ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD OCTOBER 10, 2017

IN THE MATTER OF:

REGULATORY RELIEF MECHANISMS:) R18-18

PROPOSED NEW 35 ILL. ADM. CODE)

PART 104, SUBPART 3

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS held in the above-entitled matter before HEARING OFFICER

MARIE TIPSORD, called by the Illinois Pollution

Control Board, at the James R. Thompson Center,

100 West Randolph Street, Room 9-040, Chicago,

Illinois, on the 10th day of October, 2017,

commencing at 9:07 a.m.

REPORTED BY: Jamye Giamarusti, CSR

LICENSE NO.: 084-004183

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Ms. Marie Tipsord, Hearing Officer Mr. Anand Rao, Board Member, Technical Unit
4	Ms. Brenda Carter Board Member
5	Ms. Carrie Zalewski, Presiding Board Member Ms. Alisa Liu, Board Member
6	Ms. Katie Papadimitriu, Chairman Ms. Tanya Rabczak, Attorney/Advisor for the Chairman
7	Mr. Jerry Keenan, Board Member (in audience)
8	
	ALSO PRESENT:
9	Ms. Sara Terranova, IEPA Attorney Ms. Stefanie Diers, IEPA Attorney
10	Mr. Sanjay Sofat, Witness Mr. Scott Twait, Witness
11	
12	ALSO PRESENT:
13	Ms. Kathryn Pamenter, Attorney General Ms. Antonette Palumbo, IERG
14	Ms. Susan Franzetti, Midwest Generation
15	Mr. Albert Ettinger, Sierra Club Mr. Eric Boyd, Morton Salt
16	Mr. Fred Andes, Metropolitan Water District for the Greater Chicago
17	Mr. Josh Houser, Exxon Mobil, Flint Hills Resources, and the Sanitary
	District of Decatur
18	
1920	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: 2 morning, Everyone. It's fun to see some very 3 familiar faces and some new faces as well. 4 name is Marie Tipsord. I've been appointed by 5 the Board to serve as Hearing Officer in this proceeding entitled Regulatory Relief 6 7 Mechanisms, Proposed New 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 8 104 Subpart E. 9 With me today who will be joining us shortly is Carrie Zalewski, the presiding board 10 11 member. As I said, Ms. Zalewski is currently 12 stuck on the Blue Line. But I do have other 13 board members present, and we will go ahead and start the hearing today. 14 15 To my far right is Board Member 16 Brenda Carter. In the audience today is Board 17 Member Jerry Keenan. And next to the end on my 18 left, is Chairman Katie Papadimitriu and to her 19 left is her attorney/advisor Tanya Rabczak. 20 my immediate left, from our Technical Unit, 2.1 Anand Rao, and to his left Alisa Liu. 22 The purpose of today's hearing is to 23 have witnesses from the Illinois Environmental 24 Protection Agency to respond to pre-filed

questions in this matter. Anyone else may also be sworn in to respond to these questions after the IEPA has completed its answers. And as many of you know, I'm notorious for swearing in people who start testifying when they ask questions, so seem keep that in mind.

2.1

I know that we received no other -we received no pre-filed testimony, but if time
permits, we will allow for testimony today. We
will not continue the hearing to allow time for
testimony tomorrow since none was pre-filed. If
we get through with all the questions today, we
will end at the end of the day.

We will begin our questions with the Board's questions at the request of the participants. We will allow follow up of the Board's questions and hopefully, we can take care of the other pre-filed questions from the Attorney General, the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, and Midwest Generation.

Anyone else may ask a question;
however, I do ask that you raise your hand, wait
for me to acknowledge you. After I have
acknowledged you, please state your name and who

you represent before your questions.

Please speak one at a time. If you're speaking over each other, the court reporter will not be able to get your questions on the record. Please note that any questions asked by a board member or staff are intended to help build a complete record for the Board's decision and not to express any preconceived notion or bias.

I will not be entering the questions in as an exhibit today. I think they've already all been pre-filed for a matter of the record, and I don't see any need to build the record further by adding another copy of what's already in the record. So, unless someone has an objection, we'll just have the pre-filed --we'll refer to them as pre-filed questions from the Board, IERG, Midwest Gen, and AG, and that way we'll all know where to go look if we need to read them later.

Are there any questions? Seeing none, let's begin with the Agency.

Would you like to make an opening

24 | statement?

2.0

2.1

Page 6 MS. TERRANOVA: Hello. I'm Sara 1 2 Terranova, T-E-R-R-A-N-O-V-A, attorney with 3 Illinois EPA. With me we've got Sanjay Sofat, 4 Scott Twait, and Stefanie Diers. 5 The only comment really I want to make at this point is that for most, if not all, 6 7 of what we are considering legal questions, the 8 Agency will be submitting answers to those in 9 writing following the hearing. And that's all I 10 have. 11 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right. 12 Do you want to introduce your witnesses so we 13 can have them sworn in? 14 MS. TERRANOVA: Sure. Scott Twait. 15 Do you want to spell your name? MR. TWAIT: T-W-A-I-T. 16 17 MS. TERRANOVA: Sanjay Sofat. MR. SOFAT: S-A-N-J-A-Y, last name 18 19 S-O-F, as in Frank, A-T as in Tom. 20 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Can we have 2.1 the witnesses sworn in then. 22 (Witnesses sworn.) 23 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And 24 remember to project. We're talking to the back

Page 7 1 of the room. 2 Do either of you want to make an 3 opening statement, or go right to questions? 4 MR. SOFAT: Right to the questions, 5 please. 6 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay. With 7 that, then I will turn it to over to the Technical Unit from the Board to start 8 9 questions. 10 MR. RAO: Good morning. We'll start 11 with Section 104.500, Purpose. 12 Question No. 1, addressing 40 CFR, Section 132. 13 14 Please comment on addressing 40 CRF, 15 Section 132 in the proposed rule and whether time-limited water quality standard, TLWQS, for 16 17 the Lake Michigan Basin should be included or excluded. 18 19 This was an oversight on MR. TWAIT: 20 the Agency's part. The Agency supports applying 2.1 the time-limited water quality standard to Lake 22 Michigan Basin, and we note that it could be 23 fixed by either adding a section or just a note 24 in 500.

Page 8 1 MR. RAO: When you say a note, would 2 that be a board note? 3 MR. TWAIT: It could be. The note 4 I'm talking about would be that there are 5 additional requirements in 132 for the Great Lakes Basin. 6 7 MR. RAO: We prefer if the Agency 8 proposed -- changed it to the rule instead of board note. 9 10 MR. SOFAT: Agency can do that. 11 Thank you. MR. RAO: 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Does 13 anybody have any follow ups to that? 14 Okay. Go ahead. 15 MR. ETTINGER: When do they intend to 16 do this is, I guess, is a question? Is that 17 going to happen and then we're going to see 18 another draft? How would that happen? 19 MR. SOFAT: In the next 14 or 21 days 2.0 we'll file with the Board. 2.1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And I would 22 note that one of the questions I have at the end 23 is whether or not we need to have comments, 24 responses, and then replies to the comments.

So, I was going to ask if we needed to build that into a closing comment period. So, I think we're of the same mind, Albert, if they're going to make changes, then they need to allow for responses and replies.

2.1

Mr. ETTINGER: I should identify myself. I'm Albert Ettinger. I'm here for the Sierra Club.

MS. LIU: Good morning. Pertaining to Section 104.505, Applicability and Use.

11 Question No. 2, Applicability to a 12 Watershed.

Would you please comment on which provisions of the Clean Water Act or USEPA rules author issuing a watershed based time-limited water quality standard.

Question A: Rather than using proposed Subpart E to adopt a time-limited water quality standard for a watershed itself, is IEPA's intent that the proposed rule would apply to a group of dischargers within the watershed or to certain water body or water body segments within the watershed?

MR. TWAIT: IEP intends for the

time-limited water quality standard to apply to the watershed as a whole and all of the dischargers and all of the non point sources in that watershed.

2.0

2.1

MS. LIU: Question B: If IEPA's intent is to adopt it to all waters within a watershed, could you please cite the basis in the federal rules for applying a blanket water quality standard variance to all waters within a watershed rather than specifically identifying each water body or water body segment or a specific dischargers.

MR. TWAIT: I'll note that the Clean Water Act and the federal regulations don't prohibit using water sheds in variances. We've developed this approach from talks with the USEPA and from 75 FR 75762 in response to -- and this is federal regulation.

In response to comments, EPA agrees that variances could be adopted on a multiple discharger basis and can be renewed so long as the state and EPA conclude that such variances are consistent with the Clean Water Act in implementing regulations.

In this regard, EPA allows grouping waters together in a watershed in a single variance application provided that there is a site-specific information to show how each individual water fits into the group in the context of any single variance and how each individual water meets applicable requirements at 40 CFR 13110G.

2.1

Unlike individual variances,

downstream impacts would not be an issue under a

watershed variance because they would be taking

care of the whole issue. And we think this

would be a streamlined, less burdensome,

cost-effective process for sources to seek

relief.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD:

MR. ETTINGER: What do you mean by downstream impacts? You mean downstream within the watershed or downstream from the watershed?

MR. TWAIT: Downstream from the watershed.

MR. SOFAT: In absence of a watershed variance, whether it's a water body or MDVs, there could be an issue of downstream impact.

So when you define a watershed, such that you can remove the downstream impact issue, then you can be consistent with 122.44D1.

2.1

MR. ETTINGER: Okay. Let me take an example. Let's say, for example, that I want a variance for the Spoon River Watershed. You're not suggesting that I could get a variance for the Spoon River Watershed that would allow me to put pollutants into the Spoon River that would violate water quality standards for the Illinois River, are you?

MR. SOFAT: No, we are not.

MR. ETTINGER: So, that's what I'm confused by, by the downstream doesn't need to be considered.

MR. SOFAT: I see your point. It's within the watershed. As I said, let's say there's Spoon River. There are five dischargers on it. So options are they could ask for MDV, they could ask for a water body segment or water body variance.

However, if their situation is such that -- and, again, let me clarify. Watershed variances are not fit for every scenario.

Watershed variances are fit for scenarios where you have point sources, non point sources type of pollution. Perfect example is chloride issue that we have in Chicago area during winter months.

2.1

The sources are both point sources and non point sources. To have a water body or water body segment or even MDV variance for that will create downstream impact issues. So, in situation like that, you create a watershed that allows you to eliminate that downstream impact issue.

Also, in order for you to have extension in the future, you need to show a progress, a good progress over time which you cannot make if both sources, point and non point sources are contributing to it.

So those are the limited scenarios where you use watershed variance. And watershed variance, we are not saying that it should be used to eliminate the downstream impact. We are saying it's just a benefit that it provides.

MR. ETTINGER: Okay, to use your example then, in designing a chloride variance

for, say, the Chicago River, I would have to take into account that any variance I would grant for chloride in the Chicago River would not cause an impact in the Des Plaines or Illinois River.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Right.

MR. ETTINGER: Thank you.

MR. RAO. Just to follow up, Sanjay.

You mentioned in your example for chloride that you create a watershed for that particular pollutant. So, in a chloride proceeding will

12 the Agency delineate what is a watershed?

MR. SOFAT: Yes. We will be delineating that. And we saw from the questions that we need to do that and all the water bodies within that watershed, therefore, will be considered as, you know -- well, those water bodies will receive the variance.

Because the objective is to make progress. And unless every source -- not every. All sources are involved, both types, progress cannot be shown. And, therefore, extension and other things are not going to happen in the future.

1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Andes. 2 MR. ANDES: Fred Andes, Barnes & 3 Thornburg for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation 4 District of greater Chicago. 5 Let me try to clarify on the question 6 of impact on downstream waters. If, say, 7 there's a variance being considered for the 8 Chicago River and because dischargers cannot 9 meet the chloride standard, and those 10 dischargers have some impact on the low Des Plaines River, when they apply for the 11 12 variance and they say they cannot comply with 13 the standards, they would still be eligible, correct, even though there is some impact on the 14 15 downstream water? MR. SOFAT: You will have to consider 16 17 in that case then impact on the downstream 18 dischargers. So that issue needs to be 19 considered by the upstream dischargers. 20 MR. ANDES: So they will be 2.1 considered in the variance process? 22 MR. SOFAT: In the variance process, 23 yeah, in the demonstration. Because we don't 24 want to create situations where upstream

dischargers are getting variances and causing or contributing to violation of the water quality standard at the downstream dischargers.

2.1

So, those are, and again, as I said, watershed variances are not specifically for that issue. It's just that, first, you have to decide, is this issue, that means it's a widespread pollution and coming from point and non point sources, and to make meaningful improvements, you need both sources to work on that. That's when you know this is a watershed setting, and I think chloride during winter months, that's a perfect setting.

MR. ANDES: So analysis of the downstream impact for a watershed variance is basically the same analysis, correct, as in any other variance context?

MR. SOFAT: Yes.

MS. FRANZETTI: It would be helpful if you could explain the difference between a water body TLWQS versus a watershed TLWQS.

Because when Albert, for example, was asking the question about the Chicago River, to me, that could be a water body TLWQS for the

Page 17 1 Chicago River, not really a watershed. 2 So I'm struggling a little bit as to 3 when in the Agency's evaluations of these 4 proposed rules a watershed variance is 5 appropriate versus a water body variance. 6 Susan Franzetti, F-R-A-N-Z-E-T-T-I, 7 representing Midwest Generation. MR. SOFAT: So let's also talk about 8 9 which pollutant are we talking about? 10 MS. FRANZETTI: Which -- excuse me? 11 MR. SOFAT: Which pollutant. 12 Pollutant. Okay. MS. FRANZETTI: 13 MR. SOFAT: So, in your hypothetical, 14 what pollutant are we trying to address? 15 MS. FRANZETTI: If you can choose one 16 for purposes, I'm just really trying to get a 17 little better understanding and clarity as to 18 when dischargers should be thinking a watershed 19 TLWQS may be appropriate versus a water body 2.0 TLWOS. MR. SOFAT: The only two examples 2.1 22 that come in my mind is the chloride during 23 winter months and nutrients. 24 MS. FRANZETTI: Nutrients. Okay.

MR. SOFAT: Those are the two ways I can see watershed variances helping a lot, doing what we know -- what variances stand for.

2.1

Water body, that means, the problem is limited to that water body, or the dischargers into that water body. So, it's not, like, blanket, let's have the whole watershed, you know, under a variance. That is not why we are doing it.

It's the nature of the pollution that we are dealing with. It's so widespread and coming from all type of sources that if -- let's say, we just say, oh, why not? Let's just do one water body.

Okay. So five years go by, 10 years go by, let's say that's the duration of the variance. Now, at that point, water body still are not in compliance. So, let's say then we want extension. Now, extension depends on whether or not you made a meaningful progress.

So what can a point source do if they are not adding chloride to their mainstream.

That's the scenario. So it really depends on the pollution, the extent of the pollution, and

the sources involved.

2.1

And as I said, this is not -- like, it's not like a desire to have all water bodies, you know, covered. It's really to help make the progress. Those are the circumstances where we are thinking about using watershed.

MR. TWAIT: And a water quality or water body segment, you might have the receiving stream have an issue with copper. And let's say you've got an industrial facility that's discharging copper and there's a couple municipal facilities discharging copper.

That would be a good -- and if they're all going to the same stream segment, that would be a good example of having a water body segment time-limited water quality standard.

MS. RABCZAK: It sounds like this might be appropriate if you submit an explanation to maybe those examples in writing so that it's part of the record.

MR. SOFAT: Okay. We can do that.

MS. PALUMBO: My name is Antonette

24 Palmubo, A-N-T-O-N-E-T-T-E, P-A-L-U-M-B-O. I'm

with the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group.

2.1

So my first question, what if a watershed that you delineated overlaps with multiple water quality standards? We are talking about the chloride example. So, what about the general use and the cause in the Chicago area? Would that require multiple proceedings?

MR. TWAIT: I don't think so. Each of those uses would have to be defined in the proposal. But in the example for chloride, the water quality standard is the same for each of them. So, regardless of the use, you know, I think we can take care of that.

MS. PALUMBO: In the IERG's pre-filed Question No. 9 fits in with this line of questioning, so I'm going to go ahead and raise that now, if that's okay.

For the watershed time-limited water quality standard, is the protection afforded from the time-limited water quality standard for all dischargers within that watershed or only those that were active in the proceeding?

1 MR. TWAIT: You don't necessarily need to be part of the proceeding to receive the 2 3 afforded protection under the time-limited water 4 quality standard. If the Board makes a coverage 5 for classes of dischargers, then you may participate in that way through the Agency. 6 7 MS. PALUMBO: What factors will the 8 Agency consider when it makes its recommendation 9 for what type of time-limited water quality 10 standard should be granted? 11 MR. TWAIT: We'll look at the source 12 of pollution and the sources of -- or the type 13 of pollution that we're talking about and the 14 different sources involved. 15 If it is something that has a lot of non point issues, that would be a good candidate 16 17 for a watershed variance. If it's only one 18 discharger, then that would be a good case for 19 an individual time-limited water quality 20 standard. And if there was several groups, it 2.1 would be good for a MDV. And what I mean by 22 groups is with an MDV they have to be --23 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: What is an 24 MDV?

1 MR. TWAIT: Multi-discharger 2 variance. And they have been to be grouped in 3 such a way as you're not mixing municipal facilities with industrial dischargers, but if 4 5 you had a common issue with a certain type of industry that was similar in size, they could be 6 7 grouped in a multi-discharger variance. MS. PALUMBO: What if there is a 8 9 petition for a watershed time-limited water quality standard and a discharger within that 10 watershed is not active within the proceeding 11 12 and they don't seek coverage under the proposed 13 coverage for -- under your NPDES permit, how is 14 that discharger covered then? What prevents 15 them from being enforced on? 16 MR. TWAIT: If they don't participate 17 in the Board proceeding, and they don't ask the 18 Agency for coverage, there NPDES permit will 19 have the water quality standard placed in it, 20 the underlying water quality standard. 2.1 MS. PALUMBO: Thank you. 22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes. 23 MR. BOYD: Eric Boyd, Thompson 24 Coburn, on behalf of Morton Salt.

I want to go to back to a second ago, we're talking about chlorides and the watershed variances. The process it outlines allows for petitioners to petition for watersheds or water body or individual discharge variances.

2.0

2.1

My question is: Who decides and what criteria is used by the Agency and the Board as to which standard will be -- which variance will be granted? If someone wants a water body variance and someone else wants a watershed variance, who makes that decision? What criteria is used?

MR. SOFAT: So the primary responsibility is on the petitioner. All we are doing is we are helping out the process. We're talking to USEPA to make sure if somebody chooses to do single discharger, then they know what the burden of proof is.

If they decide to do MDV, then they know what the burden of proof is. But if the primary responsibility falls on the petitioner to decide, we cannot force somebody to, hey, you need to do MDV versus watershed.

We'll tell you the advantages, but

that's ultimately on the petitioner to decide what they really want.

Now, our concern has been, and that's why you will see the concept, like, substantial compliance and other things in here, that by the time this variance package gets to USEPA, it must be such that it can be approved by USEPA, that it is consistent with 131.14.

MR. BOYD: Sorry. Just another follow-up. Has the chloride water quality standard for the cause of the low Des Plaines River, has that been approved by the USEPA yet?

MR. SOFAT: Can you repeat your question, please?

MR. BOYD: Sure. Is the 500-milligram per liter chloride standard for cause of the low Des Plaines River that the Board adopted in July of 2015 been approved by

19 the USEPA?

MR. SOFAT: Not yet.

MR. BOYD: When do you expect that to

22 happen?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MR. SOFAT: We have certain issues

24 that we are talking to the USEPA about. Once we

Page 25 1 know which way they want to go, we'll file a 2 package, ask for approval. 3 Will that be done before MR. BOYD: 4 July of 2018 when --5 MR. SOFAT: That's our intention, 6 yes. 7 MR. BOYD: Thank you. 8 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right. 9 I think we're ready to then move on to a couple of simpler questions I suspect. 10 11 Question No. 3 deals with 101.510. 12 And it asks about clarifying Section 104.510 by 13 changing some words so the provision would be -if any provision of this subpart or its 14 15 application to any person is judged invalid, the adjudication will not affect the validity of any 16 17 other provisions of this part or the validity of 18 this subpart as a whole. 19 Would the Agency be okay with that 20 change? 2.1 MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports that 22 change. 23 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay. 24 Question No. 4 is for Definitions. And this is

```
1
     just one where we would combine the first two
     sections to read, unless defined in subsection
2
3
     B, words have the definitions provided in the
4
     Act and 35 Ill. Adm. Code 101, subpart B.
5
                 Is the Agency okay with that?
6
                 MR. TWAIT:
                             The Agency supports that.
7
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And just
8
     for the record, I would note that that change
     was one that JCAR had made before it went to
9
     first notice, so we want to be sure that we have
10
     the support to change it back.
11
12
                 MR. RAO: Moving on to I think it's
     under the same Section 104.515, Highest
13
     Attainable Use.
14
15
                 Please comment on providing a
16
     definition of highest attainable use in the
17
     proposed rule like the one in the federal
18
     regulations.
19
                             The Agency supports the
                 MR. TWAIT:
20
     definition of HAC, highest attainable use.
2.1
                 MS. LIU: Question No. 6 --
22
                 MR. SOFAT:
                             Sorry. If I could add to
23
     the previous response.
24
                 As we all know, this is an evolving
```

issue HAC/HAU, so our intention is to help the petitioners with whatever guidance document and other things that USEPA comes out with. Because our intention is to closely follow what USEPA comes out on this one.

MR. RAO: Thank you.

MS. LIU: Question No. 6, Non-101

(a)(2) uses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Would you please comment on including a definition similar to 40 CFR 131.3(q).

MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports the definition that they have in their pre-filed questions.

MR. RAO: Continuing under the same section, Question No. 7, Best Management Practices.

Please comment on including a definition for best management practices in the proposed rules.

MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports the definition of BMP being included.

MS. LIU: Under Section 104.520,

23 General Procedures. Question No. 8 refers to

24 the Applicability to Persons.

1 Question A, please comment on whether 2 the proposed rule should be revised and 3 applicable to NPDES permittees, not simply 4 persons, for consistency with the federal rule. 5 MR. TWAIT: The Agency disagrees with this particular change. The intent is to allow 6 7 watershed groups to file a petition. And in 8 addition, if we have non point source pollution, 9 401 dischargers could apply also. We support the definition that is in 35 Illinois 10 11 Administration Code 101 for persons. 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: 13 MS. FRANZETTI: Have you thought through whether or not you do have jurisdiction 14 15 over the non NPDES permittees that you were 16 mentioning there as potentially included? 17 MR. TWAIT: If we --18 MR. SOFAT: We don't have the 19 jurisdiction on them, non point sources. 20 MS. FRANZETTI: And that's just a 2.1 legal concern I have is I'm not sure you can 22 regulate them by a time-limited water quality standard if the clean water doesn't regulate 23 them. I don't know for a fact the answer. I'm 24

just raising the concern.

MR. SOFAT: It's not about --

3 variance doesn't mean your are regulating them.

4 It simply says that they are covered. And let's

say there's, in the future, some control

6 | mechanisms or even trading or some other

7 | concepts that we are not envisioning, that comes

8 | into play, and, therefore, variance is necessary

9 for non point.

1

2

5

10 That's where we are coming from.

11 That there's no harm in when they are causing

12 | the -- part of the problem having that variance

is maybe useful to them. Maybe not today; maybe

14 in the future.

But we are not saying we have

16 jurisdiction on them. We are not saying that

17 | because water quality standard variance for a

18 | water body or watershed somehow gives us

19 authority to regulate them. That's not where we

20 | are going.

MS. FRANZETTI: So you're

22 | contemplating that it's almost a voluntary act

23 on the part of the non point source discharger

24 | that they may wish to be covered, and so you're

1 providing the opportunity to be covered? 2 MR. SOFAT: That's definitely one 3 scenario. And any other future scenarios that I 4 can't envision. So, point is, that we don't see 5 any disadvantage to having that when the Clean 6 Water Act allows that. Why now create 7 situation? I'm not sure how trading might work 8 out or some other control that they may decide, 9 because there are some states where they have 10 some non point source controls. 11 So, it's just going back and then 12 updating our variance. Why not adopt as it's 13 intended at the federal level. The worst part 14 is that it will never be used for non point 15 sources.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes, Ms.

Palumbo.

