adverse respiratory affects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms."

Air pollution, and in particular the high incidence of asthma-related illness reported in our area, is of great concern in the Metro-East area. We are dealing with emissions that come across the river from the Missouri side of the Mississippi and from our own coal-powered plant about 30 miles upriver.

	Page 47
1	This is a continuing problem
2	that needs to be addressed vigorously by our
3	designated state authorities, planners, and
4	legislators.
5	I thank you for allowing me to
6	comment.
7	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank
8	you.
9	Next we have Norm Brown.
10	MR. BROWN: I have no comments.
11	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Okay.
12	Thank you.
13	Next we have Virginia
14	Woulfe-Beile.
15	MS. WOULFE-BEILE: Good morning.
16	I'd like to thank the Illinois Pollution Control
17	Board for inviting our comments today.
18	My name is Virginia
19	Woulfe-Beile (W-o-u-l-f-e - B-e-i-l-e.)
20	Thanks again for inviting me
21	to speak, and I just want to say that I live in an
22	Illinois coal community also in the Metro-East in
23	the Alton area.
24	You know, as an Illinois

July 8, 2015

Page 48 1 citizen and just a citizen of the United States, I 2 think everyone deserves to breathe clean air. 3 follow the EPA air quality alerts, and I have 4 several family members that suffer from asthma, 5 COPD, and, you know, there are days when you can't 6 do anything outside or have any activities, and I 7 just think that it's very important for us to be 8 very aware of what is being emitted into the air and 9 what we are breathing into our lungs. 10 So at this time, I am just 11 here to request that you withhold the approval of 12 the proposed nonattainment plan for the one-hour 13 sulfur dioxide ambient air quality standards until 14 the draft rule is strengthened in several areas. 15 Thanks very much. HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: 16 Thank 17 you. 18 Next we have Faith Bugel. 19 MS. BUGEL: Good morning, members 2.0 of the Board, Hearing Officer. 2.1 My name is Faith Bugel; 22 F-a-i-t-h B-u-q-e-l, and I'm an attorney 23 representing the Sierra Club here today. We have 24 some comments, and I do have some questions in my

comments for the Agency, and we expect to follow up in writing with these questions as well.

2.1

regarding the 30-day average for Powerton. Similar to a previous commenter, Mr. Jorgensen, it strikes us as questionable how a 30-day average can be used as a limit for a short-term one-hour rule and how that 30-day average will protect against short-term one hour spikes of SO2.

I would ask that the Agency provide a further explanation, more detailed explanation as to how the 30-day average at 3,452 pounds per hour will prevent short-term one-hour spikes of SO2 that would exceed the standard, the National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

Second, regarding that, there was no justification included for why Powerton cannot meet a one-hour average while EPA guidance indicated that if a 30-day average is used, a justification as to why the source can't meet a one-hour average must be included, and, in fact, the only time that a 30-day average is appropriate is, in fact, where it's physically impossible for the source to meet a one-hour average.

July 8, 2015

Page 50

Considering that Midwest

2.1

Generation owns multiple coal plants in the State of Illinois, including the Will County plant, and the Will County plant can meet a one-hour average, we find it questionable that Powerton cannot meet a one-hour average.

In addition, there needs to be the appropriate conversion factor where a 30-day average is used instead, and we would ask the Agency to explain what conversion factor it used and why that conversion factor is appropriate.

By my own calculations...and I am a lawyer; I was told there would be no math...but by my own calculations, the Agency used 6,000 pounds per hour as what it modeled for Powerton's 30-day average.

My question would be, will the 30-day average allow spikes above 6,000 pounds per hour?

If the 30-day average of 3,452 pounds per hour does allow spikes above 6,000 pounds per hour, then those spikes need to be modeled, and we need that modeling to provide assurance that even with those spikes, the short-term one-hour standard

July 8, 2015

Page 51 1 will still be met. 2 Third, I would ask, there is a 3 fence line receptor. I believe it's in Column O of 4 the Pekin spreadsheet, and at that fence line 5 receptor, there is an impact of 196.2415 micrograms 6 per meter cubed which is right at the limit of 7 attainment. If with modeling of 6,000 pounds her 8 hour we have that impact right at the edge of 9 attainment at that fence line receptor, again, my question would be if the 30-day average allows 10 11 spikes above 6,000 pounds per hour, can the Agency 12 still demonstrate that with those spikes there will 13 not be an exceedance at the Pekin fence line 14 receptor in Column O of the spreadsheet. 15 Moving on, our next concern is 16 about the substitution of Will county for Joliet 5 17 in the multi-pollutant standard or the combined 18 pollutant standard. 19 First of all, I think my 2.0 question would be does this belong in this 2.1 rulemaking. Does this belong in the SO2 22 nonattainment SIP. 23 That agreement, that 24 regulation came about out of setting mercury

2.0

2.1

July 8, 2015

Page 52

standards for the State of Illinois and setting SO2 and NOx standards for the State of Illinois under the Clean Air Interstate Rulemaking, and those rulemakings seem to be neither here nor there in this rulemaking. Those were many years old, I believe eight years old at this point, and there was also an agreement in that rulemaking, and I know this Board has heard me talk about this before but I will repeat myself.

Our concern is that there was an agreement. That agreement allowed Midwest Generation leniency under the mercury rule in return for commitments for NOx and SO2. Midwest Gen has already availed itself, it has received that lenience, that more lenient schedule in return for NOx and SO2 commitments.

It seems like if Midwest Generation already received that benefit, it should hold up its end of the deal.

Its end of the deal included FGD, flue gas desulfurization. My understanding, it's meeting that commitment by dry sorbent injection, but it made a commitment to include flue gas desulfurization on every unit that it continued

2.0

2.1

July 8, 2015

Page 53

to operate except for Joliet 5 which could sometimes be known as Joliet Unit 6 even though that's very confusing as these numbers are, but it allowed an exception for Joliet 5.

The presumable reason, and again, I have searched the record, and I will assure you, I cannot find any documentation in writing of this, but the presumable reason for an exception for Joliet 5 is that it's one of the oldest in its fleet, that it's one of the least efficient units. It's operated less, so the presumable reason for it is that there was a limited life span for that unit, and then the rest of the fleet had a longer life span. It made sense that the rest of the fleet would require SO2 controls but that unit would not because of its limited life span.

Well, that time has come.

That's come to fruition. That unit's limited life span is leading to its requirement or conversion to natural gas in the near future. Therefore, it made sense that the FGD would not be required there but everywhere else.

Well, that was the reason for the exception. That does not seem to be a good

July 8, 2015

Page 54

reason to transfer the exception, so that's our concern.

2.1

I myself was part of the negotiations that lead to that deal. I feel like it is unfair, but, you know, maybe that's sort of a 6-year-old justification, but it does seem like we had a good faith deal and Midwest Gen is going back on that deal by unilaterally renegotiating it with the Agency at this time.

Finally, our last concern is about E.D. Edwards. E.D. Edwards has a permit. Its permit limit allows a certain level of SO2. Its actual operations, its actual pollution emissions under that permit are much lower, so what we're actually seeing with the new limit that's getting set under this rulemaking for E.D. Edwards is that that limit is above what its emissions in reality have been.

So what we are getting is not necessarily a reduction in fact in SO2 from Edwards, but we are only seeing a reduction on paper. Permit limit is being moved down. It's always been operating below that permit limit and will continue to operate below that permit limit.

July 8, 2015

Page 55 1 So our question for the Agency 2 is based on that understanding of where emissions 3 really have been in fact, how is the attainment for 4 Pekin, Tazewell County, going to be achieved if E.D. 5 Edwards, one of the biggest sources in the county, is making a reduction but making a reduction only on 6 7 paper and not in reality of its SO2 emissions. I know this is a serious 8 9 concern for the members of the community that, in 10 fact, live in Pekin and Peoria and Tazewell County 11 who are concerned about their air quality and 12 whether there will be a real benefit from this rule 13 in terms of short-term SO2 emissions or only a 14 benefit on paper. 15 Thank you for the opportunity 16 to comment today. 17 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank 18 you. 19 Next we have Joyce 2.0 Blumenshine. 2.1 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Good morning. MV22 name is Joyce (J-o-y-c-e), last name Blumenshine 23 (B-l-u-m-e-n-s-h-i-n-e). 24 Thank you very much to the

July 8, 2015

Page 56

Board for your time.

2.0

2.1

I'm a citizen, a volunteer concerned about health, environment, and our quality of life from Peoria, Illinois. I've lived in Peoria over 36 years, and we are in the beautiful Illinois River Valley but in a unique geographic situation where the prevailing winds bring the air from not only the Powerton Plant which is just downriver on the Tazewell County Pekin side but the Edwards plant which is just upriver from Pekin, and then going on up is Hennepin. Below that is Havana. We are in this corridor of coal-fired power plant impacts, and sulfur dioxide is a real concern for me.

I urge you, please, to withhold your approval of this rule until it is strengthened. I ask you that because we know SO2 has much more serious health impacts than we did ten, twenty years ago.

My mother has COPD. On air quality concern days, she'd take three or four steps, I have to hold her in my arms.

If you have a family member who suffers from breathing problems, this is near to and dear to your heart.

2.1

July 8, 2015

Page 57

You on the Pollution Control
Board are our citizen advocates I hope and consumer
concerned people but also industry regulators that
can make the difference in the future for all of us
and the quality of our lives.

