

Therriault, John

From: McCambridge, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 3:31 PM
To: Eastvold, Jonathan C.
Cc: Therriault, John
Subject: RE: Question about 35 IAC 720



Our rulemaking R16-7 is an identical in substance rulemaking. In this context, the Board needs to follow federal language unless the specific situation does not allow the Board to do so. One possible specific consideration that would justify Board alteration of federal language is ambiguous meaning.

The term "intermediate" is from the federal rules and occurs as the phrase "product or intermediate" in the context of physical/chemical processes. Paired with the word "product," this use limits the meaning of "intermediate" to within the process of making the product. In the context of a process, this could only have the meaning of something between the raw materials and the final product.

In chemistry, an intermediate is a material formed from the initial materials before the desired end product of a chemical process. Alternatively, an intermediate is a substance formed in the course of a chemical process that participates in the process until it is either deactivated or consumed to make the end product.

The term "intermediate" has no other meaning in this context. The meaning is unambiguous and no further definition of "intermediate" is necessary.

John T.: Please enter this e-mail into docket R16-7 as a public comment.

From: Eastvold, Jonathan C. [<mailto:JonathanE@ilga.gov>]
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 2:54 PM
To: McCambridge, Michael
Subject: Question about 35 IAC 720

In 720.131(c)(3) and 720.143(a)(1) and (a)(1)(A) you refer to an "intermediate". Is possible to define this term for purposes of this rule?

Jonathan C. Eastvold, Ph.D.
Rules Analyst II
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Illinois General Assembly

700 Stratton Building
Springfield, IL 62706

Tel.: 217-785-2254
JonathanE@ilga.gov