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. PALUMBO: Wouldn't the coverage under the time-limited water quality standard bring terms and conditions that have to be met, if you're covered?

So, if there's a jurisdictional question as to whether the watershed groups or a non point source can be regulated by Illinois

EPA, isn't there still a requirement that the person that is covered follow through with the requirements and the regulations to do, for example, the best management practices or meet the HAC.

2.1

MR. TWAIT: Yes. If they're covered under the variance, they would be required to the BMP and any other requirements that the Board --

MS. PALUMBO: So if there's no jurisdiction over, for example, a non point source discharger and they don't do the best management practices, what resource does Illinois EPA have over that non point source discharger?

MR. SOFAT: As I said earlier, the objective is not to get non point sources to use those BMPs. However, when you calculate HAC, you are supposed to consider what could be done by them in deciding the HAC. So, HAC won't be just what point sources can do. It's also what non point sources could do. So that decides the HAC. So that's why you need that element.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Sofat,

Page 32 1 now you're using HAC. 2 MR. SOFAT: Highest attainable 3 condition. I'm sorry. 4 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you. 5 MR. SOFAT: That's just my -- sorry. 6 Highest attainable condition. 7 And now I lost my thought. 8 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Sorry. 9 you want her to read back what you were saying? 10 MR. SOFAT: No. Did I --11 MS. PALUMBO: That's helpful. Yeah. 12 Thank you. 13 MS. LIU: Question B, would you 14 please comment on whether someone seeking a new 15 NPDES permit but who is not yet a permit holder 16 could apply for a time-limited water quality 17 standard. MR. TWAIT: The intent is for both 18 19 new and existing NPDES permit holders and new 20 and existing 401 projects to have the 2.1 opportunity to petition for a time-limited water 22 quality standard. 23 The time-limited water quality 24 standard is not necessarily a relief mechanism,

1 | but an alternate water quality standard.

2 MR. RAO: Question No. 9, list the

3 facilities covered by time-limited water quality

4 standards.

5 Please comment on providing a

6 | presence on IEPA's website for a list of

7 | facilities covered by current time-limited water

8 quality standard.

9 MR. TWAIT: The Agency can include

10 | that information on our website.

11 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes,

12 Ms. Franzetti.

MS. FRANZETTI: In doing that,

14 | though, will it be a clear that just because you

15 | might be left off the website listing, that

16 | that's not determinative of whether or not

17 | you're covered by the time-limited water quality

18 | standard.

19 MR. TWAIT: I think we can agree to

20 | that if we didn't have an updated list for

21 whatever reason. Our intention is to put the

22 petitioners that originally file. We'll add in

23 | the petitioners that file up to the deadline.

So they're part of the time-limited

water quality standard and then we'll include any of those that receive coverage through the time-limited water quality standard with the Agency.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: And I'm also considering the Agency's perspective on watershed based time-limited water quality standards. You may not know everybody that is covered in that situation.

MR. TWAIT: They would either have to file the original petition, file a petition and get coverage with the Board, or get coverage with the Agency through the Board's criteria.

So the Board would identify them in the order, everybody that's included at that point, and then we would include them as they ask for coverage through the criteria.

MS. LIU: No. 10, Information on Individual Dischargers.

Would you please comment on including provisions in the petition contents under proposed Section 104.530 that would clarify that an individual permittee be included under a multi-discharger variance would need to submit

their own information; for example, public or private discharger, industrial classification, size, effluent quality, existing or needed treatment train, pollutant treatability, and available revenue.

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports the proposed clarification. But I would like to mention we think that USEPA is kind of evolving in their process for MDVs. They approved a MDV with Wisconsin, and Wisconsin looked at phosphorus MDV and they calculated all the impacts within the state.

I think the figure was \$6 billion and they included the impacts to the workers, and so they didn't look at the individual facilities in approving the variance. However, in order for someone to be covered, they set up criteria at that point that they had to meet for each individual facility. But the overall variance was adopted based on impacts to the state.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Question No. 11 and 12 both deal with the state provision at 104.525.

Would the Agency agree to a change in

104.525(a)(3) that would clarify the language as set forth in the question. Is that acceptable to the IEPA?

2.1

MR. TWAIT: The Agency disagrees with this particular change. We've used the language that's directly from the statute at 38.5(h)(1)(c). If we changed it to the language that the Board has proposed, the stay is based upon meeting the deadline that's been established for classes.

If the underlying time-limited water quality standard was not applicable for a stay, such as a chloride standard for DuPage watershed, because it's an existing standard, a stay is not applicable for them.

If the Board set a deadline for the class of dischargers to file, then everybody that then filed within the deadline would have the stay. So we think there's some problems with the current proposed language.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: But (a)(2) says that stays are only applicable to any person who filed a petition for a time-limited water quality standard within 35 days after the

effective date of the water quality standard.

2.1

So (a)(2) sets that forth already that it's only within 35 days that you get a stay. And I understand that this is the statutory language, but as you'll see from the next question, too, where we ask you to clarify (b) and (c), the statutory language is very convoluted. And so this is our opportunity to make it less so.

And so we, you know -- I was going to ask you about changing 104.525(b) and (c) with something a little more clear. I think we really need to look at trying to make this a little less convoluted. If you disagree with this language, I would ask that you take a look at this section and see if we can come up with something that's a little clearer.

And, like I said, I understand what you're saying about we don't want to suddenly make the stay effective to everyone, but I think you already have an (a)(2) who gets a stay;

(a)(1) and (2) covers who gets a stay; and then

(a)(3) then talks about classes of dischargers.

And I just think that we need to make this a

little clearer so that people understand.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

I don't think we need to have a white board to try to figure out who gets stays.

Right now, I think under the statute, you need a white board to figure out who gets a stay.

So I will waive 12 because I assume the answer is similar and ask you to please take a look at this and see if we can't come up with something that's a little less convoluted.

MR. SOFAT: We'll try our best.

MS. FRANZETTI: Will the Agency just elaborate on what's the meaning of the phrase classes of dischargers versus, like, a multi-discharger variance?

MR. TWAIT: Well, you would have classes of dischargers in a multi-discharger variance; like, the classes of dischargers might be small lagoons or it might be large wastewater facilities or it might be a certain type of industrial facilities.

MS. FRANZETTI: Is the idea that you may need to define or identify classes of dischargers because under the terms of the time-limited water quality standard there may be

Page 39 1 different requirements or conditions imposed 2 depending upon which class you're in? 3 MR. TWAIT: Yes. And the burden of 4 proof might also be different. The 5 demonstration might be different instead of the burden of proof. 6 7 MS. RABCZAK: Section 104.530, Petition Contents. Question No. 13 is asking to 8 9 comment on whether the term "predecessors" in Section 104.530(a)(8) needs to be defined. 10 11 MR. TWAIT: We've taken predecessors 12 from existing Board regulations at 13 104.204(b)(3). If we decide that it needs to be 14 defined in the regulations, we're not sure where 15 it should be defined, whether it's 104 or 101. 16 MS. RABCZAK: So you're just 17 referring to the term that was already defined? 18

MR. TWAIT: It's not defined. But it's used in 104.204(b)(3).

MS. RABCZAK: Does it make sense to have a reference to a defined term?

MR. SOFAT: If the Board feels the

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. RABCZAK: Question 14.

need to define it, we can propose something.

1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Sorry. 2 Mr. Boyd has follow up. 3 MR. BOYD: Just a quick follow-up. It looks like the contents of the 4 5 petition, everything in 104.530, seems to be based on existing variance regulations. And my 6 7 question is, why did the Agency feel that was 8 necessary if the real intent of these 9 regulations is to adopt a water quality standard 10 variance process, like, under the USEPA regulations? 11 12 MR. TWAIT: Everything in 104.530 is not taken from existing Board regulations. 13 14 of them are from federal rules. 15 MR. BOYD: My question is, why were 16 the provisions that were taken from the existing 17 variance regulations included? 18 MR. SOFAT: Because they were useful 19 for the water quality standard variance 20 petitions. And, again, we only took what we 2.1 thought was relevant. And, again, I'll say 22 something that what we were trying to do, you 23 will see that we are a separate Section 38.5 in 24 the Act and we are trying to create all of that

separate because historically Illinois had variances that were not consistent with 131.14.

2.1

So what we are trying to do our best is to make sure nobody is confused that the previous ways are still relevant. So this was our attempt to say, put it in one place, one package so that people can just read it and say, okay, I know it. For a water quality standard variance, this is all I need to worry about; this is all I need to know.

So that was overall the thought process as to why we draft the statute the way it is and why we are trying to create a separate subpart here, and then why are we importing provisions from existing regulations. Because we want it at one place, so that it's convenient and easy for petitioners.

MS. RABCZAK: Please clarify whether the word "name" in Section 104.530(a)(9) means the name of the petition holder?

MR. TWAIT: It does.

MS. RABCZAK: Question 15. To clarify Section 104.530(a)(11), would you agree to the proposed change?

Page 42 1 The Agency supports this MR. TWAIT: 2 change. 3 MS. RABCZAK: Question 16, subsection 4 Would you agree to the proposed (a) (14). 5 change? 6 MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports that 7 change. MS. RABCZAK: Ouestion 17. The 8 9 proposed change in Section (b) (1), would you 10 agree to that change? 11 MR. TWAIT: Yes. The Agency supports 12 that change. 13 MS. RABCZAK: Question 18, subsection 14 (b) (2). Would the Agency agree to the proposed 15 change? 16 MR. TWAIT: We would. I would like 17 to take this time to mention that we had a 18 typographical error between the existing and 19 water quality standard. It should say 20 time-limited. So it would read existing 2.1 time-limited water quality standard. 22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: For those 23 of you who may not have that in front of you, the first sentence of that would be: 24 If the

petition is for an extension of an existing time
limit water quality standard.

MR. TWAIT: Thank you.

2.1

MS. RABCZAK: Question 19, please clarify whether Section 104.530(c) and (d) cover different potential situations. For example, if a multi-discharger can potentially be something other than a watershed water body or water body segment.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. Could you please repeat what you just said.

MS. RABCZAK: Please clarify whether the subsection 104.530 (c) and (d) cover different potential scenarios; for example, if a multi-discharger time-limited water quality standard can potentially be something other than a watershed, water body or water body segment time-limited water quality standard.

MR. TWAIT: 530 (c) and (d) are similar in nature; and the Agency would support their consolidation.

MS. RABCZAK: Thank you.

MR. RAO: Question No. 20,

Page 44 1 Identification of water body. 2 Please comment on revising the 3 petition content requirements to include the 4 name and some written identifying description of 5 the water body or the water body segment in 6 addition to the map. 7 MR. TWAIT: The Agency supports that change; and we would be willing to provide this 8 information based on the Agency's current 9 10 identification system. 11 MR. RAO: Thank you. 12 MS. LIU: Question No. 21, 13 Identification of Currently Applicable Water 14 Quality Standard. 15 Would you please comment on revising 16 the petition content requirements to identify 17 the currently applicable water quality standard 18 under proposed Section 104.530. 19 MR. TWAIT: The Agency would support 20 that change. 2.1 MR. RAO: Question 22, All Pollution 22 Minimization Plans. 23 Question A, under 22, is the

requirement that proposed Section 104.530

24

```
1
     (a) (11) overly broad in requiring a petitioner
2
     to submit all pollution minimization plans that
3
     might have nothing to do with reduction in
4
     pollutant loadings to water?
5
                 MR. TWAIT: Yes.
                                   We would agree that
6
     is overly broad.
7
                 MR. RAO: Question B, to narrow the
8
     submission of plans to only those relating to
9
     water, should the definition in proposed
     Section 104.515 parallel the federal definition
10
     and include in the context of this part, such as
11
12
     the following language?
13
                 MR. TWAIT: We believe that 104.530
14
     (a) (11) should be changed to reference that all
15
     PMPs relevant to the requested relief be added
16
     instead of changing the definition.
17
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Could you
18
     provide that to us in writing so that we're sure
19
     we get it.
2.0
                 MR. TWAIT: Yes.
2.1
                 MS. LIU: Question 21, would you
22
     please comment on whether Section 104.530 (a) (1)
```

is missing a word or a phrase with respect to

23

24

compliance.

MR. TWAIT: It is missing a phrase between the word support and compliance. It should have the petitioner's argument that.

2.1

So it will read: Data describing the nature and extent of the present or anticipated failure to meet the water quality standard or standards and facts that support petitioner's argument that compliance with the water quality standard regulation or regulations cannot be achieved by any required compliance date.

MR. RAO: Question No. 24, Consideration of Downstream Impacts.

Please comment on including a requirement in the petition content under Section 104.530 for the petition to demonstrate assurance that the time-limited water quality standard variance will not conflict with downstream water quality standards.

MR. TWAIT: We believe that with a variance, that downstream impacts to water quality standards will happen; such as, with an individual discharger, that needs to get a variance to discharge excess of a certain parameter. We know that there's going to be a

1 downstream impact. And that's fine with a 2 variance.

Where that impact is affecting another downstream discharger, then that impact has to be addressed; such as, if I was discharging a parameter and using up the entire stream for, say, copper, if there is another discharger downstream that needs mixing to meet copper, then when I do my variance, I have to make -- I have to address that downstream discharger.

MR. RAO: Would that be the burden of the petitioner or will the agency get involved in the process.

THE WITNESS: I think that is the burden of the petitioner. And the Agency will try to step in and mention when that's going to happen.

MR. RAO: Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes,

21 Mr. Ettinger.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. ETTINGER: I see two problems
here, and I just want to make sure we're clear
on both of them.

1 You're concerned about downstream 2 dischargers that are using some sort of 3 assimilative capacity that they've got now that 4 they won't have in the future. And you're 5 saying as I understand it that part of the variance procedure of the upstream variance will 6 7 be consideration as to whether this will use up 8 assimilative capacity of the downstream 9 dischargers; is that correct? 10 MR. TWAIT: Yes. 11 MR. ETTINGER: I don't care about the 12 downstream discharger. I care about downstream 13 water quality. In every case, we will not allow a variance which will cause substantial damage 14 15 or cause a violation of water quality standards in the downstream water; is that correct? 16 17 MR. TWAIT: Well, the purpose of the 18 variance is to change the underlying water 19 quality standard. MR. ETTINGER: But not of the 20 2.1 downstream water? 22 MR. SOFAT: If the downstream water 23 is not included in the variance, you're right. 24 We cannot do that.

```
1
                 MR. ETTINGER:
                               Right. So you would
2
     have to -- if you're going to not include the
3
     downstream water in the variance, you're going
4
     to have to leave the water quality standard
5
     alone in the downstream water and protect that
     water quality standard. Of course, if you're
6
7
     going to seek a variance of that water body,
8
     too, then that would have to be shown?
9
                             Right.
                 MR. TWAIT:
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Go ahead,
10
11
     Mr. Andes.
12
                 MR. ANDES: Two clarifying questions.
13
                 So, when we're submitting an
14
     application, whether it's watershed or
15
     otherwise, and one specified that you were
16
     asking for a variance including as to any impact
17
     on downstream water bodies, then that impact
18
     would be covered, correct?
19
                 MR. TWAIT: I believe so.
20
                 MR. SOFAT: Can you repeat the
2.1
     question, please.
22
                 MR. ANDES: When you submit the
23
     application, you specified that you were asking
24
     for a variance not only as to the particular
```

water body you're discharging to, but any impacts on a downstream water body, then that would all be covered in the variance?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Right.

MR. ANDES: Thank you.

Second question is, when you say that if you are consuming some of the assimilative capacity for a downstream discharger, that has to be addressed. The first question is, how would that be addressed? I mean, if you can't -- let me add -- if you can't comply with the water quality standard and you're getting the variance because of that, what does it mean that you would have to address the impact on the downstream discharger?

MR. TWAIT: We would have your length of impacted stream may change if they are discharging and cannot meet the water quality standard also. So you would just have to take that into account when you decide what length of stream that you're impacting.

MR. SOFAT: Just a moment.

MR. TWAIT: What I was referring to

was violations of the water quality standard.

If you're using the assimilative capacity and not exceeding the water quality standard, then there is not an issue.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: But if you're causing or contributing to the downstream discharger, that's when the variance needs to address that issue.

MR. ANDES: Thank you.

MR. RAO: Would you make that part of a downstream, you know, part of the TLWQS? Is that how it will be addressed?

MR. SOFAT: So, if it's a water body, let's say, and even in the case of MDV, if the relief sought were effected as such that it will, that based on the information that we have, we believe that it will cause or contribute to the violation, we'll bring that up and say, petitioner needs to address that issue.

And petitioner could on their own realize that that might be the case and, therefore, address that in their petition.

So, I think the short answer to your question is yes, we should include that requirement in our 530, that they need to do

that demonstration.

2.1

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: What happens if there's a downstream discharger in -- and I like to use the Mackinaw River going into the Illinois.

Let's say Bloomington decides suddenly that it's going to discharge all kinds of nutrients into the water and a downstream discharge -- and so they get a water body variance for where they're discharging into -- I'm just going to say the Mackinaw. I think it's actually going to increase, but let's just say the Mackinaw.

But downstream I'm discharging into the Mackinaw the nutrients that I have. I'm not exceeding the water quality standard. I'm in-taking water from the Mackinaw and discharging, not exceeding the nutrient to water quality standard.

But suddenly now because of what
Bloomington has, the nutrients that I'm now
taking in, my discharger is now -- now, I
violate the water quality standard because
Bloomington had -- how am I to know that this is

```
1
     happening? And what is my obligation as the
2
     downstream discharger to keep track of what's
3
     going on upstream?
4
                 MR. SOFAT: I'm not sure that they
5
     have obligation. I think the obligation lies
     with the IEPA, PCB and the petitioners.
6
7
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay.
8
     Anything further?
9
                 MR. ANDES: Just to clarify one
10
              When you say that the impact on the
11
     downstream water body would have to be
12
     considered, you're not saying the total water
13
     body variance would have to be expanded to
     include every downstream water, correct?
14
15
                 MR. SOFAT: Well, when you say that,
16
     is the down -- whatever that, you know,
17
     everybody is, are they -- is the water body that
18
     originally somebody is asking or requesting
19
     where it's from, is causing the violation.
2.0
                 Because that's a whole issue we see
2.1
     that you need to consider downstream impact.
22
     You can't just creat a situation where
23
     downstream went downstream, water bodies or
24
     dischargers are exceeding standards now because
```

somebody got a variance up here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2.0

2.1

22

MR. ANDES: So, you need to consider the downstream impact, but the group of dischargers that you're looking at in terms of the variance or the time-limited water quality standard would be the ones on the upstream water body.

MR. SOFAT: Uh-huh, yes.

MS. PALUMBO: How far downstream beyond the state border would a petitioner need to consider any impacts?

MR. SOFAT: If there is a water quality standard, then yes. If you don't have a water quality standard, then no. Again, it's the same basic principle. You cannot cause or contribute to a violation of a downstream water body discharger.

MR. RAO: Question No. 25, Water

Quality Standard Triennial Review.

Please comment on how IEPA will include time-limited water quality standards in its triennial review.

MR. TWAIT: The Agency will hold a hearing for the triennial review every three

years, as required by 131.20(a).

2.0

2.1

The federal regulations do not state that when you perform the triennial review, a reevaluation of the highest attainable condition is necessary. The Agency would do the triennial review and notice if any of the underlying basis has changed, such as has technology changed or economics has improved.

And if that happens, we'll notify the Board and ask them to open up the time-limited water quality standard. And based on our understanding of triennial review, a reevaluation does not need to go through the triennial review process.

MR. SOFAT: I'll also add to the response that federal regulations do allow Agencies to use their discretion to set their the priorities.

So, yes, we do need to hold a hearing. We do need to ask public comments on all applicable water quality standards, including variances. However, based on our priorities and resources, we could decide to work on only a handful of standards at that

Page 56 1 time. 2 MS. RABCZAK: Question 26, 3 Section 540. 4 Please explain what IEPA means by 5 delineates the geographic scope of the time-limited water quality standard in 6 7 Section 104.540 and whether such delineation 8 follow from the IEPA response under Section 104.535 or recommendation under Section 9 104.550. Please also clarify which provision of 10 the Act do you refer to in the Board's authority 11 12 to make such delineation. 13 MR. TWAIT: Well, first off, I would 14 like to say the Agency can add that information 15 in 104.535 and 104.550. What we mean by 16 delineates the geographic scope of the 17 time-limited water quality standard is identify 18 the discharger MDV, water body, water body 19 segment or watershed to which the time-limited 20 water quality standard applies. 2.1 MR. SOFAT: So the Agency will 22 propose language to fix that. 23 MS. RABCZAK: Okay. Question 27, Section 104.540 provides in part, the Board must 24

enter a final order that establishes prompt deadlines. Please comment on whether the word prompt is necessary or can the word be deleted.

2.1

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Just for the record, it's 104.540.

MR. TWAIT: The language that we've used, including the word prompt is included in statute. The Agency believes that the word prompt is necessary to address stakeholders' concern of long periods of inactivity. There was a concern that somebody might file for the variance and get the stay and the proceeding just wouldn't move forward.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: But if this is something set in a Board order, aren't the deadlines probably going to be proposed by the petitioner and the Agency as far as what the deadlines are going to be? I mean, prompt just seems to be a word that -- depends upon who you ask what prompt means.

And since we're talking about something that the Board's going to enter a final order that delineates certain things and sets out deadlines, those deadlines are probably

1 going to come as part of the suggestions that we've already received. And if not isn't there 2 3 recourse if, for example, you think they're too 4 far out? Can't the Agency ask the Board to 5 reconsider that order? 6 MR. SOFAT: Yes, we can. Again, I 7 think that what we are doing is we are saying 8 that the basis for these words, use of these 9 words, is used based on a serious concern that was raised. But it's Board's discretion, it's 10 11 Board who is going to interpret what prompt 12 means. 13 And, therefore, if you think the word 14 helps, we can keep it there. If the Board 15 believes that without this word they can do the 16 prompt deadlines, it's up to them. 17 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I'm just 18 wondering if JCAR is going to ask us what we 19 mean by prompt. MR. ETTINGER: Is it in the statute 20 2.1 now? 22 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 23 MS. RABCZAK: Moving on to next section which is Section 104.545. It's the 24

Substantial Compliance Assessment.

2.0

2.1

Question 28. In Section 104.545(a), the phrase as soon as practicable begins the section. Please comment on whether the phrase is necessary. And that's a similar question that we just discussed and, again, it might be a JCAR concern to clarify what that means.

MR. TWAIT: Once again, this is language directly from the statute and it was once again included to address stakeholders' concern of long periods of inactivity. As a reference it's 38.5(g).

MS. RABCZAK: Question 29, in the same section please comment on whether it is appropriate to add after 40 CFR Section 131.14, and Section 38.5 of the Act, after the words its substantial compliance with Section 104.530 to be consistent with the Act.

MR. TWAIT: The Agency agrees with this addition. We would also like to mention that substantial compliance is not a final determination for the water quality standard variance or time-limited water quality standard.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: So, it's

1 not appealable.

2.1

MR. TWAIT: No. I think my point was that just because the Board says that they're substantially compliant, that the petitioner doesn't think that they're all set to go. There is still the hearing, there's agency recommendation that can change things.

MS. RABCZAK: Question 30, it's Section 104.550, Recommendation and Response.

Please comment on whether it is appropriate to clarify proposed language in subsection (b)(3) as proposed by the Board.

MR. TWAIT: The proposed language doesn't quite read right. It said the Agency -- reading from B, it would say at a minimum, the recommendation must include the Agency recommendation on whether the Board should adopt. We think it would be better to say at a minimum the Agency's recommendation, and then remove the Agency's down below in 1, 2 and 4. And we can make that recommendation.

MS. RABCZAK: Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to Question 31. It's Section 104.555,

Hearing.

Question 31 is asking to explain what IEPA means by documentation in subsection (b) (4).

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: We mean supporting documentation to make it consistent with 40 CFR 131.14 (b) (2) (3) (a).

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If I may, I actually have a little bit of follow up on this.

The way this reads to me, and I think this is where our question came from, that the hearing notice shall include identification and documentation of any cost-effective.

So would we have to put in the hearing notice the documentation, or are we just identifying the documentation or telling them where they can go find the documentation?