The "Toll on Health" study from the Powerton Plant shows 29 deaths, over 400 asthma attacks. Those are real to those of us who have family members who suffer, and if you don't do something to control the pollution and the strength of these rules, please require the Agency to strengthen these rules.

At Powerton, the mention of a concern that -- I understood this to be a one-hour spike of SO2 regulation. How can they be allowed to have a 30-day average? I just don't as a citizen understand how that could be approved.

Please require a one-hour application for Powerton for the interest of the people in the communities. There's a prison not far from there. There is public health and recreation along the river. People water ski. These air impacts are local severe issues for us, and when you average them out or if you look at a fleet issue, it

July 8, 2015

Page 58

just defies my understanding as a citizen how that really addresses what these EPA rules are supposed to obtain.

2.1

And we appreciate the work of IEPA, and it's a difficult job, but how many years have we had these exceedances of sulfur dioxide, and now we have the knowledge of what those fine particles do and how severe it is.

And it's the same for Edwards. Edwards is about 12 miles from where I live. I'm going down that way all the time for friends who live actually along the river, and at Edwards, we know there have not been the upgrades that have been done to other fleets. Why this can get delayed so long again as a citizen I do not understand.

We need to have expedited SO2 controls put in at Edwards. That plant really needs to make an effort and show results on SO2 pollution. The fact that it's lumped into some, you know, modeling is not an assurance for us that there will actually be cleanup, and now that, you know, we hear the concerns that the standards may be stuck here without actually making a reduction of what is being done at Edwards, I do know that they haven't been

July 8, 2015

Page 59 1 running up to full power. A lot of these are 2 merchant plants, and so we the citizens are 3 vulnerable and at risk from these spikes in SO2. Please be sure that our 4 5 affected areas get the best quality standards. 6 Please withhold your approval of this proposed 7 nonattainment plan until IEPA is required to 8 strengthen these standards, and really, for our 9 Peoria Valley where the prevailing winds bring all 10 this and then with air inversion, sometimes it sits, those spikes have real citizen, family, personal 11 12 loved one impacts, and this is the time to deal with 13 it. 14 Please attend to these issues 15 and require them to be strengthened. 16 Thank you. 17 HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: 18 Ms. Blumenshine, I notice you signed in as Heart of 19 Illinois Group Sierra Club. Are you speaking on 20 behalf of the group or as a member or --2.1 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you for 22 mentioning that. 23 I did sign in. I am currently 24 chair of the Heart of Illinois Group Sierra Club.

	Page 60
1	do represent them. I got so nervous I guess that I
2	didn't even launch into my usual introduction that
3	Heart of Illinois Sierra Club is centered in Peoria.
4	We have about a thousand members in 15 counties
5	across Illinois which includes Peoria County,
6	Tazewell County where the Powerton plant is, Fulton
7	County on down to Havana and up north to Hennepin,
8	so this whole region of Illinois River Valley and
9	the five power plants. The ones we're focusing on
10	now are Powerton and Edwards, but that is in our
11	group area, and I am here speaking on their behalf.
12	Thank you so much. I
13	appreciate it.
14	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank
15	you.
16	Next we have Susan Murray.
17	MS. MURRAY: Hi. My name is Susan
18	Murray. I live in the Alton, Illinois area. I'm
19	here for the Piasa Palisades Sierra Club.
20	Thank you for the opportunity
21	to speak.
22	I'm actually going to talk
23	more on behalf of the many, many people who can't be
24	here.

July 8, 2015

Page 61 1 If you can't hear me, raise 2 your hand. 3 We have quite a few people 4 here with Sierra Club who are sporting these fine 5 T-shirts, but in spite of us that are here, there 6 are many, many, many more who are not here, and I 7 would just like to take this opportunity to speak 8 for two of those people who couldn't be here who did 9 write in their comments and asked that they could be 10 heard even though they're not here; Ellen Rendulic (R-e-n-d-u-l-i-c) and Mary Burnitz (B-u-r-n-i-t-z), 11 12 both from Lockport, Illinois, and this is what they 13 wrote into us. 14 We are currently in an SO2 15 nonattainment area. This designation comes because 16 our air quality does not meet the air quality 17 standards for SO2. 18 Since 1995, we've relayed 19 stories of the negative health effects and how our 20 lives are adversarial affected by the soot and 2.1 pollution of the chemical and coal-fired power 22 plants. 23 We are requesting that the 24 IPCB withhold approval of the proposed nonattainment

	Page 62
1	plan for the one-hour SO2 air quality standard until
2	the draft rule includes the most stringent possible
3	regulations to protect the citizens' health.
4	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Thank
5	you.
6	And am I correct that the
7	spelling of your last name is M-u-r-r-a-y?
8	MS. MURRAY: Yes.
9	HEARING OFFICER ROBERTSON: Okay.
10	Thank you.
11	So that's the end of those who
12	signed up for public comment.
13	Is there anyone else who would
14	like to make a statement today?
15	Okay. Seeing nobody, we'll
16	move on.
17	The Board has a couple items
18	it would like to address.
19	First, we have some copies or
20	we had some copies of two letters on the back table.
21	I'm glad to see they're getting used. These letters
22	are communication between the Board and the
23	Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity,
24	which I'll abbreviate DCEO, regarding the Board's

July 8, 2015

Page 63 1 request for an economic impact study and the DCEO's response. 3 In its letter, DCEO stated that it was unable to undertake such an economic 4 5 impact study at this time. 6 Did anyone have any comments 7 on the Board or DCEO letters? 8 Seeing none, on May 26th, the 9 Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, or JCAR, 10 filed a request for an analysis of economic and 11 budgetary effects of this rulemaking, and on 12 May 21st, JCAR also submitted its first notice 13 version of the rules for use in creating the Board's 14 second notice changes. 15 These documents are available on the Board's website. 16 17 Is there anyone who would like to make a comment on either of those documents? 18 19 Seeing none, for both the JCAR 2.0 filings and DCEO letters, anyone is welcome to file 2.1 any comments with the Board. 22 We also ask if the Agency can 23 respond to JCAR's request on analysis of economic 24 and budgetary effects.

July 8, 2015

Page 64 1 We're going to begin wrapping 2 up. 3 Is there anyone else who would 4 like to offer any comments on anything today? 5 Seeing no one, do any members 6 of the Board have any final comments? 7 Seeing none, under the 8 Administrative Procedures Act, the Board is required 9 to provide at least 45 days from the date of first 10 notice publication for any persons to file a public 11 comment on the Board's first notice proposal. 12 This first notice was 13 published in the Illinois Register on May 22nd, and we will be allowing public comments on the first 14 15 notice proposal up until July 24th, and any comments 16 on this first hearing would also be due on that 17 date. 18 I again note for anyone in 19 attendance, if you have any additional questions on 20 anything that happened today, any of the Agency 2.1 filings that came in yesterday afternoon, you are 22 still welcome to file any comments on any of that 23 with the Board, and you can also follow up at one of 24 the next two hearings if you so choose to.

July 8, 2015

Page 65 1 Okav. So pursuant to the 2 Board's May 7, 2015 hearing officer order, the next 3 hearing in this matter is scheduled for Wednesday. 4 That is completely incorrect. It's not Wednesday, 5 July 9th. It's Wednesday, July 29th, at 10 a.m. in the County Board Chambers, Will County Executive 6 7 Office, 2nd Floor, located at 302 North Chicago Street in Joliet. 8 Prefiled testimony is due by 9 10 July 17th. 11 Prefiled questions are due 12 July 24th, and the mailbox rule does not apply, 13 which means that any filings need to be in the 14 Board's possession by those dates. 15 And please note that those 16 deadlines also apply to the Board's August 4th 17 hearing in Pekin. 18 So that's pretty much it. 19 just again, lastly, would like to thank everyone who 20 came out today, the Agency and its witnesses, IERG, 2.1 Midwest Generation, Sierra Club, everyone who spoke. 22 I know it's the middle of the week, bad weather. 23 appreciate you guys all taking your time to come out 24 and participate in this public hearing.