MR. SOFAT: I believe that documentation has to be made available, but we can check on that and then create a response.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I'm just thinking about how substantial a hearing notice would become if you included all the documentation in the hearing notice. And that's to me the way this reads. And I think that's

Page 62 1 where the question came from and that's why what is documentation and do you really want us to 2 3 publish all the documentation that comes in the 4 petition in the hearing notice. MR. SOFAT: Go back to 40 CFR. 5 6 see what the intent is. But the way we were 7 thinking is just identify the documentation. 8 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: With maybe 9 a link to where they could find it. 10 MR. SOFAT: Right. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yeah. 11 12 MR. SOFAT: But we can look into it. 13 I'm going to have MS. FRANZETTI: trouble putting this in the form of a question. 14 15 It's like jeopardy, but I just want to make a 16 comment that it will be tough with respect to 17 the newspaper publication, you know. 18 So I just think that needs to be kept 19 in mind that you don't want to load up the 20 hearing notice so much that it's going to become 2.1 both cumbersome and expensive potentially to

So, if you can, in particular, at least try and differentiate upon review of the

publish it in a newspaper.

22

23

24

federal regulatory language decide it gives you flexibility for what needs to be in the hearing notice, you might want to revise this in a way that says on the website, you may include this, but it doesn't have to be in the notice of -- published in a newspaper of general circulation for what that's worth.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Absolutely.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And I would think, too, that given the availability of everything on the web anymore that we have and the Board's updating of the website and, in fact, we do all electronic filing, it's going to be very easy for the Board when they do a hearing notice, if it's okay, and it's going to be acceptable to feds to give, you know, even a link to the information.

MR. SOFAT: Yeah. I think all that sounds great. Our only concern is we want to make sure feds are going to be okay with that, because I think we had some discussion with them. We also now there is discussion at the national level whether or not notification, you know, on websites, et cetera, is okay; whether

hearings can be done via video conference, et cetera.

2.1

So we need to talk to them. We know this issue and we have talked with them.

Because our preference would also be the same; have it online and go from there. But I think that we did not get okay from them yet. So we'll go back, talk to them, see if there's a way to modify it.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And I might also say that it says that you'll notify the people on the service list, give them a written notice of the hearing. And then you also publish notice on the Board's website and in a newspaper.

And there may be two different notices even. If the USEPA would be more amenable to a written notice perhaps to people on the service list that it would include the documentation but allow the general notice in the newspapers to be a reference.

MR. SOFAT: We'll definitely talk to USEPA, see what they are willing to do.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.

MS. RABCZAK: Questions 32 and 33 we propose some language change.

2.1

Are you okay with the proposed changes on the Question 32 which removes must and replace them with will in subsection (f) of Section 104.555?

MR. TWAIT: The Agency is agreeable to changing must to will. And in No. 32, we would disagree with removing the words the considerations the Board will take into account. This is language consistent with 40 CFR 25.5(e) requirements.

MS. RABCZAK: Could you explain what you mean by this?

MR. SOFAT: I would say just referencing that the Board will consider 40 CFR 131.14, 38.5, and 104 subpart (f), I think will suffice. Again, we can reach out to USEPA and ask if we can delete that. But, again, our whole concept here is to make sure that feds do not say at the end of the day that your public hearing or public notice was insufficient.

That's where we are coming from. But we can check with them if they are okay with

1 this.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: That's only part of what the Board takes into consideration.

The Board also consideration the petition. The Board looks at the entire record in making its

decision.

That's kind of where we were coming from is that the Board looks at the entire record and required by statute to review the entire record and then take and look at these provisions of the Act and the law.

So that's kind of where we were coming from. We thought it might be a little redundant. Please check with USEPA if they're hard and fast on it.

MR. SOFAT: We will.

MS. RABCZAK: Question 33, relating to subsection (g) of Section 104.555, are you okay with the proposed language?

MR. TWATT: Yes.

MS. RABCZAK: Question 34 relating to Section 104.560. Could you please explain what you mean by the list of persons in Section 104.565(d)(2)(A)(iii) and whether this

list would be provided by EPA in the response under the Section 104.535 for its recommendation on the Section 104.550.

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: At the time of the opinion and order, the list of persons will be the petitioners and anyone that has filed a substantially compliant petition before the deadline. And the Agency will provide that list.

However, the Board may have a more up-to-date list depending on the people that file. Because we have to file our recommendation maybe before the deadline ends. But we can include the list of persons at that time.

MR. ETTINGER: I guess I'm confused by the Board's questions. It seems like the caption here is on 565 Burden of Proof, but now we're down to 565.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Question 34 was just misplaced in our list of questions. It is 565, but we'll get back to burden of proof.

MR. ETTINGER: Are we going to get back to burden of proof?

Page 68 1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes. The 2 next one goes back to that. 3 MR. ETTINGER: Very well. 4 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Scrivener's 5 error. 6 Well, I've got a MR. ETTINGER: 7 question about the burden of proof section when 8 we get there. 9 MS. LIU: Question 35, for Section 104.560, burden of proof. 10 11 Would you please comment on proposing 12 language that would differentiate the burden of 13 proof for a time-limited water quality standard 14 for a Clean Water Act Section 101(a)(2) and a 15 non-101(a)(2) uses under proposed Section 104.560. 16 MR. TWAIT: We would suggest that we 17 use the federal language in 40 CFR 18 131.14(b)(2)(B). And we do acknowledge that they may use a different demonstration. 19 20 don't talk about burden of proof. 2.1 And going back to burden of proof, we 22 would like to change the heading for this. 23 Instead of burden of proof, we would just like 24 to change it to demonstration so that it would

Page 69 1 be consistent with the 101(a)(2) and the 2 non-101(a)(2) uses. 3 MR. RAO: Are you suggesting any 4 changes to subsection (a) or are you going to 5 keep it as burden of proof is on the petitioner? MR. TWAIT: We would probably take 6 7 that out. 8 MR. SOFAT: We will be suggesting a 9 clean up on this issue. 10 MR. RAO: All right. 11 MR. SOFAT: Replacing burden of proof 12 with demonstration. And this appears in several 13 sections throughout the rule. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Boyd. 14 15 MR. BOYD: Just a point of 16 clarification. I've marked the places where 17 demonstration is required. So I'll just read 18 them for you. My question was going to be what 19 does demonstration mean in this context? 20 But if you're going to look through 2.1 the rule and change demonstration and burden of 22 proof, just keep these in mind; 104.538.13; 23 there's one at 104.590 (c) (2) and (c) (3). 24 Thank you.

MR. SOFAT: Thank you.

2 MR. ETTINGER: I have a further

3 question about this section.

attainable condition.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Go ahead.

MR. ETTINGER: Which I think is kind of fundamental and we might have to clarify here. I'm a little confused by (c) of 104.560, specifically with regard to the highest

Here. And I'll just read the language. The petitioner must demonstrate that the term of the time-limited water quality standard is only as long as necessary to achieve the highest attainable condition.

Now, my understanding of highest attainable condition is that that is the term that's used as to what is the highest attainable condition that you can have achieve during the period of the variance, and that the variance lasts until you can achieve the underlying water quality standard.

So, I'm a little confused by this language here. You understand my problem here that the term highest attainable condition seems

to be being used in two ways here. Perhaps it would be easier if I gave an example.

2.1

Let's say that the current water quality standard for a particular pollutant is 20 and we've decided that the proper standard should be five, but that it would cause an unacceptable level of problems that require to going below 10 during some period of time.

As I understand the federal language, highest attainable condition then would be 10 and you would seek a variance that would go long enough to achieve five.

This seems to be talking about the time-limited water quality standard time as the time to achieve 10. So I believe there's some confusion in our terminology here.

MR. SOFAT: Let me try. Let's see if it takes us anywhere. So they are going to be circumstances where calculating HAC is pretty straightforward; single discharger and we can calculate what could be there in the five limit for copper.

And that becomes HAC for -- let's say they say I need seven years to get to that

number. There are going to be cases just like our chloride example where you cannot figure out the ultimate HAU, which will correspond to a certain kind of HAC.

2.0

2.1

So what you do is you go with the existing available information. And based on that information, you decide what is the HAC for this duration. And that's why you do the evaluation. And if the reevaluation says you could do better than what you did in the previous cycle, then that needs to be self-implementing, assuming it's more stringent.

So then that becomes the HAC for the next phase. You keep on doing HAC. So it's different for those two scenarios that I talked about. Does it add to confusion or help?

MR. ETTINGER: I guess my confusion is using the same terminology for two different concepts, or maybe not making clear how the time factor is going on.

Let's say, again, to use my example, the current standard is 20; the standard that we've decided is eventually protected is five.

I can imagine a situation in which we're not

immediately going to get from 20 to 10 either, so we would need time to get from 20 to 10. And so that seems to be the language that we're talking about here. But then the time length of the whole variance would be the time needed to get to five.

2.1

And I'm just concerned that we not use the -- well, maybe I'm -- it strikes me that what we should be looking for is a variance which spells out the whole pattern overtime recognizing that the HAC might vary overtime, but also recognizing that the long run goal is to reach the actual water quality standard.

MR. SOFAT: And I think that is how the variance rule, federal and this one. I think the first sentence in here makes this assumption that in every scenario you can figure out that ultimate HAC. And I'm saying in some cases you are not going to be able to figure out HAC up-front.

MR. ETTINGER: That's where our problem is, though, on terminology. The ultimate is the water quality standard. So, the ultimate is five. The question is: How are we

1 going to work out how we're going to get there? 2 MR. SOFAT: Okay. Just one comment 3 I don't think that every scenario will 4 translate into meeting the water quality 5 standard. There could be cases where you walk 6 as far as you could and that eventually you end 7 up using HAU, which is the highest attainable 8 use. 9 So, for example, chloride is what I 10 have in my head. After doing everything everybody could do, there might be a chance that 11 it still doesn't comply with 500. And at that 12 point, so ultimate compliance with the 500 may 13 14 never happen, let's just say that. 15 At that point, what you do is then

At that point, what you do is then you come up with a limited use, a winter limited use. So that's where I'm coming from. That HAC, I think the way it's used, that's precisely how USEPA uses it. And I'm just stating my understanding with you that in cases where it's not straightforward to figure out what the HAC is, you start with HAC based on the existing information.

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MR. ANDES: I think there's a lot of

Page 75 1 confusion on this issue, and I think part of it 2 is actually due to the way EPA wrote their 3 regulations. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Which EPA? 4 5 MR. ANDES: USEPA. Yes. Let's be 6 clear on that. 7 So, let me back up a step. If we 8 have a situation where a discharger has a limit 9 and they think they can get there, and it's a water quality base limit, you would issue a 10 compliance schedule, correct? That's not 11 12 verbally --13 MR. SOFAT: Yes. MR. ANDES: You would not need a 14 15 variance in that situation? 16 MR. TWAIT: Correct. 17 MR. ANDES: Right. So the situation 18 we're talking about is where -- at least at this 19 point we don't have enough information. 20 they can't get there or we don't know they can 2.1 get there. So you're getting a variance. 22 And let's just say, hypothetically, 23 that the water quality number is five. 24 Everybody is at 20 right now. And two concepts.

One is they think they can get to ten in five years. So, at the end of the variance term, they think they can get to 10. Not to five, but they think they can get to 10. And that's as far as they can go.

2.1

And they think they can make progress between 20 and 10 during the term of the variance. So there are two issues, and I think Albert and I are agreeing there's two issues here.

One is -- and let's put aside the EPA terms for a minute, the USEPA terms for a minute. One issue is how do you define the endpoint to the variance? Where do they need to be at the end of the variance term? And we should talk about what that is and how we define it.

And the second issue is what conditions apply to the discharger during the time frame of the variance as they're working toward that goal. So, perhaps, the Agency can explain its thoughts in terms of, A, how you would define the end goal of the variance, understanding that they can't get to five, but

they can get to 10 by the end the variance. And how you define the interim conditions that would apply during the term of the variance while they're trying to get there.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

MR. SOFAT: I'm confused by the question in this sense. It seems like the hypothetical assumes that you know how to get to five. Is that the assumption?

MR. ANDES: No. Let's say financially or physically we don't think we can get to five, but we think we can get to 10 by the end of the variance.

MR. SOFAT: So, let's start with that and maybe it will narrow down the issues.

So when you know that you can go from 20 to 10 in five years, that becomes -- five years becomes as long as necessary to achieve 10. If somebody needs a compliance schedule to do that, variance allows that, too. Okay. So, that is the HAC and as long as necessary issue addressed there.

Now, when we are doing that, we know anything that's greater than five years, you have to do a reevaluation. Reevaluation is the

mechanism through which we will all learn what else and what more can be done. And HAC is a progressive thing. It continues to evolve based on the analysis.

2.0

2.1

So I'm not seeing any confusion in that. The ultimate standard, yeah. The general rule is that you have to comply with the water quality standard. That's why you start the bus. However, that doesn't mean in every case you will meet that five.

And that's why I was asking, if the assumption in that question is that, yes, I know I can get there because let's say it's economics, then you know you don't have the money, you can use factor six. So, therefore, that becomes your HAC. Five is your HAC; and your burden of proof is factor six.

MR. ANDES: Well, five is not the highest attainable condition because you can't get to five, right? 10 would be the highest attainable --

MR. SOFAT: That's why I said I'm confused by the question. If we know how to get to five --

MR. ANDES: Let's say we do not know how to get to five, we cannot afford to get to five. We can afford to get to 10 by the end of the five-year term.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Then, as I said earlier, your HAC is 10, as long as necessary is five.

And, well, let's say six, because then it doesn't make sense. It's six. And then within five years you have to do reevaluation. And that will decide the next HAC.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: So what you're saying Mr. Sofat is that if I come in and ask for a variance and I know the level is 20 and I know I can get to 10.

I come in and ask for a time-limited water quality variance for five years. And in that five years, the highest achievable condition is going to be 10. And you're going to give me a variance that allows me to get my discharge to 10.

At the end of that five years, if I have achieved 10, or say I've achieved only 11, then I reevaluate at that point and then I may be able to get to five. So my new highest

1 | achievable condition would be five.

2.1

Is that correct? That's what I think
I'm hearing.

MR. SOFAT: This is what I will change in that. I won't say five of because five means you have to get to 10 in five. So I will say six is what I need to get to 10.

But within five years then, I'll do reevaluation and say, oh, by the way, based on what I have done, I can get to seven. Material has changed, I have a limited mainstream, new technology is out there, whatever the factors might be.

So what I'm saying is that you start HAC not by solving, not doing the -- it doesn't have to be an elaborate demonstration. You start with calculating HAC based on the information existing readily available information that you have.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: But the HAC may change when you do your reevaluation?

MR. SOFAT: Right. If the end point is, let's say, five, that means, yes, you need

to continue to do something. Either you get to

a point where you have met five or you get to a point where you say, I have exhausted everything and, therefore, the only option here is HAU, which is a limited use than the original use.

2.1

MR. TWAIT: That would be to change the underlying standard.

MR. ETTINGER: I don't think we actually disagree on what's happening here. I just want to get the terminology correct. It strikes me that -- and we're not limited to five-year variances anymore.

So it strikes me that if I had a case like the one Fred presented, in which I can get to 10, but I can't in five years, but I don't know when I can get to five, I would apply for a 10 or 20-year variance.

MR. SOFAT: Precisely.

MR. ETTINGER: I would say the HAC that I can reach in five years is 10. And then during the reevaluation period, I might be able to adjust it to where I can get down to eight or maybe I'll stay. But then that would continue to be the HAC. But the ultimate goal is always five.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Page 82

And as Mr. Twait points out, or you point out, there might come a time in which you just say five is never going to happen and you change the underlying water quality standard with the UAA. MR. SOFAT: So I agree with that description. MR. ETTINGER: Ill propose some language I guess that will clarify that. MS. PALUMBO: We had a couple questions related to this topic. It feels right to address it currently then. We talked about sort of a compliance schedule built into the time-limited water quality standard. Do petitioners need to suggest this compliance schedule to meet the HAC during the term of the time-limited water quality standard?

MR. SOFAT: Can I ask you why you have that understanding? What's the basis for that understanding that compliance schedule has to be part of the time-limited water quality standard?

MS. PALUMBO: Just on our previous

discussion like we were having. We talked about a compliance schedule.

2.0

2.1

MR. SOFAT: And I said that it could be allowed. Let's say to get to 10, somebody needs to do something and, therefore, they need compliance schedule to do that. So it's permissible is what I'm saying.

MS. PALUMBO: Okay.

MR. SOFAT: It's permissible. And I think then maybe we should go to Board's question about that because I think that's the central question on compliance schedule. But anyway.

MS. PALUMBO: Once the HAC is met --well, does the Agency consider that that water body is no longer impaired?

MR. SOFAT: The water body may still -- water body is still impaired if the underlying use and the criteria has not been met. You still may have to do TMDL.

It's a temporary -- it's time-limited, as it states, it's a time-limited water quality standard. The underlying standard does not disappear unless somebody actually does

1 HAU.

2.1

MS. PALUMBO: Okay. In using the example we were working on with getting down to five, would you say it's the role of the petitioner to suggest a term that would allow the HAC to be met, or can they say, for example, I just want five years and I'll meet 10 instead of five?

MR. SOFAT: Okay. I'm going to respond; see if that answers your question.

MS. PALUMBO: Okay.

MR. SOFAT: We are excepting that petitioner is going to, based on the information, calculate what can be done.

So first is, you have to think about how to get to five. But don't know how to get to five, let's say. In that case then, you need to decide based on the existing information, to get to 10, what do I need to do, and how long do I need to get to 10.

So those are the two things, I would say, that's how I would think about HAC. That's what petitioner should be thinking about.

Did I answer the question?

Page 85 1 MS. PALUMBO: Yes. 2 MR. SOFAT: Okay. 3 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Ms. Palumbo, 4 are you through? 5 MS. PALUMBO: Yep. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Let's take 6 7 the opportunity here to take about a 15-minute 8 break. I would anticipate then after we come back we'll go for about an hour and a half 9 before we take lunch, if we need to take lunch. 10 11 We may get done. We're down to the 12 last few questions from the Board. So let's 13 take 15 minutes and come back and then we'll go 14 until about 12:30 before we take lunch. So back about 10 after 11:00. 15 16 (WHEREUPON, a short break was 17 taken.) 18 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Back on the 19 record. 20 We left off -- I think we're ready to 2.1 start with the Board's Question No. 36. 22 MR. RAO: Section 104.565, Opinion 23 and Order, Question No. 36. 24 Please comment on including

```
1
     provisions in the proposed petition contents,
2
     that is Section 104.530, and Board opinion and
3
     order, which is under Section 104.565, that
4
     clarify when the petitioner should propose a
     compliance schedule and the Board should include
5
     a permit compliance schedule in the time-limited
6
7
     water quality standard.
8
                 MR. TWAIT: Reading the preamble,
9
     they suggest having a compliance schedule
     available, if necessary. And close to the end
10
     of Page 51041, it says, moreover, consistent
11
12
     with 131.21(c), any permit compliance schedule
13
     authorizing provision that was adopted effective
     and submitted to EPA before May 30th, 2000, is
14
15
     applicable for purposes of 131.15.
                 And I'll mention that we have a
16
17
     provision for compliance schedule in 309.148.
18
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Twait,
```

MR. RAO: Can you provide the

the preamble, you said you were reading the

22 citation of the federal rule.

19

2.0

2.1

23

24

preamble.

MR. SOFAT: Attachment A.

So, the Agency believes that we have

1 | this provision already in Board's regulations.

2 | However, we are going to check with USEPA to

3 | make sure that they agree with our

4 interpretation.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

MR. RAO: Should these rules have any cross-reference to the existing provision regarding compliance schedule? Because you did mention that you wanted it to be kind of a stand alone procedural rule.

MR. SOFAT: We could for the clarification purposes, we could.

So the first thing we want to do is want to make sure that USEPA does agree that 309.148 is the authorizing provision. And if that's the case, then maybe we could suggest language in there that petitioner could ask for a compliance schedule pursuant to 309.148.

MR. RAO: That would be helpful.

19 Thank you.

MS. FRANZETTI: Do I understand correctly that the Agency believes that EPA's position is that the Agency has the authority to set a compliance schedule that may be needed to meet the terms of the water quality standard

variance when it is either renewing or modifying the NPDES permit?

2.0

2.1

MR. SOFAT: We have to clarify with USEPA whether or not 309.148 serves the purpose for permit complying schedule in general, as well as authorizing provision under the water quality standard variance that they are talking about.

So Board has a really good question about do you really need an authorizing provision for permit compliance schedules as the preamble talks about. But when we read the preamble, there is one sentence, which is the one that Scott read into the record.

Based on that, our position is, it's IEPA's position that we do meet the requirements of this compliance schedule authorizing provision, but we do want to verify with the USEPA, so that we are absolutely sure that we could continue to use -- because we have used this provision to write QBEL limits and NPDES permits in the past.

MS. FRANZETTI: And I would just add to that my way of additional information from

1 the preamble to the federal water quality standards TLWQS provision, and it's 510.36, that 2 3 the Agency EPA, the USEPA, did state that, 4 quote, where a permittee cannot immediately meet 5 the WOBEL derived from the terms of the WOS 6 variance, the permitting authority can decide 7 whether to provide a permit compliance schedule, 8 paren, where authorized, closed paren, so the 9 permittee can remain in compliance with it's 10 NPDES permit. And then they reference Clean Water 11 12 Act, Section 502, Subparagraph 17, for a 13 definition of schedules of compliance, and 40 14 CFR 122.47. 15 MR. ANDES: Let me try to make sure I 16 understand the concepts. 17 Am I correct in EPA's terminology as 18 Ms. Franzetti indicated, a compliance schedule 19 as the EPA terms it is specifically for when you

need more time to do it. Is that accurate?

MR. SOFAT: So, for a newly adopted water quality standard, you may not meet the variance. You could simply use a water quality

think you could meet the final number. You just

20

2.1

22

23

24

```
1
     a compliance schedule like we had done
2
     traditionally. But, again, you have to justify
3
     the term of that compliance schedule, just like
4
     in the past.
5
                 MR. ANDES: So you know you can meet
     the limit. You just need five years or seven
6
7
     years or whatever number of years, let's say
8
     five, to construct the facility needed in order
     to meet the limit?
9
10
                 MR. SOFAT: Right.
                                     That's
     permissible.
11
12
                 MR. ANDES:
                             That's the conventional
13
     concept of a compliance schedule?
                 MR. SOFAT:
14
                             True.
15
                 MR. ANDES: But here it seems like
16
     we're talking about compliance schedule in
17
     another way. When we're talking about in a
18
     variance, there are enforceable milestones or
19
     actions that need to be taken during the term of
20
     the variance. Now, you're in compliance, as
2.1
     long as you're doing the things that are
22
     enforceable and that might be called a
23
     compliance schedule.
24
                 But it's a different thing, correct,
```

than what I was just talking about earlier.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Yes. Compliance schedule could be used like the first scenario. Newly water quality standard is adopted and dischargers need a compliance schedule to comply with the standard.

Okay. In here, like you said, you could have PMP that describes the things that must be done and to do the PMP, one may need a compliance schedule. And that is the compliance schedule for the water quality standard variance purposes.

MR. ANDES: So, for that purpose you might a have a pollutant minimization program and certain steps that you might be taking at particular times over the term of the variance. And as long as you do those things, you will stay in compliance. So that's what you're calling a compliance schedule?

MR. SOFAT: For variance purposes.

And it could be a treatment technology that you need to modify or use that you need the compliance schedule for.

MR. ANDES: Or it could be

1 | implementing certain steps to reduce salt usage?

2 MR. SOFAT: Right. That is our

3 understanding.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: There's also a compliance schedule example in the next paragraph from what Ms. Franzetti had read.

And their example is the water quality standard being at one for the pollutant, and the current F1 quality is at 10 and the state adopts a highest attainable condition of three milligrams per liter.

You can ask for a compliance schedule in your permit to go from 10 to three. That's another place that you can use a compliance schedule in conjunction with the time-limited water quality standard.

MR. ANDES: Just to clarify, so that's a schedule issued in conjunction with the variance?

MR. SOFAT: Yes.

MR. TWAIT: Would than be in --

MS. FRANZETTI: Well, I think that's

23 part of the question. And Mr. Twait is correct.

24 That's the point I think the USEPA was trying to

makes in this section of the preamble is that because you have this requirement to achieve the highest attainable condition, as a discharger, you may not be able to immediately meet what that highest attainable condition is.

2.1

And as Mr. Twait pointed out, the example they gave is that the generic water quality standard is at one milligram per liter. You've established in your TLWQS proceeding that the highest attainable condition is three.

But you, as a discharger, need time to do certain things to achieve three. And that is where you would need and/or allow according to EPA to have a compliance schedule to get to three.

Where I think the issue is a little unclear is does that compliance schedule have to be part of the Board order when it grants you the TLWQS at three? Does the Board have to go the next step and actually have in its order the compliance schedule for that discharger to get to three, or is that something that can fall to the Agency to provide in the NPDES permit, it does not need to be in the Board order granting

the three milligram per liter TLWQS. I don't think the preamble is all that clear.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Couple of things. Andes example -- in your example, one milligram is the water quality standard.

MS. FRANZETTI: Correct.

MR. SOFAT: So if somebody could comply with that, that will be a compliance schedule up-front. If somebody is complying with HAC, then that is the compliance schedule for the variance purposes.

So, I hope that's clear because that is my understanding and I think that's what USEPA rule is saying.

As far as compliance schedules are concerned, based on our reading of the preamble, I think it's the Agency permitting authority function of deciding. Because you still have to justify how long and what needs to be done.

Because that's the whole objective of having the compliance schedule provision in your rules, that you use the factors that are mentioned or whatever the applicable regulation is on the compliance schedule.

1 So it's the Agency permitting 2 function. That's the way the rule is written. 3 That's what they have to decide. And not 4 everybody is going to need that same level 5 because you have to justify. Somebody may need 6 three years or it says five years or one year. 7 MS. FRANZETTI: And an argument can 8 also be made in support of that, that because 9 NPDES permits go through public notice and comment, that compliance schedule will be 10 subject to those public notice and comment 11 12 requirements and, therefore, not run afoul of 13 the general federal public notice and comment requirements in the TLWQS rule. 14 15 MR. SOFAT: True. MR. RAO: Mr. Sofat, if the 16 17 compliance schedule, if I'm hearing you right, 18 doesn't have to be part of the Board's order, 19 but do you think they should provide the 20 compliance schedule as a part of the petition for Board to review? 2.1 22 I quess my question would MR. SOFAT: 23 be what would be the objective of that? 24 MR. RAO: In the past when we had

variances, compliance plan is a requirement under the prediction content requirement for water quality variance. I know this is a different animal, but I'm just wondering, do you see any parallels for the Board to review the information as to how the TL is going to be or the highest achievable condition will be attained during the term?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: My review will be that for the water quality standard variances, Board really -- the function that we see Board be doing is making sure that the petition is consistent in 131.14; that the factors that are considered, the 10(g) factors, that the burden of proof or the demonstration -- not burden -- demonstration is adequate enough so that when the package goes to USEPA that it gets approved. Because it is not a relief. It's a water quality standard, alternated water quality standard that we are adopting.

So from that perspective, I see its original Board function to make sure that the alternate standard that's being adopted is consistent with the underlying regulation, 40

CFR.

2.1

As far as deciding on what compliance schedule somebody needs, we do that now. And if somebody disagrees with us, whether we give them more or less, they can always appeal to the Board.

So I think Board has the ultimate authority to decide whether or not the compliance schedule somebody got is adequate.

So from that perspective, I would say that we could always leave that function to the Agency and Board uses the traditional authority to decide whether or not it was proper. But we will do the math up-front to decide based on the nature of the discharger, all the other factors that we need to consider, what is the right adequate, you know, amount of compliance schedule for that person.

And, by the way, Board has already set up in the variance what the BMP, PMP needs to be done. So that's outlined.

Now, for each person then we'll apply that BMP, and say, okay, you need to comply with these PMPs pursuant to the Board order, justify

how long you need to comply with them. So it will be a case-by-case analysis is what I'm saying.

MR. RAO: Okay.

2.0

2.1

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I've got to put on the Board's other hat for a minute and ask an enforcement question.

How do you envision in Ms. Franzetti's example where someone is discharging at 10, they get a TL for three. And there's no compliance schedule in the Board order. So the Board says, okay, the TL is three.

What happens if someone says you're violating the Board order because you're still discharging 10 and there's no compliance schedule in the Board order to show that. How do you how do we reconcile that?

MR. SOFAT: So Board will decide, okay, it's three milligrams and you have seven years. So that's a overview of the variance.

So, yeah, everybody can get seven years. But Agency will be the one who will be putting, the BMP, the Board order into NPDES permit in order for that to be enforceable.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Well, no.

If you violate the water quality standard,

anybody can enforce the violation of the water

quality standard.

2.1

So, my question is much simpler than that, and especially as I hear you talking about how these TLs are going to work. That, if we could get a TL where we adopt a time-limited water quality standard of three, that could take people 10 years to get to.

In the meantime, that is water quality standard. And it's a break from the general water quality standard. So the water quality standard is three. Someone is discharging 10. Even if they have an NPDES permit that says they can discharge 10, that's not a defense against the violation of the water quality standard.

MR. SOFAT: So once Board approves a time-limited water quality standard, that goes to USEPA for approval. Let's say USEPA approves that. Now that becomes effective for the Clean Water Act purposes. And then we use that and put that in the NPDES permits. Now it becomes

1 enforceable.

2.0

2.1

So that's the sequence of steps that needs to happen.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I understand that. And I'm saying we get to that point. And you're telling me the discharger may be discharging at 10 and can't get to the new time-limited water quality standard of three for five years.

A private citizen decides that they see the NPDES report and it says Company ABC is discharging at 10 and they go and look it up and there's a water quality variance that says you can only discharge three, the Board order has no compliance schedule set up in there. They charge ABC company with violating the water quality standard.

How do we handle that?

MR. SOFAT: I'm not seeing the issue there because the Board opinion will decide what steps and what duration is. If we are putting those in somebody's permits that's their defense; that this is what I'm required to do.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: A permit is

not a defense against a violation of the water quality standard.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Water quality standard does not apply on its own. It has to be part of the NPDES permit. That is my understanding.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I think we'll just let that go there.

MS. PALUMBO: Is it the Agency's intent that the petitioner should acknowledge the need for the compliance schedule in their petition, perhaps in their suggestion of the HAC?

So, if the Agency is suggesting the compliance schedule, would the petitioner need to acknowledge that that would be required?

MR. SOFAT: You can acknowledge that. Again, I think at the end of the day what we are trying to decide is who decides what the compliance schedule is.

Based on our understanding of what, you know, USEPA rules are talking about, it's the permitting authority. And I see the point that it's a case-by-case analysis. Okay. And not every variance you're going to need a

compliance schedule either.

2.1

So from that perspective, that's what my response is based upon. But if somebody wants to simply mention to the Board that, hey, I believe that I may need a compliance schedule, there's no harm in acknowledging that. But then if that request is that I need a compliance schedule from the Board, that's the issue that you we are discussing right now.

MS. FRANZETTI: Would the Agency consider whether for purposes of these proposed TLWQS rules that it may support, including in the contents of the petition section, making it optional for the discharger or person seeking the TLWQS to include a proposed compliance schedule which would then uncover those situations where the petitioner knows it needs a compliance schedule even to achieve the variance number and may wish to put it right into its petition so that it may also address

Ms. Tipsord's point that until you have the compliance schedule incorporated into your NPDES permit, you are potentially exposed to a third-party enforcement actions.

Sorry. I know that was a long question.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Right. However, the question doesn't change. The question remains to be the same in my view. And that is who has the authority to provide compliance schedule.

If, in my view, Board has given you variance, that means at that state level, right there, you have variance from the standard. So I'm not seeing how a lawsuit could be filed, enforcement, that you are not complying with the underlying standard because Board has granted the variance.

Now the question becomes is it effective and ready to be used for the Clean Water Act purposes. That you have to wait until USEPA has approved it. That's when it becomes effective.

MS. FRANZETTI: I agree. And that would be another possible reason why a petitioner might want to include a proposed compliance schedule in it's petition because if that is -- if the requested TLWQS is approved by the Board, along with the proposed compliance

schedule, it goes to USEPA for approval or disapproval and USEPA ultimately also has some say in that compliance schedule, well, I think it may through the NPDES permit review.

2.1

So, for a discharger, it might be preferable to find out sooner rather than later does EPA have an issue with the proposed compliance schedule.

Now, I'm not saying they would do that all the time because it may be that EPA doesn't have a problem with the TLWQS that's been approved by the Board, but does have a problem with the compliance schedule. And hence as a discharger, you might not want to risk getting your TLWQS disapproved by EPA because they have a problem with the compliance schedule. You might want to leave that to be debate the in the context of an NPDES permit issuance.

MR. SOFAT: Right. In my view those are two separate things. The defense somebody has in my view is because of the approved variance, not because of a compliance schedule. Variance gives you the protection, not the

compliance schedule.

2.1

And when we will send the package, the package will be for approving or disapproving the variance, not the compliance schedule. Compliance schedule is the NPDES permit people's function. That is how we are seeing it.

MS. FRANZETTI: Yes. But if they can't meet yet that TL standard, the three we've been using, when the standard is the one, then getting the three when they're still discharging five does potentially expose them to enforcement until a compliance schedule is approved.

MR. SOFAT: So three is the HAC. And it will say, the variance will say that you have X number of years to get to three. In the meantime, you must apply the following PMP. So the enforcement is based on whether or not somebody is applying those PMP.

MS. FRANZETTI: If the Board order says you have X amount of time to get to the three, okay, the Board order also has to say, and that three lasts for X number of years thereafter.

MR. SOFAT: It has to.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: So, I would say your point about if the Board says you have X amount of time to get to three, that's a compliance schedule.

MR. SOFAT: Okay. Compliance schedule, it's not. Traditionally speaking, it's not compliance schedule.

Compliance schedule is what do you need to do at your side to comply whether it's PMP or whether it's the final number. There's a distinction between then.

Variance is simply, so we were talking about three milligrams and you're going to get there seven years. That means the analysis was done, what is HAC, and then analysis was done based on the PMP that has been selected, which includes BMP, how long would it take.

And that's the whole objective of that variance that you have a different standard for that many years, if you do the PMP. PMPs are the terms and conditions.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Sofat,

let me ask you a question. A time-limited water quality variance that the Board issues, if we say the new water quality standard is three for this water body, and USEPA approves that, are you saying that it's not three until the end of the variance, or are you saying it's three through the variance?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Well, it depends on how the request is made. So if I say the HAC -- because we talked about as long as necessary. So somebody is saying that, look, I'm going to need X number of years to get to this endpoint, endpoint of three. So it's, you know, year one, whether it's seven, or six, or five.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Then what is the water quality standard for the water body from the period of the variance starting until they get to three? Is there just no water quality standard?

MR. SOFAT: The HAC is your water quality standard. The underlying standard is there. That's why the variance procedure is going on because you cannot comply with that. And we talked earlier about standard is five.

But I know based on the existing and available information, I know I can only go as far as 10.

2.1

quality standard?

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: So, let me ask you this. There's a time-limited water quality variance that at the end of the variance, everybody is going to be at three. Everybody that's got the variance is going to be at three. Suddenly, they start discharging 20 for a year. Is there a violation of the water

MR. SOFAT: So can you help me understand the question. So, let's say, five years and the number is 10. So when did they start discharging 20?

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Let's say they're discharging 10 now. At the end of the variance, they're going to get to three. That's going to be the water quality standard at the end of the variance.

In the meantime, they say, hey, we can discharge 20 for a year or two before we have to start working to get to three. What happens? Is there a violation of the water quality standard.

MR. SOFAT: Whether or not they are in violation of time-limited water quality standard depends on whether or not they are implementing the PMP.

2.0

2.1

MS. ZALEWSKI: In that same example, what if they haven't done anything. If they're trying to get down to -- a discharger is trying to get down to three and they don't take any steps for the five years, say it's a five-year variance, and they come back and ask for a reevaluation. They're claiming they didn't have enough time to meet it, but they hadn't done any of those steps.

Again, is it a violation? Because if it's not in the Board order -- we're struggling. When we review these variances, usually we look at the whole package and we consider the steps and if they're reasonable and if we see enough movement of the needle in the right amount of time.

So I think they're kind of what we're struggling with up here is how we would assess a permit application.

MR. SOFAT: My view is that's where

the PMP comes in. Those PMPs have to be, like, all of you need to do this. And if you're not doing that, that means you are in violation of your Board connection, which is actually part of their NPDES --

2.1

MS. ZALEWSKI: Right. So it would be set by the Agency, not the Board.

MR. SOFAT: Right. And if somebody doesn't do anything and then they come back and say they want extension, extension requires you to say, what was required, what did you do, what can kind of progress did you make?

So it's not like somebody could just decide that they don't want to do anything and then they ask for extension. That's the whole objective of having reevaluation.

MS. ZALEWSKI: So when the Board is determining, we don't know what that timeline looks like, when we're determining whether to grant or to deny. We don't know what that timeline looks like, correct? Because it comes after the fact.

The timing of the conditions come before the Agency after the petition has been

Page 111 accepted, approved by the Board; is that right?

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: If the compliance plan is part of the NPDES permit, the Board does not see that unless there's an appeal in the NPDES permit.

MR. SOFAT: That's true.

2.1

7 MS. ZALEWSKI: So it's after the 8 Board has to decide.

MR. SOFAT: Because all agency is adding is if somebody has to do, let's say, technology or some kind of control. That requires them to have a compliance schedule. That is all we are saying how many years do you get.

However, the original Board order defines what is the HAC, what is the duration, and what PMPs must be done. We have no room to play with that.

MS. ZALEWSKI: So the PMP will be in the original petition, but not the timing of them.

MR. SOFAT: Right. All of that is decide by the Board. We are simply deciding the compliance schedule.

1 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: And part of the 2 compliance then is any sort of implementation 3 that has to be done to meet whatever that 4 threshold is. That's part of the schedule. 5 MR. SOFAT: That's the showing they will have to do. The Board required me to do 6 7 XYZ PMP or BMP. For me to do those, I'm going 8 to need X number of years. That's the 9 justification you are making. 10 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: In vour estimation, the Board would have the appropriate 11 12 information to make that determination with or 13 without a schedule. 14 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 15 MS. ZALEWSKI: What's the benefit of 16 the Agency deciding that over the Board in your 17 opinion? 18 MR. SOFAT: At the point of writing 19 NPDES permit, we will be asking the specific 20 question about how much time do you need to do, 2.1 let's say, BMP ABC. And that is case-by-case 22 That is not required by any 131.14. analysis. 23 There are two separate functions in my view 131.14 about water quality variance is 24

that if you want a variance, what do you need to demonstrate. And that's what this whole rule is about.

2.0

2.1

In that rule, they are saying, and I'm sure this rule talks about compliance schedule, that there are states out there that don't have compliance schedule provisions.

MS. ZALEWSKI: So if it's a single discharger it would make sense for the Board to put the timing on the conditions if it's a single discharger TL.

MR. SOFAT: And, again, I think that my response doesn't change because I'm separating the functions. I'm saying Board has that quasi legislative and judicial authority to decide what should be the alternated water quality standard and what actions that person has to do.

Then we go back based on that Board order, we do our compliance schedule review and decide whether or not the person should get a compliance schedule. And if they do, how long?

MR. ETTINGER: Well, if you want to keep a separate, keep it separate. But it seems

to me 560(c) which is the language I pointed to before, you specifically ask the petitioner to demonstrate how long they need to reach the highest attainable condition which strikes me is the same showing that you need for your compliance schedule.

2.0

2.1

So I'm not sure why you want to require the petitioner to prove that to the Board if you were then going to do it in the permit.

MR. SOFAT: The demonstration that we are requiring there is for HAC, which is a very different demonstration. Based on the existing information, what is the best -- if this is a single discharger, what can you do? That becomes your HAC.

Or, for a water body, what is the best point and non point sources can do to get to that HAC? So that's a totally different demonstration than a compliance schedule demonstration.

MR. ETTINGER: I think we're going to have to work on our terminology as to HAC and water quality and what's being shown here

because you're 560(c) appears to overlap with some -- appears to require the Board to consider something that you say should be considered separately.

2.1

And the Board and the Agency are going to have to consider whether the Board wants to set the time period to meet the highest attainable condition or whether the Agency is going to set the time period to meet the highest attainable condition using a compliance schedule.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Andes, you had a question?

MR. ANDES: Just on one particular point there. In a situation where, say, a discharge has happened at a level of around 10, the time limited water quality standard is issued and they are following -- the discharger is following the minimization program measures, say, for chlorides.

They're doing all the right things, but it's a really cold year with a lot of road salt that's applied and the number turns out to be 12. As long as they are following all the

minimization program requirements that were part of this process, they should be insulated from liability, correct?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: I'm not sure about that scenario. I think that when you're deciding HAC, that's when you want to think about, okay, what is the best that can be done and predicting, you know, what has happened in the past, what could happen in the future. I'm not sure about that question.

MR. ANDES: Well, I'm just saying if the level in any particular storm turns out to be higher, but they're doing all the right things, certainly our concern would be you should not be liable for a violation in that situation based on sampling in one storm when the key, and I guess the time-limited water quality standard would lay this out, what are the terms of the compliance?

What are the terms by which you will be judged being in compliance or not? Our position would be sampling in one storm shouldn't do that. Rather the question would be, are you complying with the minimization

program requirement in your permit and doing all the right things. And if so, our thought would be, you should be judged to be in compliance.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: I would say if I have to do that, I will then define my HAC with some boundaries; that this HAC is calculated based on such kind of whether predictions. Rather than just saying anything outside that box is covered and, therefore, no enforcement can happen. That is how I will try to design that my HAC applies to these kind of, you know, events.

MR. ANDES: But this is not about the HAC at the end of the process. The three, say. This is about what are the numbers going to be in any particular storm during the term of the variance.

So, I guess, we would have to talk about that. But we would also want to make sure that, say, with climate change that we not be putting boundaries on the conditions that could then change and put a discharger into violation.

MR. SOFAT: I will have to think about that question. I'm not sure that I can say if you do -- because, again, HAC is the one

that decides that, okay, based on the whether predictions, based on what has happened in the past, what do we expect. And, again, that is why you cannot always have a number. You cannot always have a number either. So especially when you are dealing with such unpredictable type of issue, maybe your HAC needs to include that, and not be a number.

2.1

MR. ANDES: The USEPA has indicated it doesn't necessarily have to be a number, but rather could be another qualitative narrative condition.

MR. SOFAT: Exactly.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD:

MR. BOYD: Mr. Sofat, I was just going to point out the whole idea of what needs to be condition in a time-limited water quality standard is already contained in the USEPA's rules that, for example, is 131.14; is that right?

MR. SOFAT: Yes.

MR. BOYD: There's a section in here that talks about what highest attainable condition of a water body or water body segment

1 must include in that time-limited water quality 2 standard. And we were talking about before 3 there's a different between discharger 4 time-limited water quality standard and water 5 body or water body segment water quality standards and 131.14(b)(ii)(B) says that the 6 7 water quality standard variance is applicable to 8 a water body or water body segment, one, a 9 highest attainable interim use and interim criterion, or, two, if no additional feasible 10 pollutant control technology can be identified, 11 the interim use and interim criterion that 12 13 reflect the greatest pollutant reduction achievable with the pollutant control technology 14 15 installed at the time the state adopts the water 16 quality standard variance and the adoption and 17 implementation of a pollutant minimization 18 program. 19 So, does that not address this issue about what interim criterion would need to be in 2.0 2.1 play during the time of the water quality 22 standard for water body or water body segment 23 TLWQSs.

I agree with you.

Ιt

MR. SOFAT:

24

Page 120 1 does. We have been talking about these 2 questions without laying out whether we are 3 talking about discharger types or water body 4 types. You are right about that. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I think 5 6 we're ready to move on. 7 Ouestion No. 37 is about Section 104.570. The Board has asked if the 8 9 Agency would object to clarifying 104.570 10 (c) (4), does the Agency have any objection? 11 MR. TWAIT: The Agency agrees with 12 this change. 13 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank vou. 14 MS. LIU: Question 38, on 15 Section 104.580, Reevaluation. 16 Would you please comment on providing 17 provisions in the reevaluation under this 18 section that would clarify the individual 19 permittees to be included under the 20 multi-discharger variance would need to submit their own information. 2.1 22 MR. TWAIT: I think including that 23 information is good. But as I mentioned before,

we think USEPA has kind of changed its thought

24

```
1
               They recently approved a variance or
2
     time-limited -- I guess theirs was a variance,
3
     for phosphorus in Wisconsin where they looked at
4
     all the impacts to the state and they made the
     case that it was the economic factor for the
5
     state. And then when they approve the
6
7
     individual facilities to take part in that
8
     variance, then they had to prove that they had
     similar economic situation as what the variance
9
10
     called for.
11
                 So they set it up in conditions of
12
     what they had to meet. But when they looked at
13
     the original variance, they looked at the
14
     impacts to the state, in general, rather than
15
     specifically.
16
                 MR. BOYD: Could I just ask that you
17
     give the citation. Was that in the federal
18
     register? Can you give a citation to that?
19
                 MR. SOFAT: Citation for Wisconsin
20
     approval?
2.1
                 MR. BOYD: Yeah, the Wisconsin
22
     phosphorus time-limited water quality standard.
23
                 MR. SOFAT: We can file that with the
24
     Board.
```

MR. BOYD: And just to quickly follow-up. Is that the only action by EPA that you all are aware of on a time-limited water quality standard.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: That's the MDV that we are aware of. That's the only one. We haven't seen -- yeah, as I said earlier, I think I said it's an evolving issue, this variance is. And they're trying to streamline how to get variances across the nation.

And I think that Wisconsin is the biggest one that has been approved. I know they're working on Kansas. That's another MDV, and I'm not sure whether that has been approved or not.

MR. RAO: So Mr. Twait, are you saying that information may not be included in this package then? Or are you suggesting depending on the type of TL --

MR. TWAIT: I think that we would like to leave open for the possibility of instead of them going for an MDV and justifying each individual case to leave open the opportunity to do something statewide like

1 | Wisconsin did.

2.1

But for the smaller MDVs, if there's three facilities or something, then, yes, I think they ought to include the individual information.

MR. RAO: Is there somewhere that could be reflected in the rules?

MR. TWAIT: We can take a look at that.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And this sort of may go to what is our next question about the Agency filing a recommendation.

Absent the Petitioner's bringing the Board information, whether it's on a statewide basis or individual basis, I mean, the Board doesn't have its own unit going out and getting that information like the Agency perhaps does.

So I guess that's kind of where our question is coming from. If this information is not submitted to us, we don't necessarily have the ability to go get it.

MR. TWAIT: I think it would have to be submitted to the Board. We just want to leave open the opportunity to do something

different than what they talked about in 2013.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And that

3 makes sense. Thank you.

2.0

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: I'm trying to make sure I understand what you're saying about the Wisconsin phosphorus multi-discharger variance approval.

So my question is in the TLWQS that Wisconsin submitted to USEPA, were there criteria for what dischargers had to meet in order to qualify for the TLWQS, including perhaps financial criteria?

MR. TWAIT: Yes. They put out criteria to meet the economic guidance and the preliminary screening was at 2 percent of the median household income as an example. And they said if you're over 2 percent, you're good. If you're between 11 percent and 2 percent, then you have to have mitigating factors, either two or three of them. And it's outlined in the economic guidance document.

MS. FRANZETTI: And then did USEPA in approving it say to Wisconsin, Wisconsin, you need to require each district who wants to avail

1 itself of the TLWQS to make a submission to you 2 showing that it satisfies the applicable 3 criteria? 4 MR. TWAIT: Yes. 5 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. In Illinois, 6 if the same thing were to occur in a 7 multi-discharger variance TLWQS, wouldn't it be 8 acceptable under these proposed regulations that 9 the same thing occurred, the Board's order sets out what the eligibility criteria is to avail 10 yourself of the TLWQS, and if a proved by EPA, 11 12 then individual dischargers have to make 13 submissions to Illinois EPA demonstrating that 14 they do satisfy the eligibility criteria. 15 MR. TWAIT: As written, it does. 16 This was based on the Board's question of 17 whether each individual at the time of the 18 application provides the individual information. 19 MS. FRANZETTI: I understand that. 2.0 And my question is trying to clarify that 2.1 perhaps that is not an appropriate way to rank 22 the rules that right up-front in the TLWQS 23 petition before the Board, that every individual

discharger who may seek eligibility needs to

24

Page 126 1 submit that information. 2 MR. TWAIT: Yes. 3 MS. PALUMBO: Did the petitioners for 4 the Wisconsin multi-discharger variance have to 5 propose criteria similar to the proposed rules 6 here? 7 MR. TWAIT: No. They don't have a Pollution Control Board like we do. So the 8 9 state put together the variance. 10 MS. PALUMBO: Okay. 11 MR. TWAIT: But they did create 12 criteria to be involved. So the applicant has 13 to demonstrate that they meet all the criteria. 14 MS. PALUMBO: So, the Wisconsin 15 equivalent of the Illinois EPA formulated this criteria. 16 17 MR. TWAIT: Yes. MR. ANDES: 18 While the only 19 multiple-discharger variance since the new USEPA 2.0 rules is the Wisconsin one, isn't it true that 2.1 there were other statewide variances adopted and 22 approved for mercury in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, 23 and those all have been approved by USEPA, 24 correct?