July 8, 2015

```
Page 66
                               With that, this hearing is
 1
 2
      adjourned.
                               Thank you.
 3
                            (Which were all of the
 4
                            proceedings held at this time.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

July 8, 2015

	Page 67
1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2)SS. COUNTY OF SANGAMON)
3	
4	CERTIFICATE
5	Laurel A. Patkes, Certified Shorthand
6	Reporter in and for said County and State, do hereby
7	certify that I reported in shorthand the foregoing
8	proceedings and that the foregoing is a true and
9	correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
10	aforesaid.
11	I further certify that I am in no way
12	associated with or related to any of the parties or
13	attorneys involved herein, nor am I financially
14	interested in this action.
15	Dated July 9, 2015.
16	Laurel A. Patkes
17	Certified Shorthand Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

T				Page 66
A	Administrative	35:19	37:6 38:20	approximately
a.m 1:12 34:4,6	5:8 63:9 64:8	air 9:16,18,19	answers 14:16	24:22 34:23
65:5	admitted 4:18	9:21,23 10:7	17:1 27:24	April 26:1
	10:21 13:22	27:4 46:6,9,18	29:13 41:2	area 43:22 46:20
aallgire@ierg 2:17	advance 14:9,16	48:2,3,8,13	anticipate 38:4	46:21 47:23
	42:15	49:15 52:3	anticipated 38:1	60:11,18 61:15
abbreviate	adversarial	55:11 56:7,19	anybody 40:20	areas 10:5 35:23
62:24	61:20	57:22 59:10	apologize 42:15	36:2,5,7,11,13
Abby 2:15 14:5	adverse 46:16	61:16,16 62:1	APPEARAN	36:23 38:5,6,8
able 9:1 21:14	advocates 57:2	alerts 48:3	2:9	38:9 39:12
absence 39:24	affect 44:17,17	Alisa 2:8 5:16	appearing 2:14	46:11 48:14
account 23:18	aforesaid 67:10	Allgire 2:15	2:18,23	59:5
accuracy 32:13	afternoon 7:2	14:3,5,14	appended 24:12	argue 24:19
32:14	64:21	28:14	Appendix 34:23	arms 56:21
accurate 31:5	Agency 4:19,19	allow 31:16	applicable 25:21	array 46:16
32:18,24	4:20 6:21,22	42:19 50:18,21	26:2	asked 7:11
achieved 55:4	7:1,2 8:2,5,7	allowed 7:16 8:8	application	23:22 44:3
acknowledged	9:8,14 10:16	8:16 32:20	57:19	61:9
8:21,22	10:17,20,24	52:11 53:3	apply 22:5,10	asking 34:19
acknowledges	11:10,24 12:2	57:15	65:12,16	assess 38:6
22:24	13:8,9,14,15	allowing 45:17	applying 24:17	assessed 36:6,24
Act 6:6 64:8	13:21 14:10,15	47:5 64:14	25:3 46:2	assessing 35:23
action 67:14	18:2,4,5,11,20	allows 51:10	appointed 1:14	36:2
activities 48:6	18:23 19:1,7	54:12	5:5	assessments
actual 54:13,13	19:16,23 20:2	Alton 36:19,19	appreciate 6:1	37:4,7
Adams 2:16	20:16 22:4,17	47:23 60:18	43:8 58:4	assistant 2:11
add 32:22	22:22 25:7,18	ambient 10:6	60:13 65:23	9:12
adding 29:14	28:19 32:3	46:9 48:13	approach 39:16	associated 67:12
addition 38:5	33:4,9 34:14	49:15	approach 39.10	assume 30:2,14
50:7	34:15 35:4	amend 7:6	11:18 23:3	32:3,6
additional 35:24	39:14 41:12	Amendments	35:5 49:22	assurance 50:23
38:17 39:24	49:1,10 50:9	1:5 5:7	50:8,11	58:20
64:19	50:14 51:11	analysis 63:10	approval 20:3,7	assure 53:6
address 62:18	54:9 55:1	63:23	20:24 21:12	asthma 46:17
addressed 47:2	57:11 63:22	Anand 2:7 5:16	46:7 48:11	48:4 57:8
addresses 58:2	64:20 65:20	answer 10:2	56:15 59:6	asthma-related
adequate 23:1	Agency's 6:8	11:14,16,18	61:24	46:19
31:23 32:6	10:3 12:16,19	14:19,21 15:17	approve 18:21	attacks 57:8
35:6	13:7,13 23:8	17:11,11 25:10	18:24 19:1,8	attainment 35:6
adjoining 36:8	30:3 40:21	34:2 35:13,21	19:11,16 21:15	35:8 36:1,10
adjourned 66:2	ago 56:18	38:24	approved 20:4	44:11 51:7,9
adjustment	agreement	answered 19:19	57:17	55:3
24:15 25:1	51:23 52:7,11	41:7	approving 22:17	attend 59:14
Adm 1:5	52:11	answering 14:17	approving 22.17 approximate	attend 39.14
Administration	ahead 28:21	26:3 33:16	35:2	64:19
45:24	ancau 20.21	20.3 33.10	33.2	UT.17
	ı	ı	ı	ı

1				Page 69
attorney 2:5	12:23 13:1	37:5 38:19	bullet 39:1	chair 59:24
5:21 29:6	20:21 29:20	39:3 40:4 41:4	bumped 24:1	Chairman 2:2
48:22	33:13 41:16	Blumenshine	Bureau 9:18	5:17 14:4
attorneys 67:13	42:2,7 54:8	4:8 55:20,21	Burke 2:2 5:14	29:11 45:17
August 6:16	62:20	55:22 59:18,21	14:5 28:24	
65:16		board 1:2 2:1,2	Burnitz 61:11	chairperson 43:21
authorities 47:3	background 39:10	2:5 5:5,14,19	butcher 42:16	challenges 40:5
available 6:18	backward 32:4	, ,		40:8
10:2 13:19		5:20,21,22 6:7	bypass 43:14	
	32:5 bad 65:22	6:13,24 7:5,11 7:24 8:3 9:6	<u> </u>	Chambers 65:6
14:10 16:11,20			C 4:20 13:14,15	changes 22:15
37:15 63:15	balances 26:12	14:5 28:23,24	13:22	38:21 63:14
availed 52:14	base 16:11	35:17 40:23	C-h-r-i-s 45:20	check 15:14
Avenue 1:13	based 32:8 38:9	43:9 45:17	calculations	checking 8:18
2:11	38:22 40:2	47:17 48:20	50:12,14	chemical 61:21
average 19:6	55:2	52:8 56:1 57:2	calendar 33:20	Chicago 2:21
23:15 24:17,23	basically 22:1	62:17,22 63:7	33:21	65:7
25:1,3 30:4,18	basis 19:6 25:9	63:21 64:6,8	calibrated 18:3	choose 39:8
30:19,20 32:1	beautiful 56:5	64:23 65:6	18:9	64:24
32:20,23 44:18	beginning 8:23	Board's 2:6 5:12		Chris 4:7 45:15
44:23 49:4,6,8	33:3	5:15,17 6:18	called 15:2	45:19
49:12,18,19,21	begins 16:6	7:13 12:16	capacity 26:15	cite 25:11
49:22,24 50:4	behalf 2:14,18	13:13,19 35:13	26:18,22 27:1	cited 39:19
50:6,9,16,18	2:23 43:1	35:14 40:23	27:2,16	citizen 46:5 48:1
50:20 51:10	59:20 60:11,23	62:24 63:13,16	Carbon 45:22	48:1 56:2 57:2
57:16,24	believe 11:12	64:11 65:2,14	Carrie 2:3 5:20	57:16 58:1,15
averaged 44:21	23:12 24:9	65:16	case 18:20 34:5	59:11
averaging 23:7	25:4 35:3 37:6	Bob 4:6 43:6	CEM 24:21	citizens 59:2
23:11,11,19,24	37:16,16 43:11	Bonebrake 2:20	27:10	citizens' 62:3
24:5,14 29:20	51:3 52:6	4:5 28:22 29:1	CEMS 17:6,7	city 43:23,24
31:9 44:15	belong 51:20,21	29:9 35:12,20	18:2,6,9 23:4	claims 40:11,14
45:4	benefit 52:18	40:16	24:8 27:15,19	clarification
aware 18:4 21:3	55:12,14	breathe 48:2	27:20 28:9	34:12
25:7 40:4,7,15	best 17:24 59:5	breathing 48:9	30:22,23 31:3	clarify 29:17
48:8	beyond 38:17	56:23	31:6,9,13,13	30:7 31:11
	bias 7:14 18:6	briefly 43:12	32:16,19	clarifying 24:3
<u>B</u>	biggest 55:5	bring 25:14 56:7	centered 60:3	clean 48:2 52:3
B 4:19 13:8,9,21	bit 12:7 39:10	59:9	certain 37:19	cleanup 58:21
15:9	42:16	bronchoconst	40:11 54:12	clear 16:7
B-e-i-l-e 47:19	blank 41:19	46:17	certainly 22:14	clearly 9:1 43:2
B-l-u-m-e-n-s	block 19:6	Brown 47:9,10	27:20	clock 33:10,17
55:23	Bloomberg 3:2	budgetary 63:11	CERTIFICA	33:17,22
B-u-g-e-l 48:22	4:3 9:16 10:1	63:24	67:4	Club 37:1 46:2
B-u-r-n-i-t-z	14:13,17 15:1	Bugel 4:8 48:18	Certified 67:5	48:23 59:19,24
61:11	26:3 32:22	48:19,21	67:17	60:3,19 61:4
back 8:18 12:8	33:16 35:2	build 7:12	certify 67:7,11	65:21

				Page /U
222142.19 47.22	Committee (2.0	57.14	aamidan 56.12	Davisla 10.0