1 MR. TWAIT: I believe so. 2 MR. ANDES: So those might be 3 relevant as well in terms of the kind of 4 eligibility criteria that were established in 5 those? 6 MR. TWAIT: Possibly as long as EPA 7 hasn't changed their thought process since then. MR. ETTINGER: I don't know whether 8 9 to put this in the form of a question or not, but we're hearing a lot of testimony by IEPA as 10 to what they think happened in Wisconsin. 11 12 I actually think that there was 13 Minnesota variance rules that were also approved and maybe we should look at some of those. 14 15 I question the usefulness of asking Illinois witnesses about rules across the state and 16 17 country that they may or may not understand. 18 I know of rules that were passed in 19 Montana that I'm personally suing them over. 2.0 I don't know --2.1 MS. FRANZETTI: But you sue 22 everybody. 23 MR. ETTINGER: But we didn't sue over 24 Wisconsin or Minnesota. So I'm just questioning

how much further we want to go on asking IEPA about things that happened in other states.

2.0

2.1

MS. LIU: Doing a proposed reevaluation, would you please comment on whether Illinois EPA should be required to file a comment or recommendation to the Board.

MR. TWAIT: I think that the Agency would agree that we should be filing recommendations at the reevaluation time and also at the extension. The reevaluations are the five-year period and the extensions -- the reevaluation would be the analysis of the HAC and an extension would be reevaluating the entire time-limited water quality standard.

And I think the Agency should be filing recommendations in each of those. We'll propose some language.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: We're down to an area of Simplifying and Clarifying

Language that the Board proposed several questions to the Agency and the first one -- and this is my JCAR training inserting itself even 30 years later, and I know it's statutory language, substantially compliant, substantial

compliance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Would the Agency comment on whether or not the terms should be defined or whether or not the terms could be removed.

MR. TWAIT: I think we can agree to come up with a definition.

the next one we have is in an attempt to address some clarification issues and some issues with the executive order on the use of requirements, we've identified several sections where it's either the Agency or the Board taking some action, and those are listed in our question where we would ask if the Agency objects to replacing the word must with the word will.

MR. TWAIT: I think what we would like to do is address all of these in our written response.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Is that the same with 2(b)?

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Okay. And

23 | the rest of those we have.

MR. TWAIT: Yeah. All of two.

1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Then that 2 is all of the Board's questions. 3 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: So let's say that 4 an alternative standard was given for four 5 years, let's just say, relatively speaking. 6 After four years, nothing happens. 7 The responsibility is on the party to come back to the Board for a renewed alternative 8 standard; is that correct. 9 10 MR. TWAIT: Yeah. If they would like an extension, they would have to come back to 11 12 the Board. 13 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: What happens if 14 they don't come back? 15 Then the underlying MR. TWAIT: regulation would be put into their permit. 16 17 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Are they notified

MR. TWAIT: We'll probably go through a permit modification, or it's possible that we could write that into the permit. If you only gave four years and we turned around and we're writing a permit for a five-year period, we

would reference the fact that their are

of that?

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

time-limited water quality standard ends at the end of four years.

2.1

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: You would, or is that something you're offering right now?

MR. TWAIT: That's something that we would probably do.

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: I just wonder if that would help clarify any sort of concerns that they weren't notified or they didn't know or anything like that. I could be overly cautious on that and I don't know what the rest of the folks up here think about that.

I think my advisor disagrees with me.

MS. RABCZAK: So we are in the reevaluation scenario, the way the section is written right now is the petition has to do something.

MR. TWAIT: Well, that would be for reevaluation. And the reevaluation, if the Board gave them 15 years to do something, they have to reevaluate at five-year intervals.

MS. RABCZAK: So my question here is that because the Board has to originally set up a schedule, but then we have to wait for the

petitioner to come in and submit the petition, what if the petitioner doesn't submit anything?

Do we still have to --

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: If they don't submit reevaluation, then their time-limited water quality standard ends. So, if the Board were to give them 15 years and say at year four and a half, you need to have your petition in -- or I mean, your reevaluation by a set date, and they don't come in and give you their reevaluation, they're time-limited water quality standard ends.

MS. RABCZAK: Would it be helpful to add that to the rules because it's not in the rules right now. It's not clear what the Board has to do in terms of inactivity of a petitioner in terms of reevaluation process.

The question is: What is the deadline by which the petitioner must submit? I guess that's going to be part of the Board's adopted schedule.

MR. TWAIT: Right. If a variance is longer than a five-year period, then it has to be reevaluated every five years. And that

Page 133 1 reevaluation has to get to USEPA within the 2 five-year period. 3 MS. RABCZAK: So would it be helpful to think about the deadlines for the petitioner 4 5 to submit the reevaluation petition, or should that be all set up by the Board in the original 6 7 time-limited water quality standard? MR. TWAIT: I think the Board needs 8 9 to include it, but I also think that if we don't have in here that their time-limited water 10 quality standard ends if they don't resubmit it, 11 12 then we need to put that in. 13 MR. RAO: So would that be under 104.580? 14 15 MR. TWATT: Yes. 16 MS. RABCZAK: Just again to clarify 17 the deadline for the petitioner to submit their 18 reevaluation petition would be set by the Board 19 in the original time-limited water quality 2.0 standard? 2.1 MR. TWATT: Yes. 22 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: That's five years. 23 MR. TWAIT: If it's more than five 24 years.

1 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Thank you.

2 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right.

With that I think we can move on to the Attorney
General's questions.

_

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. PAMENTER: Kathryn Pamenter,

P-A-M-E-N-T-E-R, with the Illinois Attorney

General Office.

I just had a couple procedural questions referencing Section 104.570 entitled USEPA Review. Our first question corresponded to subsection B.

What is the time frame within which the Illinois EPA must submit the decision of the USEPA regarding a time-limited water quality standard to the Board?

MR. TWAIT: We don't have a time limit set in the proposed rules. If USEPA doesn't copy the Board when they do that, we'll send it in as soon as possible.

MS. PAMENTER: Also with respect to Section 104.570, subsection C addresses the steps should USEPA disapprove of the Board's decision, there are steps laid out.

What occurs if the USEPA approves of

the Board's decision? When does the
time-limited water quality standard become
effective?

MR. TWAIT: In the case of
reevaluation if the Board approves -- well, wait

6

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

a minute.

MS. PAMENTER: And actually, on this
particular question, Section 104.570. It's our
understanding that the Board will issue it's
opinion and order and that then goes
through whatever appeal process may exist with
respect to that order.

It needs to be then submitted to the USEPA for its review and approval. And I guess we're trying to understand when the time-limited water quality standard becomes effective.

And if I may, based upon the discussion that was had earlier, is the time-limited water quality standard effective upon the Board's order going final? Is it when the USEPA approves it? Or is it when you all issue your NPDES permit?

MR. TWAIT: For state purposes, it's effective when it's adopted by the Board. For

water quality -- for Clean Water Act purposes, it's effective when it's approved by USEPA.

Once it's been approved by USEPA, the NPDES permit will be modified and the time-limited water quality standard will be enforceable in the permit.

2.1

MS. PAMENTER: Following up on the earlier question of the Board with respect to -- and it corresponds to the effectiveness of the time-limited water quality standard. I'm going to go back to the hypothetical that's been used throughout this discussion.

If the set standard is one, they're currently a 10 and they're trying to get to three. Upon the Board's issuance of their final approval — their opinion and order, excuse me, that's when the time—limited water quality standard becomes effective. Is the standard 10 or is it a three at that point in time?

MR. TWAIT: For state purposes, it would be -- well depends on how the Board order was written. If the Board writes it in such a way that they've got five years to get to the three, then the 10 would be applicable until

1 that time.

2.1

MS. PAMENTER: Can you say that one more time.

MR. TWAIT: If the Board writes the time-limited water quality standard and gives them -- gives the permittee five years to get down to three milligrams per liter, the highest attainable condition in that situation says that the permittee can't get -- the treatment can't get worse.

And so until they can meet the three, if they're already meeting the 10, then the 10 would be applicable until the three was applicable.

MS. PAMENTER: So for enforcement purposes, it's a 10 up until the five-year period ends at which times it's three?

MR. SOFAT: It's the PMP that's enforceable. Because PMP is designed to go from 10 to three. That's the objective of PMP. That is what the enforceable conditions are.

And, of course, in my response, I'm assuming that there's no one number HAC out there. It's the -- ultimately you're going to

1 comply with three. But three gets -- we get to 2 three by doing the PMP. So PMP will be in the 3 NPDES permit and that is what we look at in 4 order for us to determine enforceability, 5 whether the issue of noncompliance exists. MS. PAMENTER: So the issue of 6 7 noncompliance doesn't correspond to the number, 8 the time-limited water quality standard, the 9 variance. It corresponds to whether the PMPs 10 are being achieved. 11 MR. SOFAT: Exactly. Because, again, 12 it's a best guess. You're to going to look at 13 PMP and say what is the capability of these PMP 14 to achieve X percent of reductions. So that's 15 your highest attainable condition. The PMP are the ones that controls. 16 17 Well, PMP are controls and plus BMP. So PMP is 18 what takes you. BMP is what people are required 19 to do. 20 MS. PAMENTER: Thank you. 2.1 MS. RABCZAK: Can you please clarify 22 in terms of enforceability one more time a 23 scenario when the Board adopts the time-limited

water quality standard, it goes to USEPA;

24

1 meanwhile, we have a stay, we also have an 2 enforceability on the state level, time-limited 3 water quality standard, then it takes some time 4 for USEPA to review it and they disagree, so 5 they send it back to us. 6 What happens at that moment in terms 7 of what's enforceable? Because we will have to 8 reopen the docket and look at it one more time 9 before we adopt and modify the time-limited 10 water quality standard. We still have a stay. 11 MR. TWAIT: If USEPA disapproves the 12 time-limited water quality standard, the stay 13 ends. 14 MS. RABCZAK: Not until they exhaust 15 all the appeal.

16 MR. TWAIT: Well, no. The stay ends 17 at --

18 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: At the state

19 level?

20 MR. SOFAT: USEPA disapproval, state 2.1 That is how the statute is written.

22 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: So even if 23 the USEPA disapproves, the Board has -- I mean, 24 that's not the end of the TL. I mean, you can

1 come in and modify your petition and everything. 2 You're saying that once the USEPA disapproves, 3 they no longer have a stay, even though they're 4 still in a time-limited water quality process? 5 MR. TWAIT: Correct. 6 MR. SOFAT: Yes. Stay is over. 7 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: At the state level as well? 8 9 MR. SOFAT: Yeah, because it is only 10 for state purposes. Stay is only for state purposes. There's no such provision in the 11 12 Clean Water Act. 13 MS. RABCZAK: So what happens while 14 they are modifying based on the use of the 15 comments? They have no stay. 16 MR. SOFAT: You always go back to the 17 underlying standard. Any time somebody doesn't 18 file their extension or reevaluation, the 19 concept is that when the variance ends, you go 20 back to the original standard. 2.1 MR. TWAIT: And they could still 22 address -- they could address USEPA's comments 23 and go back to 104.570(c) which outlines 24 modifications of the time-limited water quality

standard, but their stay would have ended.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yeah. That

3 | was my point. That they can modify per USEPA,

4 | but you're saying that it ends.

1

2

5

8

9

18

MR. TWAIT: The stay has ended.

6 MR. SOFAT: And, again, I think I

7 | would like to make a point here that we had to

have certainty through the cycle, in the cycle.

So that's why the stay was stopped there.

But our end objective is going to be

11 | that we are working with USEPA and petitioners

12 | throughout the process so that we don't get into

13 | that situation. That is the whole objective.

14 That's the role we intend to play.

MS. PAMENTER: Continuing with

16 | Section 104.570, which is the USEPA Review

17 | Section. Subsection (c)(6) provides that the

Agency shall submit any order issued by the

19 | Board modifying a previously granted

20 | time-limited water quality standard to the USEPA

21 | for review and approval.

22 What occurs then if the USEPA either

23 approves or disapproves the Board's order

24 | modifying a previously granted time-limited

water quality standard? What's the procedure that occurs at that step?

2.1

MR. TWAIT: If USEPA approves the time-limited water quality standard, then it becomes applicable and will be put into the NPDES permit where it will be enforceable.

If USEPA disapproves, then it goes back to 104.570(c), and they can ask the Board to modify the petition, or modify the -- they can modify the petition.

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: If the USEPA approves in that instance, when does the, let's say, six-year clock begin? At the date of that approval or when they filed it with the Board? Because it's been stayed pending USEPA approval.

MR. SOFAT: So I understand the question is about when does the duration start?

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Yes, sir.

MR. SOFAT: So if the USEPA has approved it, I think we give two options. The Board order could say that it starts at the USEPA approval. It could be six years from now, it ends; or it could be six years from the day USEPA approves it.

So both options are open for the Board and petitioner has to request.

2.1

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Does the Agency has a preference?

MR. SOFAT: I think that both are equally good. It depends on the circumstances, if it's very complex. We see the advantage of having USEPA approval to make sure all the issues are resolved.

If it's a simple one, yeah, we know that in six years this can be done, then that's what we'll be recommending in our recommendation.

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Thank you.

MS. PAMENTER: Just following up on if the USEPA disapproves the Board's order modifying a previously granted time-limited water quality standard, you answered that the procedure under subsection C could then be applied. Essentially they could go back and seek a new modification.

Would it be helpful to so indicate in the rule that you just simply go back through the same steps before? Because right now is it

1 silent in the instance of a disapproval. 2 Well, we wouldn't MR. TWAIT: 3 necessarily have to go through the whole process 4 If USEPA disapproved a MDV for the again. reason that one of the facilities wasn't 5 technically in the class, the Board would have 6 7 the option of not holding a hearing and to 8 remove that person from the class. 9 You know, that would be something that relatively simple and we don't think they 10 11 need to go through a hearing to do that. 12 they wouldn't necessarily have to go through the 13 whole process again. 14 MR. SOFAT: Were you asking if the 15 Agency should just mention in the regulations 16 that you will go back to 570(c)? 17 MS. PAMENTER: Yes. 18 MR. SOFAT: We could do that. 19 MS. PAMENTER: And then actually it's 20 a similar question in Section 104.580 concerning 2.1 Reevaluation. Again, there's a sentence that

Same question, if there's a

order goes to the USEPA for review and approval.

indicates that the reevaluation opinion and

22

23

24

disapproval, do you go back to the procedure under 104.570(c)? Like, you get to seek some sort of modification, or what happens in that instance?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: So rule does not say that USEPA approves or disapproves reevaluation. It requires you to submit within 30 days.

MS. PAMENTER: If it gets submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency for approval, which is what that 104.580 says, I guess I'm just trying to understand when it goes effective under the reevaluation scenario.

Maybe I'm misunderstanding that section. That's completely possible. But there is a sentence, the Agency shall submit the Board's reevaluation opinion and order to the United States Environmental Protection Agency for approval within 30 days of issuance of the Board's order.

And we're just trying to understand what happens if the Board approves it or doesn't approve it?

MR. SOFAT: So the simple requirement in the federal rule is that you have to submit

Page 146 1 within 30 days or you go back to the underlying 2 standard and use. So that's why the section 3 simply says you need to submit it. There's no 4 requirement -- my understanding is there's no 5 requirement USEPA approving or disapproving that 6 reevaluation. 7 MS. FRANZETTI: Well, then I would 8 just raise, you may want to --9 MR. SOFAT: Can I ask for a break? 10 MS. FRANZETTI: -- review language 11 here because do say it's submitted to USEPA for 12 approval. 13 MR. SOFAT: I need two-second break, 14 please. 15 (WHEREUPON, a short break was 16 taken.) 17 MR. SOFAT: So reevaluation -- so 18 what the preamble talks about is that when you 19 do the reevaluation and if the reevaluation 20 comes up with a more stringent HAC, it needs to 2.1 be self-implemented. So there's no 22 approval/disapproval on that. 23 But if it's less stringent than the 24 original HAC, then they are saying you need to

- modify your variance and submit for approval to
 the USEPA. It's not stated in the rules, but it
 is in the preamble.

 MS. PAMENTER: I would then just ask
 if perhaps a clarification is needed to this
 part of the rule, sort of along the lines of
 what just indicated. And then I would also ask
- 8 whether, for the one that needs to be actually
 9 submitted to USEPA for approval, I think you
 10 said it's the less stringent one; is that
 11 correct?
- MR. SOFAT: Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. PAMENTER: What happens -- is the
USEPA actually going to issue something that
says we approve this or we disapprove of this?

MR. SOFAT: Because the second scenario is less stringent, they are saying modify the variance. So it's not HAC or reevaluation anymore. It's the whole package.

So, yes, they are approving or disapproving that package.

MS. PAMENTER: In that instance then, if there's a disapproval, what is the process -
MR. SOFAT: 570(c).

Page 148 1 MS. PAMENTER: So could that also be 2 clarified so that people understand the process. MR. SOFAT: I understand. You just 3 want the loop closed. 4 5 MS. PAMENTER: We want the loop closed. Thank you. 6 7 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you. 8 That leaves us with the pre-filed 9 questions of IERG and Midwest Generation. It is about 12:35, 12:40. Let's take a lunch break 10 11 until 1:30 and we'll come back at 1:30 and start 12 with IERG. And that will give you guys a chance 13 to look through your questions and see what may have already been addressed. 14 15 Thank you. 16 (WHEREUPON, a short lunch break 17 was taken.) 18 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you 19 everyone for being so prompt in getting back. 20 We'll start the afternoon session 2.1 with the questions from the Illinois 22 Environmental Regulatory Group. 23 MS. PALUMBO: The first set of 24 questions is referring to the Board Note,

Section 104.520, where the Agency's encouraging persons to file a joint petition where possible.

2.1

So if a watershed work group or another entity files a collective petition, does the Agency intend that the stay applies to the individual facilities that are part of a watershed group?

MR. TWAIT: Yes. We expect that to be applicable to the individual facilities that are part of the watershed group. In addition, it applies not only to those identified within the original petition, but also any identified in the Board's order that files prior to the established deadline.

MS. PALUMBO: Okay. Will the watershed group need to provide any sort of documentation of the companies and/or the facilities that were members of the group at the time the petition is filed or that have since joined before the time-limited water quality standard is adopted?

MR. TWAIT: That will probably be a good idea.

MS. PALUMBO: Does that need to be

Page 150 1 reflected in the rules? 2 MR. TWAIT: We would probably include 3 that in the Board order, or the Agency's recommendation. 4 5 MS. PALUMBO: Can the Agency explain for the record and just so that everybody 6 7 understands, why are watershed groups formed? MR. TWAIT: To address widespread 8 9 issues that can't be addressed by an individual 10 applicant. 11 MS. PALUMBO: Does the Agency know 12 how many watershed groups have been formed to date? 13 14 MR. SOFAT: For the purposes of MDV 15 or just in general? 16 MS. PALUMBO: Probably both. 17 MR. SOFAT: There's several work 18 groups out there working on the watershed 19 conditions. Whether or not they choose to apply 2.0 for a variance has to be seen. 2.1 MS. PALUMBO: Are watershed groups 22 typically incorporated to your knowledge? 23 MR. TWAIT: Some of them have been. 24 MR. SOFAT: Yes. I believe the

- answer to that question is yes.
- 2 MS. PALUMBO: How are the watershed
- 3 groups that you know of typically legally
- 4 represented?

1

- 5 MR. SOFAT: As I said earlier, they
- 6 have not been in a proceeding that I can answer
- 7 | the question.
- 8 MS. PALUMBO: Do you anticipate that
- 9 for the watershed pollutants that we identified
- 10 earlier in the hearing, which was nutrients and
- 11 chlorides, that it would be beneficial for
- 12 | watershed groups to sort of take the lead in
- 13 | filing for the time-limited water quality
- 14 standards?
- MR. TWAIT: Yeah, I think it would be
- 16 good for them to take the lead. That's one of
- 17 | the advantages of having the watershed group.
- MS. PALUMBO: So, if there's
- 19 | individual petitions that are filed, for
- 20 | example, for a chloride and the Board Note
- 21 allows the Board to consolidate those petitions,
- 22 does that consolidation anticipate that those
- 23 | individuals would now act collectively?
- 24 MR. TWAIT: It could. Just because

they're consolidated doesn't necessarily mean that they're going to act collectively. It all depends on what they put in their petition.

2.1

MS. PALUMBO: Would the lack of activity for one of those consolidated petitioners necessarily be detrimental to the petitions of the other people filing for that time-limited water quality standard?

MR. TWAIT: Only if they needed that person to complete their demonstration. If they can demonstrate the need without them, then that wouldn't be problematic.

MR. SOFAT: As I said earlier, we cannot force somebody to choose one type of variance over another. The objective here is certain cases are better suited for a watershed or MDV or single discharger. So we are trying to facilitate that discussion.

Again, if everybody filed their petition individually, which means, the 10(g) factors that they have chosen are individual factors. So just joining petition does not make it to be a water body and watershed variance.

So at the end of the day, the Board

needs to have the collective, if that was the water body or watershed variance people are seeking, that that 10(g) factor that they have considered has all dischargers in there.

2.1

It cannot just be I, as discharger X can only do this; therefore, here's my petition. And later on we join those petitions to ask for a watershed variance. That is not. So the demonstration that is necessary under the rules for a watershed variance must be presented to the Board.

However, whether there's one document that is later on prepared by everybody together and is provided to the Board, that is fine. So that is the underlying issue that we wanted to clarify, joining of petitions, Board has the authority. They can do that. They can remove somebody if they need to sever those.

However, here, I think the point we want to make is that be mindful of the type of relief that you are asking -- not relief -- type of variance that you are asking and make sure the demonstration is going to support that.

MS. PALUMBO: Does the Agency

coordinate watershed groups?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: We have. But Agency doesn't have to take the lead. Again, I think that now everybody knows in Illinois that there are watershed variances. If I were a discharger, I would be mindful of the things that are coming and making sure that if those pollutants are such, we have watershed, water body type variances might be necessary that I am working with others to create watershed; in fact, I'm very impressed that we have several groups out there who are doing this watershed base group work.

MS. PALUMBO: And will the Agency encourage -- I think we've covered this already. But just for clarification, will the Agency encourage the Board to specifically list those dischargers to whom the stay applies and an order -- I guess, is there any order -- strike that. I don't think that question makes sense.

Would you encourage the Board to specifically list those individual dischargers that are part of the watershed group to whom the stay would apply or to whom the time-limited

water quality standard would apply?

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 2. This is in relation to those pending petitions that were converted from petitions for variances into petitions for time-limited water quality standards.

Would the Agency support allowing the petitioners with pending time-limited water quality standard petitions to amend their petitions after the Board adopts these rules, then have the Board undertake a substantial compliance assessment based on the adoptive rules, and then if there are any new substantial compliance deficiencies, issues a revised deadline for filing a substantially compliant petition?

MR. TWAIT: At this point the Board has already concluded non substantial compliance. The Agency believes it is up to the petitioner to either ask the Board to elaborate on the noncompliance of the petition or file an amended petition with the Board asking the Board to again determine substantial compliance, so a

substantial complaint petition could be filed by the deadline.

2.1

If the Board after adoption of the rules reconsiders or reevaluates the petitions for substantial compliance, the Agency would be in support of that.

MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 3 relates to Section 104.520(b), the parties to the proceeding. Can the Agency elaborate on how a person becomes a participant as that is used in 520 (b)(3)?

MR. TWAIT: The Agency was following the intent provided by USEPA stated in the preamble to the final rule. The purpose and, these are quotes, the purpose of the 131.20(b) requirement is to implement the Clean Water Act and provide an opportunity for meaningful public input when states or authorized tribes develop water quality standards, which is an important step to ensure the adopted water quality standard reflect full consideration of the relevant issues raised by the public.

The citation is 80 FR 51042. And, additionally, with 25.5, public input and

Page 157 1 participation is open to everyone. 2 MS. PALUMBO: What are the various 3 rights afforded to any person that may become a 4 participant to this proceeding? 5 That goes back to the MR. TWAIT: definition of participants. 6 In 101.202, a 7 person becomes a participate in one of several ways, including filing a comment, being added to 8 9 the notice list of a particular proceeding, testifying at hearing or making public remarks 10 at a board meeting. 11 12 MS. PALUMBO: So, is the Agency's intent that a participant would have the right 13 14 to put forth testimony, correct? 15 MR. TWATT: Yes. 16 MS. PALUMBO: Is it the Agency's 17 intent that a participant would have the right 18 to question witnesses at a hearing? 19 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 20 Is it the Agency's MS. PALUMBO: 2.1 intent that a participant would have the right 22 to file motions with the Board in this

Yes.

MR. SOFAT:

23

24

proceeding?

Page 158 1 MS. PALUMBO: In what weight in the 2 Agency's mind is the Board to give information 3 provided by a participant? 4 MR. SOFAT: Equal. 5 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Equal to 6 what? 7 MR. SOFAT: Equal to the parties and 8 petitioners. 9 MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 4, and I think we have established this earlier in the 10 11 I just want to clarify. hearing. 12 Can a time-limited water quality 13 standard be issued for a narrative water quality 14 standard? 15 MR. TWAIT: In theory, yes. 16 time-limited water quality standard can be 17 issued for a narrative water quality standard. 18 The Agency does not believe that the federal 19 regulations would prohibit this. 20 MS. PALUMBO: Would this process 2.1 proceed differently than with a numeric water 22 quality standard? 23 MR. SOFAT: Calculating HAC, some of 24 those things, yeah, it will be different and

Page 159 1 complicated. 2 MS. PALUMBO: For example, how would 3 you calculate an HAC for the narrative water 4 quality standard that prohibit unnatural algal 5 growth. 6 MR. TWAIT: I think that would be one 7 of the difficult things about the narrative standard. 8 9 MR. SOFAT: But that does not mean that you can't use variance for a narrative 10 11 standard. 12 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Keep your 13 voice up. 14 MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 5, 15 this relates to the Pollutant Minimization Programs. That's defined in Section 104.515(b), 16 17 but Pollutant Minimization Plan is undefined. 18 So is the Pollutant Minimization Plan part of 19 the Pollutant Minimization Program? 2.0 MR. TWAIT: There's no substantial 2.1 difference between the two. 22 MS. PALUMBO: Okay. Those are 23 interchangeable terms. 24 MR. TWAIT: Uh-huh.

Page 160 1 MS. PALUMBO: Okay. When is a 2 Pollutant Minimization Program developed? 3 MR. SOFAT: Prior to filing a 4 petition. 5 MS. PALUMBO: This is when I was 6 thinking that those were different things. 7 Okay. 8 In this, the PMP, the Pollutant Minimization Program, is intended to be 9 implemented during the term of the time-limited 10 water quality standard, correct? 11 12 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 13 MS. PALUMBO: Can you explain the 14 differences between the Pollutant Minimization 15 Program and the Best Management Practices as those are referenced in Section 104.530(b)(1). 16 17 MR. TWAIT: The Pollutant Minimization Plan can include the BMP. The BMPs 18 19 are typically for non point source pollution; 20 can also be for point source pollution. 2.1 But then the PMPs also include things 22 that they can do at their facility, such as, 23 changing the source of their product to reduce

pollutants, or adding treatment.

24

```
1
                 MS. PALUMBO: So, in terms of
2
     chlorides as we discussed that pollutant
3
     earlier, if a facility has salt storage for
4
     deicing, that potentially impacts stormwater run
5
     off, would the Agency expect petitioner to
     address this salt storage facility under the
6
7
     Pollutant Minimization Program, Best Management
8
     Practice, or both?
9
                 MR. TWAIT: Either would be fine, I
     think.
10
11
                 MS. PALUMBO: Okay. So to avoid
12
     confusion, would the Agency be amenable to
13
     either revising the rules to just use plan or
14
     program? I believe program is used in the
     federal rules.
15
16
                 MR. SOFAT: Yes, we will.
17
                 MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 7, we've
18
     talked about the reevaluation process for the
19
     time-limited water quality standard already.
20
                 But does the Agency envision this
2.1
     process to be initiated with the Board at a set
22
     point; for example, would it be so many months
23
     in advance of the expiration of the time-limited
24
     water quality standard?
```

1 MR. TWAIT: Yes. There needs to be 2 enough time for the Board to take a look at it, 3 approve it, and for the Agency to transmit it to USEPA. 4 5 MS. PALUMBO: Does the discharger 6 initiate this process or does the Agency? 7 MR. TWAIT: The petitioner. And it 8 should be laid out in the Board order when they 9 need to submit that plan or reevaluation. 10 MS. PALUMBO: Do you have any sort of estimate on how long every evaluation might 11 12 take? 13 MR. SOFAT: Since the petitioner 14 calculated HAC, so they should have a very good 15 idea how long it could take to reevaluate. 16 MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 8, does 17 the Agency believe that the variance process that is set forth in Section 35 of the Illinois 18 Environmental Protection Act is still available 19 20 for relief from a technology standard? 2.1 MR. TWATT: Yes. 22 MS. PALUMBO: Will a time-limited 23 water quality standard be addressed in a 24 biannual Illinois Integrated Water Quality

- 1 report in the Section 303(d) list.
- MR. TWAIT: Would you repeat that?
- 3 MS. PALUMBO: Will a time-limited 4 water quality standard that was already
- 5 effective, be addressed in the biannual Illinois
- 6 Integrated Water Quality report and the
- 7 | Section 303(d) list?
- 8 MR. SOFAT: Time-limited water
- 9 quality standard does not replace the underlying
- 10 standard word as in use. So, therefore, it will
- 11 | not be considered or used to develop impaired
- 12 water list or the integrated report.
- MS. PALUMBO: Question No. 10. This
- 14 refers to what you're going to change to
- demonstration. So as it stands now, burden of
- 16 proof in Section 104.560.
- How would the burden of proof be
- 18 evaluated differently for the proposed
- 19 time-limited water quality standard factors in
- 20 | Section 104.560(b) than they were evaluated for
- 21 | the preceding -- for the underlying water
- 22 | quality standard?
- MR. SOFAT: So is your question --
- 24 let me see if I understand the question.

Is the question asking what's the difference in terms of demonstration between an underlying standard option versus a time-limited water quality standard?

MS. PALUMBO: Yes.

2.0

2.1

MR. TWAIT: This comes from 408 FR 51041. Finally, some commenters questioned the level of scientific rigor required for water quality standard variances as compared to use attainable analysis, required for changes to the 101(a)(2) uses.

Section 40 CFR 131.5(a)(a)(4)
provides that EPA's review under Section 303(c)
involves a determination of whether the states
or authorized tribes standards which do not
include the use specified in Section 101(a)(2)
of the Act are based on an appropriate technical
and scientific data and analysis.

Because water quality variances are time-limited designated uses and criteria, this requirement applies to water quality standards variances. States and authorized tribes must adopt water quality standard variances based on appropriate technical and scientific data and

analysis; therefore, the level of rigor required for a water quality standard variance is no different than a designated use change.

2.1

That said, the appropriate technical and scientific data required to support a designated use change in water quality standard variance can vary depending on the complexity of the specific circumstances.

analysis often needed to support adoption of a water quality standard variance could be less complex and require less time and resources compared to removing a designated use because many water quality standard variances evaluate only one parameter for a single permittee for a limited period of time.

This level of effort, a state or authorized tribe needs to devote to a water quality standard variance will in large part be determined by the complexity of the water quality problem the state or authorized tribe seeks to address.

MS. PALUMBO: Last question. From a timing perspective, assuming a petition for a

1 time-limited water quality standard is filed 2 related to a newly adopted standard, should 3 time-limited water quality standard proceedings 4 progress to completion prior to USEPA approval 5 of the underlying water quality standards? 6 MR. TWAIT: If the Board adopts the 7 standard, it's effective for state purposes. 8 And if the petitioner needs relief, then they should move forward. 9 10 MS. PALUMBO: I did actually have one 11 more question. Sorry. 12 This morning, Scott, I believe that 13 you mentioned that a time-limited water quality 14 standard is not meant to be a regulatory relief 15 mechanism. And the name of this rulemaking is 16 in the matter of regulatory relief mechanism. 17 How do we, or how does the Agency 18 intend to ensure that the regulated public or the public that's interested knows that this is 19 20 not a regulatory relief mechanism?

MR. TWAIT: The existing variance process that Illinois had, or the old variance process that the Illinois EPA had is in the regulatory relief section. That is the reason

2.1

22

23

24

1 | that we kept this in that same section.

2 MS. PALUMBO: How would you term what

3 | a time-limited water quality standard is? Just

4 | a new water quality standard? I mean, just as

5 the name suggests then?

6 MR. TWAIT: An alternative water

7 quality standard.

8 MS. PALUMBO: No further questions.

9 Thank you.

10 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you

11 | very much.

12 Ms. Franzetti on behalf of Midwest

13 | Generation.

MS. FRANZETTI: Thank you.

15 Question 1 under Procedural Nature of

16 | TLWQS Proceedings.

17 Section 38.5 of the Illinois

18 | Environmental Protection Act provides in

19 relevant part that the Board, quote, may conduct

20 non-adjudicatory proceedings to adopt a TLWQS.

21 | Section 101.108(a) of the Board's rules provides

22 | that, quote, Board proceedings can generally be

23 divided into two categories: rulemaking and

24 adjudicatory proceedings, end quote.

Section 101.108(c) identifies, quote, variance petitions, 35 Illinois Administrative Code 104 as an example of an adjudicatory proceeding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Does the Agency interpret the use of the term non-adjudicatory in Section 38.5 of the Act as evidencing a legislative intent to create a third category of Board proceeding; in other words, something other than a rulemaking or an adjudicatory proceeding?

MS. TERRANOVA: This is one of the questions that the agency has determined is legal in nature and we're hoping that we could respond to this question in writing after the hearing.

MS. FRANZETTI: Can I ask you this?

I was not involved -- I understand
there were some stakeholder meetings with regard
to proposed Section 38.5.

Was there any discussion of this particular issue of why Section 38.5 expressly denotes a TLWQS proceeding as a non-adjudicatory proceeding?

MR. SOFAT: Because that is what is required by the federal rule, that these

hearings need to be non-adjudicatory. And I think it's in 25.5.

MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Do you think placing the rules -- I'm moving to 1(a.) -- in the adjudicatory proceeding section of the Board rules, which is Part 104, risks perhaps creating confusion as to the nature of the TLWQS variance proceeding?

MR. SOFAT: We intend to look into that issue. We're going to look into that and respond in writing.

MS. FRANZETTI: Would your answer be the same as to (b) about creating a stand alone part?

MR. SOFAT: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

MS. FRANZETTI: Moving on to

17 | Multi-Discharger Variances, Question 2.

The Board Note to Section 104.520 notes that the Board has the power to join

20 additional parties and consolidate petitions.

21 Is it also intended that the Board has the power

22 to sever joined parties and/or break up

23 previously consolidated petitions, such as

24 multi-discharger petitions, when the Board

thinks it's appropriate to do so?

2.1

2 MR. TWAIT: Yes. We think that they 3 have that ability where appropriate.

MS. FRANZETTI: And would you agree then that the Board can do that on its own motion? It doesn't need a motion by a party to the case?

MR. SOFAT: Board can do on its own. Again, I will caution that, as I said earlier, joining or severance of these petitions, you need to make sure that whatever demonstration you're trying to make is not jeopardized by severance of, you know, petitions or joining of the petitions.

MS. FRANZETTI: The purpose of these questions is to understand. I know earlier today you were saying that the primary responsibility for what type of proceeding is pursued is with the petitioner to determine.

Do they think it should be a single discharger, do they think it should be a multi-discharger petition? And what I'm trying to understand is, obviously, a petitioner can get that wrong. They may think it's the right

approach, but the Board may not. And what
you're saying is it is your intent that the
Board is the ultimate judge of that until it
goes to the USEPA?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Yes, Board is. And Board is looking at what the petition has requested and what petitioner has demonstrated.

So based on that, they could say, yes, you need a single discharger variance requirement. You do need the MDV requirement.

If you look at the rule, this whole process that's laid out, as I had said before, laid out to facilitate that so that whatever we do at the state level gets approved at federal level.

MS. FRANZETTI: And that's all I was referring to is the fact that the Board ultimately decides it at the state level. But because if the Board grants a TLWQS, it has to go over to USEPA, they might disagree with whatever the category of TLWQS was that the Board approved; in other words, Board may have approved the TLWQS as a water body segment TLWQS. It's possible USEPA may disagree that

that's the right category for this particular TLWQS; is that right?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: First of all, we are going to be in touch with the USEPA when these petitions are filed, which we have been doing, what is the right kind of variance type for these petitions.

Second of all, I think I want to make a comment, is that I believe -- and, again, I think I can -- our understanding, I can speak that way, is that Board will look at what did you file and what did you ask for and whether or not you're demonstrating consistent with the rules.

So I'm not sure if Board is going to say, look, you got it wrong, but here's the right answer. I believe Board would be saying, look, you asked for a MDV. I looked at the factors that you had to, you know, show demonstration on, and I don't believe you met that burden, or that, yes, you have.

So our rule is going to be in these proceedings that we are talking to USEPA up-front, making sure we are at least filing

recommendations consistent with their viewpoint, that here's what you should be doing.

2.1

But, again, somebody could say, you got it wrong, USEPA got it wrong. I am going to do it this way. Because I can make my case. I don't think we can stop that. And I don't know if Board is going to substitute their view for a petitioner's view.

MS. FRANZETTI: Staying with this topic, because it's related to it, so I want to jump to Question 12 and use the pending Midwest Generation, well, it will be a TLWQS proceeding to pursue this issue a little further.

So, on Question 12, says in PCB 16-19 captioned Midwest Generation versus IEPA, after the filing of the Agency's response in which it suggested that the relief could be individual, water body segment, or multi-discharger time-limited water quality standard, the Board entered an order establishing a class of dischargers consisting of heated effluent dischargers into the East Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Upper Dresden Island Pool, including Flint Hills, Midwest Gen, Will County Station,

Joliet 9 Station and Joliet 29 Station, and Stepan Chemical.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

What is your understanding of what the effect is of establishing that class of dischargers in the Board's order?

MR. TWAIT: The effect of
establishing classes of the discharger was to
give the petitioner the option to either seek a
water body segment relief or an MDV relief.
Both of those need classes of discharger. The
individual does not need a class of discharger.

MS. FRANZETTI: So it holds open the option to pick between those types of TLWQS proceedings?

MR. TWATT: Yes.

MS. FRANZETTI: Does the Board define a class of dischargers only in water body specific variances or does this also occur in multi-discharger petitions? I think you're saying it does.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ TWAIT: It also includes multi-discharger variances.

MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to keep
going to 13, stay with this same general idea or

1 concept.

2.0

2.1

Does the Agency agree that the

April 12th, 2017 PCP 16-19 Order does not make a

determination whether Flint Hills and the other

identified dischargers in PCP 16-19 are

proceeding as single discharger petitions, as a

combined multi-discharger petition, or some

other form of petition?

MR. TWAIT: It was not the Agency's intent to decide which type of relief was appropriate. We're helping to facilitate that decision.

MS. FRANZETTI: And you agree the Board order is not making a determination yet as to what type of proceeding it is.

MR. TWAIT: Correct.

MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to 13 (a), so under the proposed rule, when and how does the Board determine the type of TLWQS proceeding to be utilized? Is that in its final order, for example?

MR. TWAIT: Yeah. It's not the Board that will ultimately decide. At this time we're just listing the options of the types of relief

that are appropriate.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: Do you really mean what you're saying in that answer? Because I thought a few moments ago we were in agreement that it's the Board who's the ultimate arbiter or decider of what type of TLWQS is to be granted.

MR. TWAIT: Well, the Pollution

Control Board can make -- we can make a recommendation to the Board and say, we think it should be a stream segment and they can do their order accordingly. And the petitioner can turn around and say, no, that's not the one that I want. I'm going to do an MDV or they can do an individual.

And when they resubmit their petition, their amended petition, then the Board will look at what relief they've asked for and whether or not they've justified that relief.

MS. FRANZETTI: So moving to (b), I think based on the last part of your answer, I can anticipate your answer to (b) but I want to be certain.

So if the decision on whether the

proceeding is an individual water body segment or a multi-discharger TLWQS is not made before the 90-day deadline for filing the amended petition that the Board set in its April 12th order in the Midwest Gen pending proceeding.

2.1

Doesn't this leave unclear the substantive requirements that the amended petition must satisfy to be deemed in substantial compliance by the Board?

And let me clarify. What we're struggling with is we filed the petition as an individual discharger petition. That's what we think is appropriate. The Agency, in its submission to the Board, really didn't take a position, said it could be this, it could be that. Also said, as the next question gets into, that it was talking with the EPA about it, just as Mr. Sofat a few moments ago said, we're going to be talking to the EPA to get an idea from them or sense from them what type of TLWQS proceeding it should be.

You didn't get that at least as of the time of filing your submission in the Midwest Gen proceeding. You didn't get that

kind of response from EPA, correct? They were still thinking about it, too.

2.1

MR. TWAIT: We've talked to them and with the MDV. We talked to them and they were leery of whether or not you could put together an MDV because of the differing industrial facilities. You've got a refinery there, a chemical plant, and a power generation.

They didn't think that the petitioners would be able to make their demonstration for an MDV; however, they said that they're going to go back and talk to headquarters and get back to us. They haven't done that yet.

I'm going to reach out and see if -prod them to make sure they've done that. The
other thing that we've talked to them about was
a stream segment TLWQS. And we asked them one
of the questions that you asked, whether or not
you had to look at non point source pollution.

They said that that type of variance does have to look at non point source pollution; however, if the facility looks for non point source pollution in the case of thermal and

doesn't find it, then they just have to include that with their submission.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Let me clarify a few things.

If Midwest Gen believes they can make a single discharger variance case, we are not stopping. What our recommendation is saying that you could do water body segment, MDV, et cetera, those are the options that we are saying you have. You may or may not like those options.

As far as MDV is concerned, each individual, if they can get a variance as individual dischargers, they cannot get MDV.

But the real issue there is -- so, therefore, petitioner has to decide up-front what do they want. And I think what we are doing is we are saying we'll keep on talking to USEPA so that we are clear.

But because these are new rules and USEPA has been doing variances in Region 5, but the standard rules were not out there for public to know exactly what they have in mind.

So what we want to do is we want to

make sure that we give petitioners as much guidance as possible towards the process. But that does not mean that petitioner doesn't have to make their decision. That's their decision.

2.1

And as far as MDVs are concerned, they are simply a streamline convenience mechanism. And that is why when you're thinking about MDVs, you want to think about homogenous groups, which groups go together.

And I think in this case, there are all three different types of industries. And that is why USEPA is having issue with how are you going to do a combined burden of proof demonstration, or is it going to be individual discharger. Because if you want to do individual discharger, you can always do that.

So MDV is really still -- you still have to think in terms of individually making your case. Which factor are you going to take under 10(g) and what level of demonstration do you need to make the case? So that part does not go away, whether you do single or MDV.

And as far as, I think in our view, the Board is concerned, the Board is going to

look at in their judicial capacity as, okay, did you comply with; you are asking MDV; did you meet the MDV burden or not? I doubt that the Board will be suggesting maybe you should go with MDV, or you need to go with MDV.

2.1

So these classes and all those things, they are just for convenience. They are established up-front so that people have an idea because, like, as I said, these are new rules and new requirements and sort of new concept.

So what we want to do is we want to make sure that the process -- it's not, like,
Board issues one order and boom. Either you have a variance or you don't. So that's why substantial compliance concept is in there, and that's why we are going to be continuing to talk to USEPA. Tell us if these provisions are adequate, sufficient or not.

MS. FRANZETTI: I think what I hear you saying is -- and let's stick with the Midwest Generation example for some clarity.

The clearest path for Midwest

Generation to take is to pursue a single

discharger TLWQS, because the Agency isn't going

to object to that. Now, whether the Board does or not, but probably not likely, because single discharger variances are allowed. And it's less likely the USEPA would have an issue with that.

2.1

Is that what you're trying to tell me Mr. Sofat?

MR. SOFAT: I'm definitely saying that, but I'm saying a little more also.

But for Midwest Gen you can choose to be a single discharger and make your case as a single discharger and Board will decide whether the case was made or not and USEPA will just make sure that whether or not it's consistent with 131.14.

MS. FRANZETTI: And where I'm trying to go is to also say the flipside. Let's just say the other dischargers, Flint Hills Resources has a pending proceeding as well, two other dischargers have been mentioned as potentially effective, Stepan and Exxon Mobil.

If Midwest Gen and Flint Hills, for example, were to get together and decide let's go the multi-discharger approach, that actually has a little more risk to it. The Board may

- 1 disagree. And even if the Board doesn't 2 disagree, when it goes over to USEPA in a 3 Board-approved TLWQS, USEPA might ultimately 4 disagree that should be a multi-discharger 5 TLWQS, correct? 6 MR. SOFAT: I don't read that way. 7 think the risk associated to me is whether or 8 not somebody can make the case for MDV. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Before you 9 move along, there's a couple things I want to 10 state for the record. 11 12 First of all, I would note that ordinarily in a case where another case before 13 14 the Board is being discussed to this extent, it 15 would be a situation where I would tend to 16 caution the parties about that. 17 But I would note, first of all, that 18 because, by definition, the PCB 16-9, and the 19 time-limited water quality variances are not 20 adjudicatory cases, and this is also a 2.1 non-adjudicatory proceeding, I've given a little
 - But do keep in mind that this is the decision-maker up here in both instances.

22

23

24

bit more leeway.

please keep that in mind. I just want to get that on the record because I know that I am pretty hard and fast when it comes to adjudicatory cases and rulemakings and not letting you talk about them.

2.1

But because by definition, 16-9 and the other time-limited water quality standard variances that are before us are not adjudicatory cases, I've given you a little bit more leeway on those. I noticed them when I came into the questions, but I wanted to get those on the record.

I have a question for the Agency.

And, that is, you've told us that you're going to be in contact with USEPA and you're going to come in with recommendations that you think the USEPA are going to be on board with so that you hope that you're going to be able to put together this packet so that when it gets to USEPA with the Board's order, the chance of disapproval are going to be very slim because you're going to be in constant contact with the USEPA.

My question is, we already have an

issue where Ms. Franzetti was just talking about 16-9 and the fact that you didn't have a yes or no or a plus or minus or whatever from the USEPA when you were required to file your recommendation.

2.1

My question is: While you may think this is going to really work well, my experience with USEPA is that USEPA doesn't care what our deadlines are. Have you thought through the prospect of given the deadlines that are written into the rule and to the statute, how the IEPA is going to handle the situation where they have to file a recommendation and USEPA says, yeah, yeah, we'll get to you later?

MR. SOFAT: Again, I think that just because Agency thinks that water body based water quality standard variance is the best way to go, we can't tie a petitioner to that.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: That's not the question I'm asking, Sanjay.

My question is: You have said a couple of times today that your intent is to stay in constant contact with USEPA such that when the process gets done, as far as you're

1 concerned and as far as the Agency is concerned, the Board's determination that 131 is met, 2 3 you're going to have been in constant contact, 4 you're going to talk to them before you file 5 your recommendation, you're going to do all 6 that. 7 My question is: What happens when 8 USEPA doesn't pay any attention to your 9 deadlines, and you don't have contact from them before you have to file answers? 10

MR. SOFAT: So, again, we are talking about a 21-day deadline, right? In that one, one all we have to suggest is the four things — and at that point, as I said, USEPA is not going to care whether somebody is going form MDV or water body. They're going to care about whether or not somebody has met the burden, which is later on.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

So the deadlines that Board and IEP have, they're simply about guiding. The Agency deadlines that we have, we are saying, okay, yes, for this kind of pollutant issue, you could have the following three types of variances. Petitioner can decide which one of those they

1 want.

2.1

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: The petitioner comes in with their petition; the Board deems it's a sufficient petition. And we set prompt deadlines at that point, do we not? Doesn't the Board set prompt deadlines for the Agency to come?

MR. SOFAT: Right.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Don't you have feedback on the petition at that point?

MR. SOFAT: Yes, we do.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And if we set a deadline of 21 days and the USEPA chooses not to get back to you in that time -- I mean, I appreciate what you're saying. I appreciate that you think you're going to be able to be in contact.