coal 43:18 47:22	Committee 63:9	57:14	corridor 56:12	Davis's 10:9
50:2	common 17:6,8	concerned 55:11	Coumadin	day 6:2 33:20,21
coal-fired 56:12	communicated	56:3 57:3	44:19	42:8 44:8,22
61:21	39:23	concerns 58:22	counsel 2:11,15	45:2
coal-powered	communication	conditions 22:3	9:13	days 44:11,19,21
46:23	37:11 62:22	conferring 36:8	counties 60:4	44:23 48:5
Code 1:5 5:8	communities	confusing 53:3	county 36:20,22	56:20 64:9
Column 51:3,14	57:20	consent 36:24	43:22 50:3,4	DCEO 62:24
combination	community	38:8	51:16 55:4,5	63:3,7,20
29:16	47:22 55:9	considered 18:2	55:10 56:9	DCEO's 63:1
combined 51:17	companies	20:4 32:24	60:5,6,7 65:6,6	dead 45:1
Combustion 1:7	40:10	Considering	67:2,6	deadlines 65:16
5:10	company 21:19	50:1	couple 21:23	deal 52:19,20
come 6:2 17:7,7	29:2	consistent 33:1	29:4 62:17	54:4,7,8 59:12
21:4 38:13	compare 26:5	consumer 57:2	course 44:24	dealing 46:3,21
46:22 53:17,18	30:3	context 24:19	court 9:1 11:20	Deanna 2:2 5:17
65:23	compared 30:5	continue 20:10	43:4	dear 56:24
comes 27:2	30:18,20,23	54:23	crazy 44:15	deaths 57:7
38:10 43:18	34:6	continued 52:24	creating 63:13	decided 21:19
61:15	comparing	continuing 47:1	credible 16:20	decision 7:13
coming 5:24	31:12 34:10	continuous 17:2	critical 46:3	38:17
42:12	compensate	18:8	crowd 6:1	decisions 38:2
comment 7:20	24:16 25:2	continuously	CSR 1:24	decree 36:24
7:21,23,24	complete 7:12	27:19	cubed 51:6	38:8
8:11,14 42:14	8:9	control 1:2,7	Current 46:13	defies 58:1
42:22 43:10		5:10 10:4	currently 35:22	definitely 39:22
	completed 8:7 42:8		•	· ·
45:12,18 47:6	· -	47:16 57:1,10	36:2,5,23	delayed 58:14
55:16 62:12	completely 65:4	controls 44:6	59:23 61:14	demonstrate 16:22 51:12
63:18 64:11	compliance	53:15 58:17	D	
commenter 49:5	15:10 16:3,11	conversion 50:8	$\overline{\mathbf{D}4:1}$	demonstration
comments 4:6	16:22 17:3	50:10,11 53:19	Dana 2:10 9:12	35:8
6:10 41:18,21	18:10,12,16,22	conveys 24:22		demonstrations
42:1,3,9,20	19:5,9,18 23:4	COPD 48:5	Dana.Vetterh	35:7
47:10,17 48:24	32:8	56:19	2:13	deny 21:14
49:1 61:9 63:6	composite 30:3	copies 7:8 12:21	Daniel 1:14 5:4	Department
63:21 64:4,6	30:17,21	12:23 13:19	data 30:23 38:10	62:23
64:14,15,22	concentration	62:19,20	date 10:19 13:11	describe 33:9
Commerce	25:20 26:14,21	copy 13:1	13:17 64:9,17	deserves 48:2
62:23	28:2,4	correct 21:7	Dated 67:15	designated 10:5
commitment	concentration	23:5 24:7,11	dates 44:4 65:14	36:4 47:3
52:22,23	27:3	34:21 35:7	David 3:2 4:3	designation 38:1
commitments	concern 46:20	37:9 62:6 67:9	9:16 15:1	38:17 40:1
52:13,16	49:3 51:15	correctly 35:22	Davis 3:2 9:18	61:15
committed	52:10 54:2,10	corresponding	10:1,16 14:13	designations
39:21	55:9 56:13,20	26:16,23	31:11	38:7 40:6
	<u> </u>			
	-	-	-	-

				Page /I
desk 7:8	downriver 56:8	31:23 32:1,3,6	26:5 33:2,19	faith 4:8 48:18
desulfurization	downward	33:3 34:6	44:19	48:21 54:7
52:21,24	24:15 25:1	40:12 46:3,21	examples 26:4	fall 20:20 21:6
detailed 49:11	draft 46:10	54:13,17 55:2	exceed 49:14	falls 28:8
determination	48:14 62:2	55:7,13	exceedance	family 48:4
16:11	dry 52:22	emit 26:7	51:13	56:22 57:9
determine 18:10	due 26:8 64:16	emitted 48:8	exceedances	59:11
18:12 36:3	65:9,11	emitting 26:9	58:6	far 30:1 57:20
39:15	duly 1:14	engineer 9:19	exceeded 26:11	federal 15:15
determined 19:5	duly 1.14	ensure 39:18	exception 53:4,8	26:2
determining	\mathbf{E}	enter 10:15	53:24 54:1	feel 54:4
18:16 23:4	E 2:16 4:1	11:24 12:3	excuse 20:17	fence 51:3,4,9
39:12	E.D 54:11,11,16	entered 10:10	Executive 65:6	51:13
	55:4			FGD 52:21
dictated 37:3 diesel 16:3	earlier 31:6 33:2	entitled 5:6	exhibit 4:19,19 4:20 10:11,16	53:21
difference 57:4	early 45:24	environment 56:3	,	
	East 1:13 2:11		10:17,20 12:14	file 7:2,23 17:10
different 17:7,8	36:19 43:21,23	environmental	13:8,9,14,15	25:14 63:20
23:11 27:5,16	economic 62:23	2:19 6:6,8,21	exhibits 4:17	64:10,22
27:22 31:10	63:1,4,10,23	6:24 9:13,18	12:1 13:21	filed 6:4 7:1,4
33:7 44:5	edge 51:8	12:4,14 14:6	expect 24:13	35:10 63:10
differently 27:9	Edwards 54:11	44:1	49:1	filing 14:16
difficult 58:5	54:11,16,20	envision 22:17	expected 20:9	filings 63:20
dioxide 10:4,6	55:5 56:9 58:9	EPA 3:1 24:13	expedited 6:9	64:21 65:13
26:14,17 29:23	58:10,12,17,24	48:3 49:18	58:16	filled 14:22
46:9,15 48:13	60:10	58:2	experience	final 38:9 64:6
56:13 58:6	effectively 31:2	EPA's 9:17	16:19	Finally 54:10
dioxides 17:6	effects 61:19	46:12	expertise 46:2	financially
discussed 35:9	63:11,24	equate 24:10	explain 50:10	67:13
discussion 29:12	efficient 53:10	equated 32:15	explanation	find 17:13 50:5
dispersion 24:24	effort 58:18	establish 18:21	49:11,12	53:7
docket 1:5 5:12	eight 52:6	estimate 23:1	exposures 46:14	findings 11:24
document 13:4	either 7:17 8:13	everybody 44:17	express 7:13	fine 58:7 61:4
23:8,9 24:8	17:11 39:12	everyone's 45:5	external 23:22	firm 29:2
34:24	63:18	evidence 10:21	F	first 5:23 6:9,12
documentation	Ellen 61:10	13:22 16:20	F-a-i-t-h 48:22	21:20 29:10
40:14 53:7		18:6,15 40:14	facilities 18:2	44:8 49:3
documents 7:3	emission 23:17	46:14	44:6	51:19 62:19
63:15,18	24:1,14 25:9	exact 44:4,4,12		63:12 64:9,11
doing 19:20	26:18,24 27:7	exactly 44:7	facility 15:23	64:12,14,16
23:23 44:10	33:1	EXAMINATI	18:8 30:22	five 21:8,15,19
door 7:8 8:12	emissions 1:6,7	4:4 15:6 29:8	fact 23:18 49:21	22:1 31:19
dosages 44:24	5:9,10 10:4	examined 15:3	49:23 54:20	32:17 36:7,13
DOT 45:24	17:2 18:9	example 20:14	55:3,10 58:19	38:5,18 46:15
double 15:14	21:22 23:2,7	21:18 23:14	factor 50:8,10	60:9
doubt 19:21	25:22 26:17,23	25:11,13,23	50:11	five-hour 19:4,9
		<u> </u>		

<u> </u>				Page 72
19:18 20:23	53:20	group 2:19 7:1	33:12 35:18	32:19 46:15
21:6,11,12	Gen 52:13 54:7	12:5 14:6	40:18 41:3,10	hundred 37:18
22:18 32:20,23	general 24:13	43:23 46:1	41:11 42:6	hypothetical
fleet 53:10,13,14	29:21 34:13	59:19,20,24	45:8,13 47:7	31:19 32:10
57:24	Generation 2:24	60:11	47:11 48:16,20	34:1
fleets 58:14	29:3 50:2	Group's 12:15	55:17 59:17	J4.1
Floor 65:7	52:12,18 65:21	guess 20:19 24:6	60:14 62:4,9	I
flue 52:21,23	geographic 56:6	24:7 41:1 60:1	64:16 65:2,3	idea 11:17 22:2
focusing 60:9	getting 44:16	guidance 49:18	65:17,24 66:1	identification
follow 15:9,22	54:15,19 62:21	guys 65:23	hearings 6:13	10:18 13:10,16
17:1 21:12	give 11:13 17:24	gu ys 03.23	14:11 64:24	identified 38:5
48:3 49:1	25:13 45:18	H	heart 43:13,16	38:18
64:23	given 7:19 8:6	half 21:21,21	44:20 56:24	identify 36:12
follow-up 14:2,8	14:19 27:22	31:19	59:18,24 60:3	IEPA 2:11,14
28:15 29:4	Giving 8:19	hand 8:20 61:2	held 1:11 66:5	29:13 35:22
35:15,16	glad 62:21	handed 13:4	help 7:9,12	37:3,24 38:4
followed 8:2	Glen 45:22	happen 20:8	Hennepin 36:15	39:5,23 58:5