But I would point out that part of the reason we're here is it took them three years to decide not to approve the word variance for Citgo. So USEPA doesn't operate like we do with deadlines.

So my question is: If they don't get back to you -- if the Board says, Agency, we

have a sufficient petition and you have 21 days to respond to this sufficient petition and USEPA doesn't get back to you so that you can say with a certain amount of certainty, that they're going to approve this variance, where does that leave us if somebody loses their stay if USEPA decides to disapprove it, if you can't even tell somebody, yeah, you're on the right track?

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Citgo did not get approved because it was not consistent with their regulations. It took them that many years. So I'm not using that as an example to say they will not get back to us.

I think the issue that we are facing is this -- what level of justification is required to get any kind of variance I don't think even USEPA knows.

So it's a matter of us, IEPA telling them, Board, Board, we are talking to them and, therefore, don't set a 21-day deadline. Prompt simply means that we want things to move because that's the concern we heard from USEPA and other stakeholders.

So given the clarity that we can see,

```
1
     I am saying that USEPA is going to work with us.
2
     We have been -- there's an example of how
3
     closely we have been working with them from day
4
     one. And that is the cause chloride work group
     that is out there that will file their variance
5
6
     at some point. We have been asking them what
7
     level of justification is required by that
8
     group.
9
                 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Right.
10
     that's not reassurance to me because I know when
     the cause chloride standard was originally
11
12
     adopted. So I guess what I hear you saying, and
13
     please forgive me if I'm wrong, but what I hear
     you say is that there's a real possibility that
14
15
     these time-limited water quality variances could
16
     be in front of the Board for years at a time.
17
                 MR. SOFAT:
                             No.
18
                 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Can I ask a
19
     follow-up, do you mind?
20
                 MS. FRANZETTI: Not at all.
2.1
                 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: So just a
22
     different scenario, if that's okay.
```

instructing the Agency to respond back in

Let's say the Board issues an order

23

24

```
1
     21 days. What if you hear back from the USEPA
     on the 26th day and the docket is still open?
2
3
     What happens then?
                 MR. SOFAT: We can supplement our
4
5
     recommendation.
6
                 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: So would that
7
     derail the -- would that change the current
8
     proceeding pending before the Board?
9
                 MR. SOFAT: Unless Board was doing
     something on day 22nd, I don't believe so.
10
11
                 MS. PAPADIMITRIU:
                                    If the USEPA comes
12
     back and says that it's not accepted, what
13
     happens to the proceeding pending before the
14
     Board?
15
                 MR. SOFAT:
                             So, for context purposes,
16
     are we looking at the substantial compliance
17
     step, or are we have gone true public
18
     participation and everything and we are right
19
     before the Board order?
20
                 Because, again, what we are going to
2.1
     do is we're going to make sure that, as I said
22
     earlier, the types of variances is simply so
23
     that people who are sleeping, they can wake up,
24
     and really establish a process where the state
```

is actually helping the petitioners and helping the water body achieve its goals. That is the point there.

2.1

Individually, anybody can decide I am not going to have MDV. I don't want water body.

I'm just going to do single discharger. As long as you make the case, proceed.

So, as far as USEPA is concerned, that's not the focus. The focus -- Citgo lessons that we learned were that you need to have a demonstration that's consistent with their rules. And that is really the main -- that's really the main import that we are seeking from USEPA.

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: So, my question goes back to if you have responded to the Board within the docket and then you have a subsequent conversation with the USEPA, does that information make its way into the Board's proceeding?

MR. SOFAT: It will. If it's material and substantial, it will.

MS. PAPADIMITRIU: And the Agency files that?

Page 192 1 MR. SOFAT: The Agency will file 2 that. 3 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Okay. Thank you. 4 MR. HOUSER: Hi, my name is Josh 5 Houser, H-O-U-S-E-R. I'm with the law firm of Hepler and Broom; here today on behalf of Exxon 6 7 Mobil, Flint Hill Resources, and the Sanitary District of Decatur. 8 9 If a discharger is discharging a pollutant from multiple facilities, can this be 10 11 an individual time-limited water quality 12 standard or must it be an MDV? 13 MR. SOFAT: Can you repeat the 14 question, please. MR. HOUSER: Sure. 15 If a discharger 16 is discharging pollutant from multiple 17 facilities, can this be an individual 18 time-limited water quality standard or must it 19 be an MDV? 20 MR. SOFAT: So multiple facilities 2.1 owned by the same party? 22 MR. HOUSER: Yes. 23 MR. SOFAT: So I have three plans. 24 Plan one, plan two, plan three?

Page 193 1 MR. HOUSER: Sure. 2 MR. SOFAT: I can do MDV for that. 3 Assuming my plans are homogenous, they are not one is a refinery, another is POTW, and the 4 5 third is something else. 6 MR. HOUSER: Must it be an MDV? 7 MR. SOFAT: No, it doesn't have to 8 be. 9 MR. HOUSER: It can be an individual? 10 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 11 MR. HOUSER: For all three 12 facilities? 13 (Inaudible speaking.) MR. SOFAT: 14 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: You got to 15 talk for the record or talk off the record. MR. HOUSER: Is it going to be three 16 17 petitions -- I'm sorry. 18 Can you file one petition as an 19 individual time-limited water quality standard 20 for three facilities? 2.1 MR. SOFAT: Are you using the same 22 10(q) factor? 23 MR. HOUSER: Yes. 24 MR. SOFAT: Are you asking for

Page 194 1 individual for MDV? 2 MR. HOUSER: Can that be an 3 individual? 4 MR. SOFAT: If you're going to be 5 individual and you have the same burden of proof for all three, is that the question? 6 7 MR. HOUSER: Yes. MR. SOFAT: If it's same burden of 8 9 proof for all three of them, and you want 10 individual, I'm not sure why you want 11 individual. That's exactly what an MDV does. 12 MR. HOUSER: Well, I'm asking if it 13 has to be an MDV? 14 MR. SOFAT: Nothing is has to be. 15 MR. HOUSER: But it can be an individual still? Whether or not it's 16 17 preferable, it can be? 18 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 19 MR. TWAIT: That would be three 20 individual petitions if you're going to do individual. 2.1 22 MR. HOUSER: Okay. And so that would 23 still be the case then if you were discharging 24 that pollutant into two different water bodies

Page 195 1 because there would be three different individual time-limited water quality standard 2 3 petitions being filed? MR. SOFAT: So MDV don't care whether 4 5 or not you have common water body. 6 MR. HOUSER: And single, it would 7 just be because there are individual -- they 8 have to be individual petitions, then it wouldn't matter. 9 10 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 11 MS. FRANZETTI: Just following up on 12 that, you could make perhaps them individual 13 petitions, but if there is a lot of commonality to the relevant information to support those 14 petitions, you might ask the Board to 15 16 consolidate the two proceedings or the three 17 proceedings for ease of administration? 18 MR. SOFAT: That Board has the authority to do it, yes. 19 MS. FRANZETTI: It does have the 2.0 2.1 authority? 22 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 23 MS. RABCZAK: Would it make sense to have a recommendation or have a clarification as 24

part of the rules to distinguish between all those types so the people can understand which type they should go with?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MR. SOFAT: I will say a very good discussion about MDV actually is part of Midwest Gen. They have an attachment at the back. It's 2013 FAQ.

MS. FRANZETTI: For the record, it's the USEPA guidance document entitled

Discharger-Specific Variances on a Broader

Scale: March 2013.

MR. SOFAT: Question, I believe, 7 or so. I mean, it's a pretty good document to read about what they had in mind in terms of how to decide whether you want MDVs or not.

MS. RABCZAK: That's going to be a document you will be using in determining what type you will suggest?

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Can't hear you. Talk to the back of the room, not to Sanjay.

MS. RABCZAK: My question was: Would that be the guidance document for the IEPA to decide which type they would recommend?

1 MR. SOFAT: This as well as any other 2 document that USEPA might come up in the future. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: A potential downside, 4 however, Mr. Sofat of the March 2013 guidance is 5 it does predate the federal rule on TLWQSs. 6 So, in some respect, it may not 7 reflect post federal rule thinking by the USEPA. 8 Would you agree with that? MR. SOFAT: Yeah. And in absence of 9 however any document, I think we'll continue to 10 use it and we'll continue to talk to them and 11 12 see if their thought process was evolved since **'**13. 13 14 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to go back 15 to Question 3 before I jumped ahead to one of my 16 other questions. 17 It's a straightforward question. Can 18 the Board create subdockets in TLWQS variance 19 proceedings -- I should have added -- under your 20 proposed rules? 2.1 Is that something that you 22 contemplated the Board can do in this type of

non-adjudicatory proceeding?

23

24

MR. TWAIT: What would be the purpose

for a subdocket?

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: Well, I'm not going to be able to probably identify all of them, but there might be a situation where the Board feels that it can move ahead with respect to certain elements of the TLWQS petition with respect to potentially multi-dischargers, but may want to segregate out either certain of the dischargers and wait to see as it gets further along through hearing on perhaps the subset of dischargers that it feels have clearly shown an entitlement to a TLWQS.

MR. TWAIT: Yeah. I believe they have that authority.

MS. FRANZETTI: Again, these questions are coming -- I'm not trying to trick you in anyway. It's coming from the perspective of what is envisioned by a non-adjudicatory proceeding instead of having put it in the rulemaking category. Because clearly in rulemaking, the Board can create subdockets. It's done so.

So, I'm just trying to understand what the Agency's intent here is in terms of how

this non-adjudicatory proceeding is
characterized and what the Board's authority is.

Moving to Assimilative Capacity,
Ouestion 5.

2.1

If a discharger only needs a variance because it claims another upstream discharger has used up the assimilative capacity of the water body for a particular pollutant at issue, does this change anything about how the matter proceeds?

You touched on this a little bit earlier today with respect to the upstream discharger seeking a TLWQS having to show that it doesn't adversely impact a downstream discharger by whatever the TLWQS relief is it's seeking. But this is different.

This is assume the upstream discharger hasn't -- they're not seeking any TLWQS. But a downstream discharger does feel that they've used up -- some upstream discharger or dischargers have used up the assimilative capacity of the water body and that inability to get a mixing zone by the downstream discharger is preventing it from complying with a new water

quality standard, or an existing one.

2.1

So is that a situation where it can seek a TLWQS as the question asks? Does that change anything about how the matter proceeds before the Board?

MR. TWAIT: Could you clarify what the upstream discharger has done? Because typically, when we give mixing zones, we won't give 100 percent of the receiving stream. Presumably we won't give 100 percent of the receiving stream to the time-limited water quality standard.

Can you give me an example?

MS. FRANZETTI: I don't think I can in real life. I understand what you're saying. You're saying this will never happen because the Agency will never give mixing zones or any other relief in an NPDES permit, to the extent it would use up all of the downstream assimilative capacity stream.

MR. TWAIT: With mixing zones, the regulations we can't give 100 percent. When we do mixing zones, we use 25 percent of the upstream flow. So I'm just trying to figure out

Page 201 1 what's the cause of it. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: I understand what 3 you're saying. I can move on. 4 MR. ETTINGER: Do you anticipate 5 granting any variance which will allow you or increase dischargers? 6 7 MR. TWAIT: I believe the answer 8 would be yes. 9 MR. ETTINGER: Under what 10 circumstances? 11 MR. SOFAT: Variances for new or 12 increased? MR. ETTINGER: A variance which 13 14 allowed an increased loading into the water over 15 the current. 16 MR. SOFAT: Yes, we'll support that. 17 And, again, the purpose there is to make 18 improvements. 19 In the coverage, Agency could propose 20 to the Board any new discharger should be 2.1 required to do more than, let's say, what others 22 are. So what it does is, I'm assuming, of 23 course, water body, watershed variance in my head when I'm talking about this. 24

1 And I'm saying if you're truly going 2 to make improvements, then we need to have all 3 the sources participating. To make that happen, 4 what you need to do, if a new one wants to come 5 in, that is okay. But you will have to do more 6 than X. Whether it's 1.2X, 1.5X, that's 7 separate. 8 But, yes, for those kind of water 9 body based variances, I believe that's the right 10 way to do it. 11 MS. FRANZETTI: Moving on to Public 12 Participation. I'm going to skip Question 6. 13 Seven, let me just change it a little 14 bit because I think you may have answered it in 15 response to Counsel for IERG's questions. 16 Is it the Agency's position that the 17 level of public participation that is required under Section 38.5 of the Act the same as that 18 19 required under the federal regulation? 20 My point being, do you think 2.1 Section 38.5 of the Act calls for a greater

MR. SOFAT: I do not believe so.

Ι

level, greater degree of public participation

than do the federal TLWQS regulations?

22

23

24

1 think it's the same.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 8. And you have touched on this, but I would still like to

4 pose the question.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

This use of the term parties to classify non petitioners, how did you decide that non petitioners should be classified as parties to the proceeding rather than just as participants, you know, public commenters.

MR. SOFAT: We need to go back to that section. We see that issue. So we need to file something in writing.

MS. TERRANOVA: We would like to take Questions 8 and 9 and answer those in writing, if that's okay.

MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving on to Question 10 under Board Established Classes/Deadlines.

Question 10, why did the Agency propose in Section 104.540 that the Board's order establishing classes of dischargers and deadlines should be a final order rather than an interim order?

MR. TWAIT: The Agency did that so it

could be appealed.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: That was the Agency's intent under these proposed rules that that order can go up on appeal and not await towards final decision on the requested TLWQS relief?

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 11, do the proposed regulations prevent the Board from revising either the class, the geographic scope, or deadlines later on in the proceeding; in other words, after that order referenced in Section 104.540 is issued?

MR. TWAIT: No, they do not.

MS. FRANZETTI: We asked 12, 13.

15 | Moving on to 14.

Going back to the pending Midwest Gen proceeding in PCB 16-19, and specifically the April 12th order issued by the Board which references Stepan Chemical and Exxon Mobil neither of whom as of yet filed a TLWQS petition with the Board.

Given that Section 38.5(b) provides in relevant part that, quote, a time-limited water quality standard may be sought by, one,

1 persons who filed with the Board a petition for 2 a time-limited water quality standard under this 3 section, will entities like Stepan Chemical and Exxon Mobil need to file either an individual 4 5 petition or joint petition with the Board in 6 order to be eligible to receive a TLWQS? 7 MR. TWAIT: If either of them wants 8 to participate in the TLWQS, they need to file a 9 petition; or, if the existing petition moves forward as a water body segment petition or MDV 10 time-limited TLWQS and a class of dischargers is 11 12 defined by the Board and they establish 13 criteria, then they could potentially get 14 coverage from the Agency, if they meet the 15 criteria. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to 15. If one 17 or more of the entities referenced in that 18 April 12th Board order do not file an appearance 19 in the Midwest Gen proceeding or otherwise 20 participate, does the Board have the authority 2.1 to make the TLWQS applicable to that party? 22 MR. TWAIT: No. Unless they are 23 included in the class of dischargers. I'm going to skip the 24 MS. FRANZETTI:

next question because I think you just answered that.

Moving on to 16. And I'm not sure whether Ms. Terranova, you may want to answer this one in writing. It relates back to this issue of who's a participant, but I'll ask it.

Under the proposed rules, are each of the entities named in the Board's order in the Midwest Gen proceeding a participant in the proceeding regardless of whether they file or join in a TLWQS petition filed with the Board?

MR. TWAIT: No. These are potential petitioners, permit holders that might be affected to be a participant. They must meet the definition in 101.202.

MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to 17. The April 12th order states that Exxon Mobil is a, quote, potentially-affected discharger subject to the Agency's further evaluation, end quote.

Do the proposed rules prescribe how and when the Agency will conduct the referenced, quote, further evaluation, end quote.

MR. TWAIT: No, they do not.

MS. FRANZETTI: So the next question

2.1

then is, if not, how and when does the Agency expect to complete this evaluation.

2.1

MR. TWAIT: That is going to be dependent on Midwest Generation and the amount of relief that they ask for. If they ask for no more relief than what they had, say, two years ago before their conversion to gas, then Exxon Mobil wouldn't be affected. If they ask for more relief than what they had two years ago, then it might potentially be impacting Exxon Mobil.

MS. FRANZETTI: Thank you. That clarifies the Agency's position.

Question 18, can a petitioner file an amended petition before the Agency conducts its evaluation and determines whether Exxon Mobil is an affected discharger? I would think the answer would be yes based on your answer to Ouestion 17.

MR. SOFAT: Yes.

MR. HOUSER: Just going back real quick. Scott, you mentioned, that there had to be a definition of class of dischargers. But the Board's order, I believe that if that was a

```
1
     class of dischargers and named them as you, know
2
     thermal, dischargers, wouldn't that include
3
     Exxon Mobil and Stepan Chemical?
                 MR. TWAIT: It would if the Board --
4
5
     well, if the petition is filed as either an MDV
6
     or a stream segment time-limited water quality
7
     standard, an individual -- if Midwest Generation
     was to file an individual, then it does not have
8
9
     classes of dischargers.
                 The other thing is, is whether or not
10
     the Board sets criteria for those classes and
11
12
     whether they meet those criteria.
13
                 MR. HOUSER: So the class of
14
     dischargers in the Board's order only applies
15
     pending how Midwest Gen files their petition,
     whether it's individual or not?
16
17
                 MR. TWAIT: Correct.
18
                 MS. FRANZETTI: Moving on, Filing,
19
     question 19.
20
                 Under the proposed rules, is there a
2.1
     point in time in a multi-discharger proceeding
22
     where the petitioners must file a document
23
     jointly rather than individually?
24
                 MR. TWAIT:
                             This would be prior to
```

- 1 determining final substantial compliance.
- MS. FRANZETTI: Are you asking me a
- 3 | question?
- 4 MR. TWAIT: No. This would be prior
- 5 to the final substantial compliance evaluation.
- 6 MR. SOFAT: If you can't do that,
- 7 | then you need to let the Board know that they'll
- 8 be doing so in the future.
- 9 MS. FRANZETTI: Question 20. If the
- 10 USEPA disapproves of a TLWQS adopted by the
- 11 | Board in a multi-discharger proceeding, do the
- 12 | proposed rules require that all of the
- dischargers named in the multi-discharger TLWQS
- 14 | join in a petition to modify filed with the
- 15 | Board, or may only one or some of those
- 16 dischargers file a petition to modify with the
- 17 Board.
- 18 MR. TWAIT: It would not need all of
- 19 the petitioners to continue. This would be
- 20 especially if based on USEPA's approval, or
- 21 disapproval, if they specifically said this
- 22 chemical company can't be included with the
- 23 other classes of discharge.
- 24 And so they would definitely not -- I

mean, they could come back and make their demonstration based on their class. But, I mean, that would be one reason why they would not come back is if they weren't, they were specifically mentioned by USEPA.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: Given there is a number of places today where you said you're going to reconsider and revise rules, this section of the rules, it just might need be clarified that one or more of the -- I don't know what word to use, participants or petitioners in multi-discharger proceeding can seek.

MR. SOFAT: I think we can try to clarify that. It really depends on the underlying case. If we needed five people to make a case, then after disapproval the modification needs to make sure that you are able to make that case.

So underlying, you know -- where was the underlying case? If they were simply grouped together for the efficiency purposes, yeah, then you just need two for an MDV in theory, right. But underlying case load depends

1 on that. What was underlying case? Let's say it was factor six, widespread, socioeconomic 2 impact. So if removing one brings you back 3 4 into -- it's not going to cause that widespread. 5 So, now, you can make your case. I understand what 6 MS. FRANZETTI: 7 you're saying. I might agree with you that that 8 is a substantive issue as to burden of proof and 9 not a procedural issue with respect to whether one or more, but not all of the dischargers need 10 to be joining in a petition to modify submitted 11 to the Board after EPA disapproval of the prior 12 13 Board order. 14 MR. SOFAT: As long as substantive requirements are clear, that's fine. 15 MR. HOUSER: In that situation, after 16 17 the USEPA's disapproval, does the Agency agree, 18 I think, based on earlier conversations at that 19 point all dischargers have lost their stay? 2.0 MR. TWAIT: Yes. 2.1 MR. ANDES: Let me step back a minute 22 to the issue addressed in Question 19. Before EPA makes a decision when the 23

multi-discharger proceeding is going on and say

24

```
1
     that several petitions have been consolidated,
2
     so now they're going forward as a
3
     multi-discharger petition and they've had a
     finding of not substantial compliance and they
4
     need to file for their information and say 16
5
     out of 17 dischargers put something together and
6
     decide to file it and the other one just doesn't
8
     agree, can those 16 fulfill their obligations by
9
     submitting that information to the Agency and
     saying this is the information we think
10
     justifies the multi-dischargers variance?
11
12
                 MR. TWAIT:
                             Yes.
13
                 MR. ANDES: How would that other
14
     discharger be dealt with?
15
                 MR. SOFAT: That discharger needs to
16
     decide if they can make a single discharger case
17
     or maybe they don't need variance anymore.
18
                 MR. ANDES: So they can potentially
19
     be pulled out of the process.
2.0
                 MR. SOFAT: As I said, our concern is
2.1
     that the underlying case needs to be made,
22
     whether 14 makes it, whether two make it. As
23
     long as that is there, I think the
24
     requirement -- it's not the full need to take
```

the steps.

1

8

MS. FRANZETTI: I think that takes

3 | care of my Question 21. So I can move on to 22.

4 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Before you

5 | get to 22, it's been about an hour and a half

6 | since lunch so why don't we take about a

7 | 10-minute break and come back.

(WHEREUPON, a short break was

9 taken.)

10 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Question

11 No. 22 for Midwest Gen.

MS. FRANZETTI: Under the proposed

13 rules, is it correct that under Section 104.545,

14 a newly filed petition as opposed to a converted

15 petition under Section 104.520(a)(2) is allowed

16 at least two opportunities to obtain a finding

of substantial compliance from the Board; first

18 | in the initially filed petition and then in an

19 amended petition if the Board finds that the

20 | initial petition was not substantially compliant

21 before a stay expires.

So, in other words, you get two bites

23 at the apple to get a substantial compliance

24 determination from the Board before you would

- risk losing the stay of the applicability of the underlying water standard.
- MR. TWAIT: It's the Agency's

 intention to allow as many opportunities to file

 an amended petition as the petitioner would

 file. And, however, this ultimately depends on

 the Board.

8

9

10

11

- But we did not write in there that you get two bites at the apple. The way that we laid it out was that you would have as many times as necessary before your deadline.
- MS. FRANZETTI: Yes. But you're
 switching to a converted petition in answering
 that way.
- MR. TWAIT: Regardless, we do not foresee two bites at the apple for everybody.
- MR. ANDES: You don't foresee only two bites at the apple?
- MR. TWAIT: Correct. It would be as
 many times as you want to file an amended
 petition. And, once again, that is dependent on
 the Board.
- MS. FRANZETTI: Let's take that separately. First, though, so we're all

understanding the proposed rules correctly.

2.1

The proposed rules do speak to, you file a petition, the Board makes a determination that it is substantial compliant, and if they find that it is not, in one or more respects the rules expressly provide for a second opportunity to satisfy the substantial compliance standard by filing an amended petition, correct?

9 MR. TWAIT: We don't see it as only 10 two.

MS. FRANZETTI: I understand you don't see it as only two. It's at least two, correct?

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

MS. FRANZETTI: Now, where it's a converted petition, the Agency -- what you're telling me in your prior answer is that -- and let's use the Midwest Gen pending proceeding as an example.

Do I understand your answer correctly that in the Agency's view between now and 90 days from when the Board adopts these TLWQS rules, which is what you're referring to as the deadline, correct?

1 MR. TWAIT: Uh-huh.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: Midwest Gen order gives Midwest Gen up to 90 days subsequent to the adoption of these rules to file an amended petition to address the deficiencies that the Board notes in that order, correct?

MR. TWAIT: Correct.

MS. FRANZETTI: So you're saying between now and that 90-day deadline Midwest Gen could be filing an amended petition or it may rule it's deficient again. If we're not yet at that 90-day deadline, we can file another amended petition, not yet a substantial compliance determination, and this can just keep going up until the 90-day deadline?

MR. TWAIT: So as long as the Board will allow that. But that is the Agency's intention.