following 39:1	Glosser 2:2 5:18	28:13	36:16 56:11	59:7
follows 15:4	14:4	happened 64:20	60:7	IEPA's 35:13
footnote 23:5,21	go 20:18 28:21	happens 26:7	Hi 60:17	38:24
24:11,20	35:19 39:8,21	Hardin 2:20	high 46:19	IERG 8:3 14:1
foregoing 67:7,8	39:22	29:2	higher 23:17	23:6 29:6
forget 36:20	going 10:15	harmful 45:4	26:10,16,22	65:20
formal 20:3,4,7	16:13 21:19	Havana 56:11	27:6 28:3,7	IERG's 7:4 12:3
20:7,24	22:1 26:10	60:7	hold 6:13 52:19	13:7 22:22
found 35:4	27:18 32:4,5	head 15:12	56:21	25:18
four 31:20 56:20	41:8 42:7,9,13	health 43:13,17	hope 57:2	III 1:5
fourth 39:1	44:6,7,7,8,10	45:5 56:3,17	hour 1:12 20:20	Illinois 1:2,13
friends 58:11	44:17,17 45:11	57:6,21 61:19	21:2,5,9,13,20	2:12,16,18,21
frown 33:4	54:7 55:4	62:3	21:21 23:17	5:7 6:8,21,24
fruition 53:18	56:10 58:11	hear 6:20 8:17	24:15 26:8,16	9:13,17 12:4
fuel 16:3,23	60:22 64:1	33:14 42:15	26:23 27:6	12:14 14:6
34:20	good 5:2 9:11	43:3 58:21	28:3,4,6 30:5	34:17 35:23
full 34:9 59:1	11:17 14:3	61:1	30:19,23 31:13	40:10 47:16,22
Fulton 60:6	19:20 28:22	heard 52:8	31:18 33:10,17	47:24 50:3
funny 42:16	45:4 47:15	61:10	33:17,22,23,23	52:1,2 56:4,5
further 38:23	48:19 53:24	hearing 1:11,14	33:24 34:7,9	59:19,24 60:3
40:17 49:11	54:7 55:21	5:2,6 6:19 7:10	34:10 49:9,13	60:5,8,18
67:11	Grand 1:13 2:11	10:12,23 11:4	50:15,19,21,22	61:12 64:13
future 38:1	granted 6:7	11:19,23 12:6	51:8,11	67:1
53:20 57:4	great 15:21	12:10,18 13:2	hours 20:24	illness 46:20
	46:20	13:4,6,12,18	21:8,15,20,23	imagine 22:19
G	greater 31:18	13:24 14:3	22:1 31:13,19	impact 51:5,8
gallons 16:1,4	32:10,12,12	15:18 17:12	31:19 32:4,5,7	63:1,5
gas 52:21,24	Green 43:21	25:14 28:16,23	32:9,11,12,17	impacts 56:12

T				Page /3
56:17 57:23	introduce 9:9	49:5	legal 2:15 40:5,7	lives 57:5 61:20
59:12	11:5	Joyce 4:8 55:19	legislators 47:4	living 45:21
important 43:11	introduction	55:22	length 31:18,22	LLP 2:20
46:6 48:7	60:2	July 1:12 6:15	lengthy 19:20	local 46:1 57:23
impossible		64:15 65:5,5	lenience 52:15	located 65:7
49:23	introductory 33:11	65:10,12 67:15		Lockport 61:12
	inversion 59:10		leniency 52:12 lenient 52:15	_
improperly 21:17	inviting 47:17	justification 49:17,20 54:6	let's 16:24 26:6	long 20:24 58:15 longer 24:14,17
	47:20	49.17,20 34.0		25:3 33:5
incidence 46:19 include 21:17	involved 67:13	K	30:2,14 34:3 41:23	53:13
52:23		K-r-u-s-a 45:20	· -	look 15:13 16:9
	IPCB 61:24	Keenan 2:4 5:21	letter 63:3	
included 49:17	irregularities	kept 15:11	letters 37:17	16:10,14,18,20
49:21 52:20	43:16	knew 21:20	62:20,21 63:7	41:8 57:24
includes 60:5	issue 34:18	know 15:16	63:20	looks 5:24 41:7
62:2	57:24	16:10,19 17:5	level 18:16 21:4	loss 24:16 25:2
including 46:16	issues 43:13,17	17:9,10,11,15	54:12	32:15
50:3 incorrect 65:4	46:3 57:23 59:14	17:20,22 20:1	life 53:12,13,16 53:18 56:4	lot 59:1 louder 12:7
		22:10 24:18		
increase 32:13 32:14	items 62:17	29:19 32:23	Likewise 7:18	loudly 8:24 43:3 loved 59:12
	J	33:21 37:21	limit 18:11	
increased 46:17 indicate 23:2	$\overline{\mathbf{J}2:20}$	39:11 40:9	20:20 24:14,17	lower 21:22
	J-o-y-c-e 55:22	41:6 44:15	25:3,20,20,24	27:10,11 33:3 54:14
indicated 39:20 49:19	Jackie 3:3 9:22	46:6 47:24	26:6,6,11 27:7 27:14 33:5	
	James 2:5 5:22	48:5 52:7 54:5		lumped 58:19
indicates 15:24	January 16:7,15	55:8 56:16	49:7 51:6	lungs 48:9
indicative 16:3	38:20 39:1	58:13,19,21,24	54:12,15,17,22	M
industry 57:3 information	Jason 2:5 5:22	65:22	54:23,24 Limitations 1:5	M-u-r-r-a-y
6:17 46:13	Jasper 36:19,21	knowledge 58:7	5:8	62:7
inherent 24:16	JCAR 63:9,12	known 53:2	limited 53:12,16	mailbox 65:12
25:2	63:19	Krusa 4:7 45:15	53:18	majority 14:18
injection 52:23	JCAR's 63:23	45:16,19	limits 23:7 25:22	making 55:6,6
inspector 16:8	Jeff 9:20		26:2	58:23
16:10,13,18,20	JEFFREY 3:3	L	line 51:3,4,9,13	malfunction
instance 25:8	Jennifer 2:2	L.A 1:22	links 46:14	26:9
intended 7:12	5:14	Large 1:7 5:10	listed 5:11 34:20	manager 9:16
7:13 10:4	Jerry 2:3,4 5:20	lastly 65:19	34:23	9:21,23
11:13	5:21	launch 60:2	listening 45:6	mandate 18:24
intent 30:3	job 58:5	Laurel 1:24 67:5	little 12:7 39:10	Marion 36:16
interest 57:19	Joint 63:9	67:16	Liu 2:8 5:16	Maritime 45:23
interested 7:7	Joliet 6:15 51:16	law 29:1	41:1	marked 4:18
67:14	53:1,2,4,9 65:8	lawyer 50:13	live 43:21,23	10:18 13:10,16
interfere 18:15	Joppa 36:16,17	lead 54:4	47:21 55:10	Mary 61:11
internal 23:23	Jorgensen 4:6	leading 53:19	58:10,12 60:18	math 50:13
Interstate 52:3	43:7,8 45:9	left 5:17 9:15	lived 56:4	matter 1:4 5:7
	•		•	•

				Page 74
24:13 65:3	merits 6:10	monitors 17:3	necessary 35:4	34:16,22 35:2
matters 9:4	message 24:22	18:9 39:17,18	43:1	42:11 44:18
maximum 21:3	met 51:1	monthly 26:5,6	need 15:13	numbers 53:3
22:3,5,10,11	meter 51:6	26:11 44:22	22:15 24:15	
22:14 26:15,21	method 23:3	morning 5:3	30:7 39:16,17	0
27:14 28:7	methodology	9:11 14:3	40:1 44:4,4,12	O 51:3,14
mean 7:21 19:5	29:18	28:22 47:15	50:22,23 58:16	O'Leary 2:3
22:12 23:24	methods 17:16	48:19 55:21	65:13	5:20
31:2 35:14	20:13 31:16	mother 56:19	needing 25:1	oath 15:3
means 44:21	Metro-East	motion 6:9 7:6	needs 14:21 47:2	object 19:22
65:13	45:22 46:4,5	10:13 12:19	50:7 58:17	objection 20:4,8
meant 31:24	46:21 47:22	move 10:9 11:9	negative 61:19	objections 10:13
33:10	micrograms	12:13 14:1	negotiations	10:14 12:19
measure 27:9	51:5	16:24 18:17	54:4	obtain 58:3
31:23	middle 21:23	22:21 42:9	neither 52:4	odd 35:5
measured 26:14	65:22	62:16	nem 45:20	offer 7:17,20,21
26:18,21,24	Midwest 2:23	moved 54:22	nervous 60:1	7:22 8:10,13
measures 15:10	29:3 50:1	Moving 18:1	never 28:13 30:8	42:22 64:4
27:19	52:11,13,17	51:15	new 16:9 22:7	Office 65:7
measuring	54:7 65:21	multi-pollutant	38:22 39:2,5,7	officer 1:15 5:2
27:21	miles 46:24	51:17	39:12 54:15	5:6 10:12,23
medications	58:10	multiple 50:2	Newton 36:21	11:4,19,23
44:20,22 45:1	mind 12:7	Murray 4:9	Nitrogen 1:6 5:9	12:6,10,18
meet 49:18,20	minimum 21:2,5	60:16,17,18	nonattainment	13:2,5,6,12,18
49:24 50:4,5	29:18 31:17	62:8	10:5 36:4,10	13:24 14:4
61:16	minutes 46:15		38:7 39:12	28:16,23 33:12
meeting 52:22	Mississippi	N	40:6 43:22	35:18 40:18
member 2:2	46:23	N 1:13 2:11 4:1	46:8 48:12	41:11 42:6
5:14,20,20,21	Missouri 46:22	name 5:4 8:22	51:22 59:7	45:8,13 47:7
7:11 14:5,21	mistaken 37:17	9:12 14:21	61:15,24	47:11 48:16,20
28:23 46:1	model 23:16	29:1 36:20	noon 34:6,9	55:17 59:17
56:22 59:20	modeled 25:9	42:24 45:19	Norm 47:9	60:14 62:4,9
members 2:1	50:15,22	47:18 48:21	north 60:7 65:7	65:2
5:15 7:18 9:5	modeling 9:20	55:22,22 60:17	note 7:11 12:22	oh 36:18,21 44:9
28:24 40:22	23:13,16 24:2	62:7	42:10 46:12	okay 8:17,18
44:3 48:4,19	24:24 38:23	names 42:14,17	64:18 65:15	13:2 14:14
55:9 57:9 60:4	39:13 40:2,5	National 10:6	notes 67:9	15:17 16:24
64:5	50:23 51:7	46:9 49:15	notice 1:11 6:10	17:10,14 18:17
memory 36:15	58:20	natural 53:20	20:17 59:18	28:2,5 30:12
mention 57:13	models 40:11	near 53:20	63:12,14 64:10	30:16 31:17
mentioning	monitor 16:21	56:23	64:11,12,15	42:6 47:11
59:22	monitored 44:8	nebulous 44:9	notion 7:14	62:9,15 65:1
merchant 59:2	monitoring 39:2	necessarily 16:9	NOx 52:2,13,16	old 22:8,9 52:5,6
mercury 51:24	39:5,7,9,13,15	31:24 32:19	number 31:21	older 16:9
52:12	39:24 44:5	54:20	32:9,11,12,13	oldest 53:9
	27.21.1.0			
			·	•

	•		•	•
once 8:7,9,21	P	permitted 26:15	pollutant 51:18	13:8,14 65:9
one-hour 24:24		26:21	pollution 1:2	65:11
29:14,18,23	page 4:2 38:24 Palisades 46:1	permitting 7:17	43:17,18 44:6	preparing 41:2
30:4,6,10,19	60:19	person 11:18	44:16 46:18	present 34:1
30:20 31:12,17		personal 59:11	47:16 54:13	presiding 2:2
46:8 48:12	panel 11:13,17	persons 64:10	57:1,10 58:18	5:14 14:4
49:7,13,18,21	paper 54:21	pertaining 33:6	61:21	28:23
49:24 50:4,6	55:7,14	Phil 45:10	possession 15:24	presumable
50:24 57:14,18	Pardon 41:15	physically 49:23	16:14 65:14	53:5,8,11
62:1	part 1:5,6,6 5:8	Piasa 46:1 60:19	possible 21:23	presuming 33:1
ones 34:19 60:9	5:9,9 6:2 15:9	place 6:14,15	26:13,20 27:20	pretty 65:18
ongoing 31:6	19:2 22:23	15:10	28:11 62:2	pretty 03.18 prevailing 56:7
open 43:13	25:19 43:17	plan 19:8,17	posted 37:17	59:9
opening 9:6	54:3	20:3,8,15,16	-	prevent 49:13
10:24 11:8	participate	20.3,8,13,10	potential 35:24 38:7	-
	65:24	39:5 46:8	pound 23:17	previous 49:5
operate 53:1 54:24	particles 58:8		-	previously 15:2
	particular 27:23	48:12 59:7 62:1	26:16,23 27:6	prior 15:10 16:16 29:12
operated 53:11	46:19		28:3,4,6 34:7 34:10	
operating 22:3	parties 67:12	planners 47:3		prison 57:20
26:15,22 27:14	Patkes 1:24 67:5	Planning 9:17	pounds 26:7,8,9	probable 17:23
54:23	67:16	9:19,21,24	34:5 49:13	problem 47:1
operation 22:6	pay 39:17	plans 18:21,24	50:14,18,21,21	problems 44:2
operations	Pekin 6:16 51:4	plant 36:16,17	51:7,11	44:20 56:23
22:10,14 54:13	51:13 55:4,10	36:17,18,21	power 36:9,15	procedural 9:4
opinion 32:21	56:9,10 65:17	46:23 50:3,4	36:16,17,18,21	procedure 20:6
opportunity	people 8:14 12:8	56:8,9,12 57:7	56:12 59:1	procedures
7:20 8:6 14:7	29:19 33:13	58:17 60:6	60:9 61:21	43:15 64:8
18:23 43:9	41:17 42:11,18	plants 36:9	Powerton 49:4	proceed 11:11
45:18 55:15	57:3,20,22	43:18 50:2	49:17 50:5	proceeded 6:9
60:20 61:7	60:23 61:3,8	59:2 60:9	56:8 57:7,13	proceeding 5:6
62:23	Peoria 43:21,23	61:22	57:19 60:6,10	5:11 6:3 10:8
opposed 25:1	55:10 56:4,4	please 7:8,11	Powerton's	10:16
opt 19:3	59:9 60:3,5	8:20,24 9:8	50:15	proceedings 5:1
option 17:3	percent 26:18	11:20 18:18	ppm 18:16 25:8	66:5 67:8
39:11,19	26:24 27:15	36:13 43:2	25:20,24 26:10	process 21:22
order 31:22 65:2	28:9 37:18	56:14 57:11,18	26:14,17,20,24	25:24 26:15,22
organized 39:8	perform 19:4,8	59:4,6,14	27:3,6,9,14	promulgated
outcomes 27:16	19:17 20:12	65:15	28:8,10	17:4 25:24
outside 40:10	performed 23:1	plus 36:7	preconceived	pronunciation
48:6	period 19:21	podium 42:23	7:14	42:17
overestimate	29:15	point 8:4 9:8	preempt 35:14	proper 20:13
40:12	periods 31:9	11:6 13:7	prefile 7:16	properly 20:12
owns 50:2	permit 26:5	20:21 24:6	prefiled 6:23 7:5	22:24 39:18
Oxides 1:6 5:9	54:11,12,14,21	32:11 39:6	8:2 10:10,15	proponent 6:20
	54:23,24	40:17 52:6	12:4,15,16	proposal 6:11
		l		

				Page /6
7:7 10:3 19:24	9:21,23 10:7	raise 61:1	recorded 31:14	relayed 61:18
33:7 64:11,15	46:6,9 48:3,13	raised 29:5	recordkeeping	Rendulic 61:10
proposed 17:16	49:15 55:11	ranging 46:15	16:6	renegotiating
19:8,17 34:17	56:3,20 57:5	Rao 2:7 5:16	records 15:11	54:8
46:8 48:12	59:5 61:16,16	41:5	16:12,14,23	repeat 19:14
59:6 61:24	62:1	rate 23:2,18	recreation 57:21	26:19 52:9
proposing 22:5	question 7:11	24:1 26:17,18	reduction 54:20	replaced 43:14
22:7	8:20,23 11:16	26:23,24 27:10	54:21 55:6,6	reported 46:20
	15:8 16:24	33:1	58:23	67:7
protect 49:8 62:3		read 10:11	reference 29:15	
	18:1,17,20			reporter 1:24
protection 6:6,8	19:3,15 22:20	reading 18:7	33:10 39:2	9:1 11:20,22
6:21 9:13,19	22:21,23 23:6	27:22 31:5	referenced 23:8	43:4 67:6,17
provide 14:8	24:6 25:6	ready 11:14	references 23:6	REPORTING
49:11 50:23	27:12,18 28:1	real 44:9 55:12	referred 33:20	1:22
64:9	29:10,13 30:1	56:13 57:8	refers 39:2	represent 8:23
provided 8:10	30:7 33:6	59:11	reflect 24:15	29:2 60:1
17:2 18:5,14	34:13 35:12,15	reality 54:17	regarding 10:3	representing
37:24	35:16,19 38:2	55:7	49:4,16 62:24	48:23
provision 29:12	50:17 51:10,20	really 55:3 58:2	regards 18:19	request 46:7
public 1:11 4:6	55:1	58:17 59:8	region 60:8	48:11 63:1,10
6:13 7:19,20	questionable	reason 19:20,21	Register 64:13	63:23
7:21,23 8:10	49:6 50:5	29:22 53:5,8	regulate 35:5	requesting
8:13 41:18,20	questions 7:1,5	53:11,23 54:1	43:15	61:23
41:24 42:3,9	7:6,16 8:3,5	reasons 21:16	regulated 34:17	require 53:15
42:14,22 43:10	9:4 10:2,9	29:16 35:9	regulation 51:24	57:11,18 59:15
57:21 62:12	11:14 12:4,15	recall 15:13 35:1	57:15	required 19:12
64:10,14 65:24	12:17 13:8,14	36:14	regulations	53:21 59:7
publication	14:2,8,8,11,16	received 16:1	20:16,18 62:3	64:8
64:10	14:18 25:19	19:23 20:23	regulators 57:3	requirement
publicly 37:14	28:15,19 29:5	21:11 52:14,18	Regulatory 2:19	16:6 22:13
published 64:13	29:5,13 33:14	receptor 51:3,5	6:24 9:23 12:5	53:19
purchase 16:23	34:14 35:10,14	51:9,14	12:15 14:6	requirements
purchased 16:1	40:17,21,24	recess 41:24	reject 21:24	15:16 20:18
purpose 6:19	41:6,7,9,12	42:5	rejecting 21:16	35:24 38:10
21:24 24:4	48:24 49:2	recommend	rejection 21:12	requires 16:21
29:14	64:19 65:11	36:3	relate 29:5	requiring 15:11
purposes 17:19	quick 41:24	recommendati	related 29:20	respect 10:6
pursuant 1:11	quite 5:24 27:17	38:22 40:1	30:1 32:21	35:20
6:5 36:24 65:1	41:17 61:3	recommended	33:8 34:14	respiratory
put 8:20 20:15		36:10	43:17 67:12	46:16
44:6 58:17	<u>R</u>	record 7:12,19	relates 23:13,21	respond 15:19
putting 27:4	R 1:5	8:11 9:9 10:10	29:10	63:23
	R-e-n-d-u-l-i-c	11:6 15:24	relating 24:8	responded 22:22
Q	61:11	42:7,10,21	35:13	25:18
quality 9:17,19	R15-21 5:12	53:6	relation 18:12	response 18:19

19:2 22:23
38:2 63:2 10:9,16 9:21,24 23:6 Sierra 37:1 46:2 sort 26:8 54:5 responses 7:4,5 12:3,14,16 rule 15:10 16:21 Sections 6:5 48:23 59:19,24 source 16:8 19:3 13:7,13 35:10 17:3,16 33:7 Sections 6:5 60:3,19 61:4 19:12,20 20:9 responsibility 38:10,13 46:10 39:3 45:3,12 sign 8:13,14 27:8,10,13,15 20:12 48:14 49:7 62:21 59:23 28:8 31:24 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 53:13,14 56:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 24:21,21,23 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 27:5 34:16 35:12,15 seen 40:13 send 41:9 Similar 49:4 55:5 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Similar 49:2 Similar 4
responses 7:4,5 route 39:9,21,22 29:11 33:7 48:23 59:19,24 source 16:8 19:3 12:3,14,16 13:7,13 35:10 17:3,16 33:7 see 14:1 17:13 65:21 20:17 23:15 responsibility 38:10,13 46:10 39:3 45:3,12 sign 8:13,14 27:8,10,13,15 20:12 48:14 49:7 62:21 59:23 28:8 31:24 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 53:13,14 56:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 result 32:2 65:12 12:20 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 results 21:14 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
12:3,14,16 rule 15:10 16:21 Sections 6:5 60:3,19 61:4 19:12,20 20:9 responsibility 38:10,13 46:10 39:3 45:3,12 65:21 20:17 23:15 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 result 32:2 65:12 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 54:16 63:11 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:5 34:16 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking send 41:9 Similar 49:4 55:5 Returning 37:5 Rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 span 53:12,14 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 spak 7:19,22
13:7,13 35:10 17:3,16 33:7 see 14:1 17:13 65:21 20:17 23:15 responsibility 38:10,13 46:10 39:3 45:3,12 sign 8:13,14 27:8,10,13,15 20:12 48:14 49:7 62:21 59:23 28:8 31:24 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 result 32:2 65:12 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:5 34:16 7etired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 Similarly 33:22 span 53:12,14 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
responsibility 38:10,13 46:10 39:3 45:3,12 sign 8:13,14 27:8,10,13,15 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 result 32:2 65:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 24:21,21,23 51:21 52:3,5,7 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:8,10,13,15 58:18 51:22 65:12 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 retired 45:23 51:21 52:3,5,7 54:21 62:15 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
20:12 48:14 49:7 62:21 59:23 28:8 31:24 rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 53:13,14 56:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 result 32:2 65:12 12:20 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 results 21:14 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 24:21,21,23 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking 1:6 sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
rest 19:15 28:24 52:12 55:12 seeing 9:5,7 sign-up 8:11 33:3 39:20 53:13,14 56:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 result 32:2 65:12 12:20 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 results 21:14 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 24:21,21,23 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
53:13,14 56:15 62:2 10:14 11:9 signed 41:18 49:20,24 result 32:2 65:12 12:20 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 results 21:14 10:3 23:15 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 24:21,21,23 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking sense 38:16 Simply 29:14 53:16,19 Returning 37:5 1:6 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
result 32:2 65:12 12:20 40:22 42:14,19,20 source's 20:11 results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 source's 20:11 24:21,21,23 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:5 34:16 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 Returning 37:5 71:6
results 21:14 rulemaking 6:4 41:12,23 54:15 59:18 62:12 sources 1:7 5:10 24:21,21,23 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:5 34:16 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 Returning 37:5 71:6 <
24:21,21,23 10:3 23:15 54:21 62:15 significantly 27:5 34:16 58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking send 41:9 Similarly 33:22 span 53:12,14 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
58:18 51:21 52:3,5,7 63:8,19 64:5,7 23:17 35:5 39:8,14 retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking send 41:9 Similarly 33:22 span 53:12,14 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
retired 45:23 54:16 63:11 seen 40:13 Similar 49:4 55:5 return 52:12,15 Rulemaking send 41:9 Similarly 33:22 span 53:12,14 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
return 52:12,15 Rulemaking send 41:9 Similarly 33:22 span 53:12,14 Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
Returning 37:5 1:6 sense 38:16 simply 29:14 53:16,19 38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
38:19 rulemakings 53:14,21 Sims 3:3 9:22 speak 7:19,22
review 6:9 19:13 52:4 sent 20:14 single 26:9 30:8 8:16,24 12:7
1 1
rhythm 43:16 rules 15:14 sentence 24:12 SIP 51:22 33:13 42:16
right 5:13 9:22 34:18 57:11,12 29:15 33:11 SIPCO 36:16 43:2,9 45:6
15:16 38:2 58:2 63:9,13 serious 55:8 Sir 33:12 47:21 60:21
41:6 44:24 running 28:7,9 56:17 sites 39:2,5,24 61:7
51:6,8 59:1 serve 5:5 sits 59:10 speaking 59:19
right-hand runs 24:24 SERVICE 1:22 situation 23:21 60:11
42:23 31:12,17,20,21 set 31:22 54:16 28:12 56:6 specific 18:6,15
risk 59:3 31:22 32:13 setting 51:24 situations 40:11 25:11,13 33:21
river 36:18
46:22 56:6 severe 57:23 ski 57:22 specifically 8:5
57:22 58:12 sake 42:21 58:8 snapshot 27:23 16:15,17 21:3
60:8 SANGAMON she'd 56:20 sneak 33:5 28:19 37:7,21
Robertson 1:14 67:2 sheet 41:19 SO2 18:10,11,12 37:21 40:7
5:2,4 10:12,23 saw 34:14 42:15 23:7 25:21 41:19
11:4,19,23 sbonebrake@ sheets 8:11 26:2,6,20,24 spell 42:24
12:6,10,18 2:22 41:16 33:7 34:18 spelling 62:7
13:2,6,12,18 scenario 22:16 short-term 35:24 46:14 spike 57:15
13:24 14:4 30:17 46:14 49:7,8 49:9,14 51:21 spikes 44:16
28:16 33:12 schedule 52:15 49:13 50:24 52:1,13,16 49:9,14 50:18
35:18 40:18 scheduled 65:3 55:13 53:15 54:12,20 50:21,22,24
41:11 42:6 Schiff 2:20 29:2 shorthand 67:5 55:7,13 56:16 51:11,12 59:3
45:8,13 47:7 scientific 46:13 67:7,9,17 57:15 58:16,18 59:11
47:11 48:16 searched 53:6 shot 27:18 59:3 61:14,17 spite 61:5
55:17 59:17 Sears 2:21 show 19:9,18 62:1 spoke 65:21
60:14 62:4,9 second 6:14 7:6 58:18 someone's 22:17 spoken 42:19
Robinson 28:23 29:22 41:15 shows 57:7 soot 61:20 sporting 61:4
room 8:15 43:3 49:16 63:14 side 42:24 46:22 sorbent 52:22 Sprague 3:3

				Page 78
9:20 10:2	15:8	63:12	tank 15:23	thank 5:23 8:18
25:10,15 36:7	state 8:22 26:2	substantive 6:10	Tazewell 43:22	9:10 11:3
36:14 37:2,10	35:23 38:6	substitution	55:4,10 56:9	12:10 14:7,14
38:14	40:10 42:24	51:16	60:6	14:15 15:21
spreadsheet	43:2 47:3 50:2	suffer 48:4 57:9	technical 2:6	17:14 25:17
51:4,14	52:1,2 67:1,6	suffers 56:23	5:15 23:9	28:15,16 33:15
Springfield 1:13	stated 19:3 63:3	suitability 24:20	34:24 40:23	34:12 40:16,18
2:12,16	statement 11:8	sulfur 1:5 5:8	tell 36:12	41:2,12 42:3
SS 67:1	11:13 62:14	10:4,6 16:2	ten 16:4 56:18	42:11 43:9
stack 17:20	statements 9:6,7	17:6 26:14,17	ten-minute	45:5,7,8,13,16
18:21,24 19:4	10:24	29:23 46:9,14	41:24	47:5,7,12,16
19:8,9,17,18	states 24:12 36:8	48:13 56:13	term 24:17 25:3	48:16 55:15,17
20:10,12,20,23	46:13 48:1	58:6	terms 36:9 55:13	55:24 59:16,21
20:24 21:6,11	stating 22:23	summary 37:24	test 17:15,21	60:12,14,20
21:13,14,16	25:19	support 23:9	18:21,24 19:4	62:4,10 65:19
22:2,18,24	Station 36:15	34:24	19:8,17 20:10	66:3
23:3,23 24:1,8	status 36:10	supposed 58:2	20:12,20,23	Thanks 47:20
24:21,23 26:10	stay 22:13	sure 12:9 15:12	21:1,6,11,14	48:15
27:8,13,23	Steam 36:17	16:2 17:5,20	21:17 22:2,2	theoretically
28:7 29:18,21	step 42:23	17:22 27:2,17	22:11,24 23:3	28:11
30:1,2,5,9,10	STEPHEN 2:20	27:24 30:13	24:1,21 27:9	theory 27:21
30:11,14,18,20	steps 56:21	34:2 35:21	27:13,23 28:7	31:7
31:3,9,16,16	Steve 29:1	59:4	29:18,21 30:2	thing 17:19 45:4
32:2,7,8 33:5	stories 61:19	surgery 43:13	30:5,9,18,20	things 44:2,13
staff 3:1 7:12	Street 2:16 65:8	Susan 4:9 60:16	31:4,10,12,16	think 22:20 25:5
14:20 28:24	strength 57:10	60:17	31:17,20,21,22	28:12,14 31:11
35:17 40:23	strengthen	swear 11:17,20	32:2,6,7,8,9,13	32:12,18 38:20
stage 28:18	57:12 59:8	sworn 11:22	32:14 33:5	44:4,4,12 45:4
standard 10:7	strengthened	15:3	testified 15:3	48:2,7 51:19
18:3,11,13	46:10 48:14	symbol 14:20	testify 8:8,13	thinking 26:4
22:4,7,8,9,12	56:16 59:15	symptoms 46:17	41:21	third 6:15 51:2
25:8 27:11	strikes 49:5		testifying 8:7 41:14	thousand 60:4 three 6:12 7:2
29:23,24 30:4 30:6,24 31:3,7	stringency 24:16 25:2 32:15	T-shirts 61:5	testimony 6:20	19:9,17 20:22
31:8 34:7,10	stringent 18:3	table 8:12 12:23	6:23 7:16 8:2,9	21:10,12 22:18
34:20 49:14,15	18:10 25:21	13:1 62:20	8:19 10:10,15	23:23 30:9,10
50:24 51:17,18	26:1 31:3 62:2	take 6:14,15	11:10 41:18	30:14 31:12,13
62:1	stuck 58:22	27:18 41:8,23	42:8 65:9	31:17 32:19
standards 46:6	stuck 58.22 study 57:6 63:1	43:4 44:18,22	testing 21:22	56:20
46:10 48:13	63:5	56:20 61:7	24:8 28:9 30:2	three-hour
52:1,2 58:22	submit 17:11	taken 42:5 44:24	31:16 32:18	24:23 30:2,4,9
59:5,8 61:17	19:12 20:2,3,7	67:9	tests 19:9,18	30:10,14,18
start 9:3 31:15	38:22	talk 52:8 60:22	21:13 22:18	32:1
34:3 42:13	submittal 35:6	talking 23:10,12	23:23 24:23	time 6:2,18 7:17
starting 11:10	submitted 21:10	31:15 43:19	30:10,11,15	8:9 10:15,22
	•		•	

				Page /9
11:1,3 13:23	two 27:5 31:19	USEPA's 22:23	43:23 44:9	written 7:23
14:1 17:20	43:14,15 61:8	24:20	54:14 60:9	wrote 61:13
19:21 24:14	62:20 64:24	usual 22:3 60:2	64:1	WIOLC 01.13
25:12 27:22,23	type 23:11,11		we've 61:18	X
29:20 31:18	24:4	\mathbf{V}	weather 65:22	$\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ 4:1
37:18 39:6	types 17:7	Valley 56:6 59:9	website 6:18	
41:13 42:19	types 17.7	60:8	13:20 37:18,20	Y
45:6 48:10	U	valves 43:14	37:22 46:12	yeah 25:15
49:22 53:17	U.S 45:23,24	version 63:13	63:16	37:10 44:9
54:9 56:1	ultralow 16:2	Vetterhoffer	Wednesday 1:12	year 38:15
58:11 59:12	unable 63:4	2:10 4:4 9:11	65:3,4,5	years 16:2 45:23
63:5 65:23	unaware 16:5	9:12 11:2,12	week 65:22	52:5,6 56:5,18
66:5	understand	12:2,9,12,24	welcome 41:4	58:5
timeframe 29:19	27:12,17 34:2	13:3 14:12	63:20 64:22	yesterday 7:2
38:1	57:17 58:15	15:7	went 20:15	35:11 64:21
timeframes 17:8	understanding	view 26:13	22:14 39:15	yesterday's
Times 23:7	23:20 34:16	vigorously 47:2	wife 45:21	11:24
timing 33:8	38:12,21 52:21	Virginia 4:7	winds 56:7 59:9	yield 31:3
titled 23:7	55:2 58:1	47:13,18	wish 7:19,21,22	
today 5:13,16,24	understood	visit 16:8	7:22 8:20	Z
6:23 7:15,22	35:22 57:14	volunteer 56:2	11:24	Zalewski 2:3
8:1 9:15 10:2	undertake 63:4	vulnerable 59:3	wished 41:21	5:20
34:18 41:3,13	unfair 54:5		wishes 8:5,8,10	
41:22 43:19	unilaterally 54:8	W	8:13 12:3	0
45:12 47:17	unique 56:6	W-o-u-l-f-e	withhold 46:7	084-001340 1:24
48:23 55:16	unit 2:6 5:15	47:19	48:11 56:15	1
62:14 64:4,20	9:20,23 32:4	wait 8:21 35:16	59:6 61:24	1 16:7,15 33:18
65:20	34:3 52:24	waive 45:11	witness 4:2 15:2	33:18 34:10
today's 6:19	53:2,12,15	want 11:7 45:16	witnesses 9:9	10 4:19,19 6:5
told 37:6 39:14	unit's 23:2 53:18	47:21	11:20,21 14:10	22:21 65:5
50:13	United 48:1	wanted 35:21	28:20 40:21	10(b) 22:23
Toll 57:6	units 23:4 53:10	43:20	41:13 65:20	10:05 42:2
Tool 45:10,11	upgrades 58:13	wasn't 30:13	Wood 36:18	10:03 42:2 10:15 42:3
top 15:12 33:23	upriver 46:24	water 57:22	work 39:17 58:4	10:13 42:3 10:17 42:7
total 34:16,22	56:10	way 18:7 26:12	works 43:24	100-gallon 15:23
Tower 2:21	urge 56:14	58:11 67:11	wouldn't 19:7	1021 1:13 2:11
track 25:15	use 17:6,8 33:5	we'll 8:14 11:9	19:11,16	11 25:6
transcript 67:9	39:15 40:5	17:13 18:17	Woulfe-Beile	11(c) 25:7
transfer 54:1	63:13	22:21 36:8	4:7 47:14,15	11(d) 25:19
trick 22:1	USEPA 23:2,8	41:9 42:2,3	47:19	11(e) 25:19
true 67:8	23:22 24:3,7	43:6 44:11	wrapping 64:1	11:50 34:4,6
try 22:1	35:6 36:3 37:1	62:15	write 61:9	12 33:17 58:10
trying 12:7 24:9	37:3,17,20	we're 16:5 22:7	writing 15:19	13 4:19,19,20,20
26:4 33:4	38:11,13,21	31:12 41:8	25:14 37:12,14	15 4:4 60:4
twenty 56:18	39:23	42:7,13 43:19	49:2 53:7	15-21 1:5
1				

-				Page 80
15-hour 19:5	29 4:5 57:7	603 34:20		
16 38:24	294 .5 57.7 29th 6:15 65:5	60606 2:21		
17th 65:10	2nd 65:7	62701 2:16		
196.2415 51:5	2110 03.7	62794 2:12		
1972 17:3,17	3	6600 2:21		
26:1	3 26:1			
1995 61:18	3,452 49:12	7		
	50:20	7 16:24 65:2		
2	30 44:18,21,23	700 35:3,5		
2 33:18	46:24	7th 6:7		
20,000 26:8,9	30-day 23:15			
2000 18:16 25:8	44:14 45:3	8		
25:20,24 26:10	49:4,6,8,12,19	8 1:12 18:1		
26:14,17,20,24	49:22 50:8,15	9		
27:3,5,9,14	50:18,20 51:10	9 18:17,20 19:3		
28:8,9	57:16	67:15		
2006 45:24	30,000 26:7	9:00 1:12		
2010 10:6 29:23	302 65:7	90 16:1		
2015 1:12 65:2	312)258-5646	9th 65:5		
67:15	2:22) th 03.3		
2017 16:7,15	312)419-9292			
38:20 39:2	1:23			
214 1:5 5:8	35 1:5 5:7			
214.301 18:22	36 56:5			
19:10 22:5,8 29:11	4			
214.603 33:8,11	4 6:5 15:8			
215 2:16	400 57:7			
217 1:6 5:9	43 4:6			
217)522-5512	45 4:7 64:9			
2:17	47 4:7			
217)782-5544	48 4:8			
2:12	4th 6:16 65:16			
21st 63:12				
225 1:6 5:9	5			
22nd 64:13	5 51:16 53:1,4,9			
24 46:15	50 26:18,24			
24/7/52 27:21	27:15 28:9			
31:6	55 4:8			
24th 64:15 65:12	6			
26th 63:8	6 53:2			
27 6:5	6-year-old 54:6			
28 6:5 35:13,21	6,000 50:14,18			
38:2	50:21 51:7,11			
28.2 6:5	60 4:9			
	<u></u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	