MS. FRANZETTI: Now, you would agree that even though a petitioner might, like
Midwest Gen, file an amended petition now trying to get a substantial compliance ruling from the Board, the Board may not rule on that until close to the 90-day deadline. Perhaps the Board

```
1
     wants to wait until these rules are final before
     it makes a substantial compliance decision.
 2
 3
     Would you agree with that?
 4
                 MR. TWAIT: It's possible.
 5
                 MS. FRANZETTI:
                                 Midwest Gen does not
     control how and when the Board rules on an
 6
 7
     amended petition, correct?
                 MR. TWAIT: Correct.
 8
 9
                 MS. FRANZETTI: Given that your
10
     proposed rules allow a party that is not covered
     by the converted petitions, and a party comes in
11
12
     tomorrow to file a petition -- well, not
13
     tomorrow -- that files a petition after these
14
     rules are adopted clearly knowing what the rules
15
     contain is allowed at least two opportunities.
16
                 Why is the Agency opposed to
17
     providing in these rules that a converted
18
     petitioner gets that same opportunity of two
19
     filings, an initial and then an amended, if
20
     their first petition is deemed not to meet the
2.1
     substantial compliance requirement after the
```

MR. TWAIT: I don't think there's

petitioner sees what these final rules contain

before it loses the stay?

22

23

anything in our rules that would limit the number of filings that you have. And if you file tomorrow with an attempt at a substantially compliant rule or petition and the Board didn't review it until 89 days after adoption of the rules, then, I would suggest that you petition the Board to change the deadline.

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: And give you an extension of that 90 days so you can get a second attempt at achieving a substantial compliance ruling from the Board?

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

MR. ANDES: Let me ask. So, in a converted petition, let's say, that the petitioner or petitioners, since they submitted the original petition before the new EPA rules were in effect and before these new rules were in effect, they submitted an amended petition after these rules go in effect, but before 90 days ends.

That's their first petition that tries to comply with the new EPA rules, and the Agency and/or the Board determined that it's not yet substantially compliant. Say, they done

most of what is required in the new regulations, but not everything. They're not substantially compliant. What happens then?

2.1

MR. TWAIT: It would be they would issue -- the Agency would issue a recommendation to the Board and the Board would then rule on substantial compliance.

MR. ANDES: So if the Board ruled that that petition, which is really the first documents being submitted under the new rules is not substantially compliant, do the petitioners now have a chance to amend and fill in the blanks.

MR. TWAIT: Yes. Up until the deadline, if they want the stay.

MR. ANDES: That wasn't my question.

Let's say that they waited until the new rules are effective so they know what the new rules actually say, and they file their new amended petition, the first one under the new rules, 60 days in, and the Agency delivers it's recommendation, the Board issues an order, 120 days pass when the new rules are effective.

So within 60 days after the amended

```
1
     petition was filed, but we're now past the
2
     90-day period. And you determine, well, they
3
     did most of what was needed but there's this one
     issue where we're still not comfortable.
4
5
                 Does that party now, even though they
6
     can easily amend their petition to add in the
7
     incomplete information, have they now lost their
8
     stay?
9
                             I believe they lost their
                 MR. TWAIT:
10
     stay unless the Board has modified their
11
     deadline.
12
                 MR. ANDES: As your rules are
13
     currently written?
14
                 MR. TWAIT: Correct.
15
                 MR. ANDES: Could those be revised so
16
     that party has another chance to complete its
17
     petition?
                 MR. SOFAT: No.
18
                                  I don't think we
19
     need to do that. What makes us say that after
20
     two attempts somebody will get it right?
     think that where we have issues is because of
2.1
22
     the complexity of the variance or situation at a
23
     particular discharger site, that they should say
24
     to the Board, that, look, because of the
```

following conditions, I need extension.

2.1

And Agency, because this is the first time these requirements are getting applied, we're going to be generous about that.

Definitely. But it cannot be a blanket sort of let's just move the deadline for everyone.

MR. ANDES: So if the parties determine at some point in developing the amended petition, look, we think this one is complex enough that we are probably going to need another attempt, when would we need to go?

And would this be then we would file a petition to the Board to modify the deadline, or would that be something the Agency would go in and we would engage with the Agency as to the recommendations to modify the deadline?

MR. SOFAT: I think it could be a joint motion. But petitioner needs to come forward with here are the basis, because of which we are not going to be able to reach this deadline.

And as I said, this is the first cycle. We definitely want to work with petitioners. We definitely want to make sure

that people understand what the requirements are. We all are sort of learning. But it cannot just be that everybody gets extension.

2.0

2.1

Because, again, what if the six-month expense is not good enough. So, from that perspective, you know, I understand the concern here, I think. It's, like, somebody is going to get more chances than I do. And I think we understand that. We fully understand the concern there. But the way to respond is not modify the rule, but to make your case before the Board.

MR. ANDES: I think the concern is not somebody's getting more chances. The question is the converted petitions particularly that have been developed under another set of regulations, so we're having to convert them and add new information under two new sets of regulations and then have one shot in getting into a substantial when we don't even know what substantial means, at risk of losing the stay, that's the real issue.

How do we make sure we don't lose the stay while we're figuring out with the Agency

what is really required? That's the challenge.

2.1

MR. SOFAT: Right. And I understand that. And I think this discussion happened when we were doing the legislation. But at that point, there was a view that, no, there is 40 CFR 131.14 out there and people can read that and they can get their lead based on that.

These rules don't have to be in place. And I think there's a specific provision in the statute for that.

I'm staying we all collectively can address them. But, you know, just simply saying we should just move the deadline or everybody should get at least two or three attempts, I don't think it really gets to the issue.

Because a certain petition might have really complex issues. So as these issues come up, our view is that let's figure out what needs to be done and then we present our case to the Board.

MS. FRANZETTI: Are you saying,
Mr. Sofat, that you think that Section 38.5
intends to allow the petitioner who comes in,

- 1 post these rules being adopted, so knew exactly 2 what the rules required, unlike the converted 3 petitioners, their first attempt as it's just 4 been stated, didn't have even the benefit of the 5 final rule. 6 Are you saying that you think 38.5 of 7 the Act deliberately chose to give those 8 post-rules adoption petitioners expressly two 9 opportunities, at least two to get it right, but did not intend to give that same at least two 10 opportunities to the converted petitioners? 11
 - MR. SOFAT: No. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is 38.5 has a provision that says Board could adopt a time-limited water quality standard variance without the subpart F or 104 rules that we are discussing today; 38.5(k).

Because I don't see that in 38.5.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. FRANZETTI: And it says what?
That the Board can adopt a TLWQS without these rules being in effect? Okay. I don't follow the logic.

MR. SOFAT: And that was in response to Fred's question. I was saying, if we are

saying rules are getting adopted and then we have 90 days to figure out what the rules require, that issue was discussed is what I was saying.

2.1

And when this statute was written, there's in fact a provision, the last paragraph under subsection K that says, Board has the authority to proceed with adopting this time-limited water quality standard even in absence of these procedural rules that we are talking about today.

MR. ANDES: But it sounds like the legal reading of the -- and this might be helpful to have this laid out -- is that for converted petitioners, you only have one opportunity to file an amended petition.

It has to be substantially complete, and they can do that up until that 90-day time period, and that's it. Anything they do, and including if the Board doesn't act on their amended petition before the 90 days expires, once the 90 days expires, they cannot submit a new amended petition and keep their stay.

That's the legal reading I think the Agency is

laying out. And that's a final order.

2.0

2.1

MR. SOFAT: I am not really following this question about somebody gets two attempts versus only gets one. I'm not following that at all.

I think it -- it says amended petition. It doesn't say the amended petition. You can have as many amended petitions you want to file with the Board as long as Board can entertain that. There's no restriction on how many attempts you get.

It's really about at some point, you have a deadline to show to the Board, here's my substantial compliance petition. And we just talked about in cases where we find during the process of doing those petitions that, guess what, the substantial compliance petition is not going to be ready by the Board's, you know, previously defined deadline. Maybe it's time to tell the Board here are the reasons why, so that we can get that extended.

MR. ANDES: Okay. My only other question is maybe this is something that we can state in writing to get a clear answer. Because

- I think we're not clear right now in terms of there's some specific legal questions we're trying to get the answer to.
- 4 And I think it would be helpful to 5 get the Agency's clear legal statement of how it 6 reads -- how it reads to the proposed 7 regulations and why it thinks that the process 8 you just laid out is dictated by the statute. 9 Because that's part of what we're not getting. 10 We're not sure why this is dictated by the 11 statute.
- MS. FRANZETTI: He took that, but he's not saying it is. Correct?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- MR. SOFAT: Subsection K mentioned was in response to the fact that these rules it was not envisioned from day one that these rules had to be in place before Board can adopt it.
- That's all that part K reference stands for. It doesn't say how many times you can file or not file. So I hope I'm making that at least comment clear.
- 23 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Go ahead.
- MS. PAMENTER: I just had a follow-up

```
Page 228
1
     question. 104.525 speaks to the stay
2
     provisions.
3
                 Do you believe that this provision
4
     precludes a petitioner from filing a motion with
5
     the Board for an extension of the stay?
6
                 Should someone be in this, for
7
     example, this situation that's been set forth to
8
     you all? Can the stay be extended, the stay
     period?
9
10
                 MR. SOFAT: Could you repeat the
11
     subsection, 525?
12
                 MS. PAMENTER: I was looking --
13
     104.525 seems to be the section that deals with
14
     stays and how long they are effective, how long
15
     they go for.
16
                 I am not seeing a provision in here
17
     that affords the opportunity for someone to file
18
     a motion with the Board to extend the stay.
19
                 Do you believe that petitioners are
20
     precluded from filing a motion to extend the
2.1
     stay given how Section 104.525 is currently
22
     written?
23
                 MR. SOFAT: The section is silent.
                                                      Ι
```

agree with you. But I do not believe that

precludes somebody from filing that.

2.1

MS. PAMENTER: Thank you.

the confusion is coming from and I think it also comes out, if you read (c)(3), if the person files an amended petition by the deadline established by the Board, but the amended petition is not in substantial compliance, then the Board shall deny the amended petition and the stay will only continues until judicial rights are extinguished. It doesn't talk anything about another amended petition.

And when you read Section 545 where it talks about the substantial compliance assessment, it again only talks -- there's nothing -- it's not clear from that that you can have more than one amended petition.

I think the Agency in view of these questions and the legal issue that they're looking at, I'm not sure that that's consistent with what the Agency thinks the rule is saying. I see some reason for some confusion, and I would ask the Agency to take another look at those two sections together, as well as the

statutory language.

2.1

Because I believe some of this is very close to what's in the statute, and see where we're at. Because I think the point they're making is if they come in -- if a converted variance comes in and they're not in substantial compliance with the new rules, that's it. That's their bite of the apple.

If it's a brand-new variance that comes in after these rules are adopted, they come in, the Board says you're not in substantial compliance, then you can come in with an amended petition and that's their two bites of the apple that they're talking about.

So I would just suggest that you go back, it's late in the day, take another look at this. And I see where the confusion is coming from. I have to admit that I'm a little confused by all of this, and see if you think there might be some clarification.

But like I said, I do think some of this comes from the statutory language as well. So it maybe that we're tied in with statutory language on this. Please take another look,

Page 231 1 especially if you read 545 with 525. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to jump to 3 26. Ouestion 26. 4 Under the proposed rules, does the 5 Board accept the petition's factual contentions as true in making its determination on the 6 7 substantial compliance issue, similar to when a court is determining a motion to dismiss 8 complaint in state court. 9 10 MS. TERRANOVA: This is going to be another one of those legal questions that we are 11 12 going to answer in writing. 13 MS. FRANZETTI: As well as the next 14 question? 15 MS. TERRANOVA: Yep. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: 27. Is it the 17 Agency's intent that the standard of review that 18 applies to a petition to modify under 19 Section 104.570(c) is a de novo review by the 2.0 Board? 2.1 MS. TERRANOVA: We can classify this 22 as a legal question also. 23 MS. FRANZETTI: I would just ask that

if you do agree that the standard of review

should be or is intended to be a de novo review under your proposed rules, then I would ask you to consider revising the proposed rules to expressly reference that standard.

2.1

Okay. Question No. 28. Appeal
Deadlines. If a party other than the petitioner
files a motion to reconsider a Board order,
approving a TLWQS, requesting that the Board
instead deny the TLWQS or impose stricter
requirements as part of it, must the Agency
delay transmitting the approved or adopted TLWQS
to USEPA pursuant to Section 104.570(b) until
the motion to reconsider is resolved, or does it
have the discretion as to how to proceed
regarding the transmittal to USEPA?

MR. TWAIT: If a third party files a motion to reconsider, the Agency will send the petition to USEPA. And this is synonymous with a permit appeal where the permits issued.

MS. FRANZETTI: Are you saying that where a Board approves a TLWQS, even if some non petitioner participant moves to reconsiders, arguing the Board shouldn't have approved it or should have been imposed stricter standards,

you'll move ahead to send the Board's order approving the TLWQS to USEPA?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

3 MR. SOFAT: As well as the motion to reconsider.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 29, does a, quote, person adversely affected or threatened, by Board approval of a TLWQS under

Section 104.565 immediately appeal the Board's decision in state court without waiting for the USEPA to complete its review?

MR. TWAIT: Yes, because they must meet their deadline. It must be filed within 35 days after the petition was served on the person affected by the order.

MS. FRANZETTI: So it is contemplated that under the rules, a person may have to appeal a board decision before the USEPA decides whether it's approving or disapproving a board TLWQS decision?

MR. TWAIT: Yes.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 30. If one or more petitioners in a multi-discharger petition do not want to appeal a Section 104.565 order, does this prevent the appeal from being

Page 234
1 filed?

MS. TERRANOVA: This is another one that we considered a legal question that we would like to answer in writing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 31, if the USEPA reviews an adoptive multi-discharger variance and concludes that the variance is appropriate as to some but not all of the dischargers, do the proposed regulations treat the appropriate dischargers as having an approved TLWQS variance?

MR. TWAIT: We expect that USEPA will spell that out in their approval/disapproval document. And so, yes, if they approve part of it, then it would be applicable.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 31, does a pending appeal of a USEPA disapproval decision in federal court prevent the Board from considering a petition to modify under Section 104.570(c) or can both of those things be done simultaneously?

MR. TWAIT: They can both be done simultaneously.

MS. FRANZETTI: Question 32, if a

1 stay is terminated by a USEPA disapproval 2 decision under Section 104.525(b)(2)(B) and the 3 Board modifies the adopted TLWQS variance under Section 105.570(c), does this put the stay back 4 in effect while the modified TLWQS variance is 5 6 again reviewed by the USEPA? 7 MR. TWAIT: No. The stay ended with 8 the USEPA disapproval. 9 MS. FRANZETTI: Would you explain why the Agency is proposing in the rules that the 10 stay terminates even though the Board may 11 12 receive a petition to modify that addresses the 13 alleged deficiencies in the USEPA disapproval? 14 MR. TWAIT: We did that to avoid an 15 infinite loop. We wanted there to be a finite 16 cycle for the stay. And it's from the 17 legislation 38.5. 18 MS. FRANZETTI: During the -- and I don't know what to call it? Do you call it 19 20 negotiations on the language of 38.5? Is that 2.1 the way I should refer to them? 22 MR. SOFAT: Discussion. 23 MS. FRANZETTI: During the 24 discussions about the language of 38.5, was this

1 issue specifically discussed? I mean, was it 2 even contemplated at that time that, you know, 3 these scenarios where USEPA may disapprove a 4 board order TLWQS on a readily rectifiable 5 ground and even your rules anticipate that with allowing motions to modify to the Board 6 7 subsequent to USEPA disapproval, in those 8 discussions, was that discussed that the stay 9 should not stay in effect to cover at least that initial petition to modify? 10 11 MR. SOFAT: I'm not sure if there was 12 explicit discussion or not. But I also know 13 that we were not trying to extend stays to every scenario. 14 15 MS. FRANZETTI: I can understand Some scenarios may be unreasonable to 16 17 extend the stay, correct? And that's what 18 you're concerned about when you say an infinite 19 loop I think was the phrase you used; is that 20 right? 2.1 MR. TWATT: Yes. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: Would you be opposed 23 to modifying your proposed rules to at least 24 allow the stay to continue through one

Page 237 1 opportunity to obtain the Board's decision on a 2 petition to modify subsequent to USEPA 3 disapproval? MR. SOFAT: It's based on the 4 5 statutory language. So I don't think these 6 rules can go beyond what the statute allows. 7 MS. FRANZETTI: You think that would 8 be going beyond what that statute allows? It specifically says --9 MR. SOFAT: 10 USEPA approval. 11 MS. FRANZETTI: But isn't it 12 conceivable that the USEPA disapproval that 13 would be intended there would be after the Board -- well, the petitioner and the Board 14 15 get an opportunity to respond to the USEPA 16 comments, and the USEPA says, no, this 17 disapproval is final. 18 Because certainly you would agree 19 there are instances where the EPA has 20 disapproved, it then comes back to the stay, or 2.1 in our instance, the Board, and the concerns the 22 USEPA had are, in fact, successfully addressed, 23 in which event that initial disapproval turns

24

into an approval.

1 So the initial disapproval was an 2 interim type disapproval to which I could argue 3 your Section 38.5 is only speaking about a final 4 EPA decision after you've gotten an opportunity 5 to respond to your initial decision; would you 6 agree? 7 MR. SOFAT: No. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: Do you have any law 9 to back that up? 10 MR. SOFAT: I think the way we review that is -- the thought process I have laid out 11 12 before is Agency intends to work with USEPA from 13 day one. And, therefore, once they write a 14 formal opinion, it's final. There would be a 15 lot of discussion before they issue their final decision. 16 17 So, therefore, that's why I'm saying 18 that at some point you got to put a stop to the 19 process. And that is what the statute says,

that at some point you got to put a stop to the process. And that is what the statute says, that's what we are saying today. But I will also say that our working with the USEPA will give us plenty of heads-up that this is what's going to happen.

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. FRANZETTI: And Mr. Sofat, I wish

1 I could be as optimistic as you are about EPA 2 being so communicative with the stay, but I 3 happen to share the thought that has been 4 expressed earlier that absolutely there have 5 been situations where you can't get a clear answer out of them in advance; wouldn't you 6 agree with that? 8 I'm speaking out of MR. SOFAT: 9 experience. And even in case of Citgo, we were 10 told this is what's going to happen. 11 MS. PALUMBO: In the scenario that 12 we're discussing right now in which USEPA 13 disapproves the TLWQS, the Board would have 14 already adopted it, correct? 15 MR. SOFAT: Uh-huh. 16 MS. PALUMBO: So, in that instance, 17 it is effective for state use? It is effective 18 at the state level, correct? 19 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 20 MS. PALUMBO: So if the TLWQS is not 2.1 effective for the purposes of the Clean Water 22 Act, and the stay has ended, what sort 23 enforcement is the discharger opened up to at 24 that point? Can you be elaborate on that?

1 MR. SOFAT: So USEPA has disapproved. 2 As I said before, the stay provision is only a state law. It's not Clean Water Act. The Clean 3 4 Water Act has no provision that says you can 5 somehow stay things. 6 So, your stay is only going to be 7 relevant for the stay purposes. 8 MS. PALUMBO: So, theoretically, a 9 citizen suit could be brought pursuant to the Clean Water Act in federal court, let's say, 10 because USEPA disapproved the TLWQS; is that a 11 12 correct assessment? 13 MR. SOFAT: So USEPA has disapproved 14 it and the line standard applies. And during 15 that time, yes, that's a possibility. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Sofat, 16 17 just as - on that, too, on that didn't you state 18 earlier, and maybe I misheard and mistook notes, 19 but that if the USEPA disapproves the 20 time-limited water quality standard, that in 2.1 effect ends the state time-limited water quality 22 standard. So you no longer have a state stay 23 either. 24 MR. SOFAT: That is true.

1 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: So at that 2 point, you're subject to the underlying 3 provision, both state and federal? 4 MR. SOFAT: Yes. 5 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: 6 follow-up question to that, you're saying USEPA 7 disapproval, you're saying that's final. Are 8 there no appeals in the USEPA disapproval to the EAP or to the circuit court? 9 MR. SOFAT: I have to think about 10 I don't know if they have to publish it. 11 that. 12 If it's published in the federal register, then yes. If it's not, then not. 13 14 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: But if it's 15 appealed, and if there is an appeal period, then 16 surely the stay would stay in effect while it's 17 under appeal. 18 MR. SOFAT: Again, I don't know -- we 19 will look into whether or not appealing to a 20 federal code, you could request an extension of 2.1 your stay. That part we need to check into 22 that. 23 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Andes. 24 MR. ANDES: Let's take that issue a

```
1
     step further. This strikes me, two issues to
2
     the explore. One is, before EPA disapproves
3
     this kind of action, which is what I call a
4
     standard action, the EPA has to issue a proposed
5
     disapproval, correct, and allow public comment?
6
                             I'm only going with my
                 MR. SOFAT:
7
     experience with Citgo. I don't think they did
8
     that.
            They simply issued an order.
9
                 MR. ANDES: So, that's one issue.
10
     Certainly when the EPA disapproves a state water
     quality standard, they are supposed to do that?
11
12
                 MR. SOFAT:
                             Yes.
13
                 MR. ANDES: Take at least 30 days of
14
     comments and publish it under the federal
15
     registry notes. They haven't done that in the
16
           That's another issue.
17
                 So that's one issue where there might
18
     be an opportunity to say, this is coming, can we
19
     work on a provision that says in that kind of
20
     situation, say, the EPA, suppose it disapproves
2.1
     it, but you're working with them to try to
22
     address the issue, is there a way to extend the
23
     stay in that circumstance?
24
                 So that's, I guess, one issue for us
```

to explore further.

2.1

The other aspect for you to explore would be in answer to the hearing officer's question about challenges. Absolutely there would be an opportunity -- I'm not afraid to say this since we've done this -- there would be an opportunity to challenge the EPA disapproval in federal district court.

And one could ask for an injunction on the EPA. It wouldn't be an automatic stay, but you can certainly ask for an injunction conjoining the effectiveness of the EPA disapproval, which then would I think leave the stay in effect. So, I think these are legal issues for us to explore further.

MS. FRANZETTI: At the time of the discussions of Section 38.5, was it even discussed the situation where the grounds for the EPA disapproval can be addressed through a petition to modify filed before the Board; and that in that situation, was it a purposeful decision that in that situation the stay should still expire?

MR. SOFAT: I don't remember explicit

- 1 discussions. But I will say this, the state 2 provision that we have, I was very happy to have 3 what we got. MS. FRANZETTI: I understand. 4 And 5 I'm not challenging the reasonableness generally 6 of the stay provision. 7 Was there discussion about generally 8 letting the stay continue while the Board worked 9 to resolve the deficiencies identified by the USEPA, you know, any discussion along those 10
- MR. SOFAT: No.
- MS. FRANZETTI: Now, let me take the flipside.
- Was there any discussion by advocates

 of -- it doesn't matter how minor the deficiency

 may be that the USEPA identifies in its

 disapproval, the stay should still expire; was
- 19 there that kind of argument being made about
- 20 | Section 38.5?

lines?

- 21 MR. SOFAT: You are asking the wrong
- guy who can't remember what happened yesterday.
- 23 I can't recall.
- 24 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. All right.

1 Let me move on. I'm going to ask (c) here. 2 Given that the USEPA disapproval 3 decision has the effect of terminating a stay, 4 did the Agency consider the alternative approach 5 of having the Board issue a preliminary or tentative decision to be submitted to the USEPA 6 for comment upon the conclusion of the hearing 8 and post-hearing briefing before the Board proceeds to enter a final decision that is then 9 submitted to USEPA for approval or disapproval? 10 11 Obviously, a different approach, but 12 one where if there's no alternative, the stay 13 automatically expires upon EPA disapproval of a 14 Board order granting a TLWQS, what about an 15 approach then that submits a preliminary 16 determination by the Board for USEPA review and 17 response? 18 MR. SOFAT: The issue I see with that 19 is USEPA is going to say it's not a final 20 action. We don't need to tell you anything. 2.1 And I understand that everybody has concerns

But I cannot emphasize enough when I say

regarding this stay expiring and things like

we're going to work with USEPA, we are very,

22

23

24

that.

very serious about that. We do not want those examples. This whole exercise started because we got a disapproval.

So, again, yes, it might seem like yes, there's a certainty in the process, somebody could, you know, lose their stay, et cetera, all that stuff. Yes, it's there. But that is there because we needed a process that ends at some point.

But as far as -- and, again, I know the challenge that now we have certain transitioning from 35 (a) type petitions to 38.5. So, I think, yes, challenges will be there. We'll have to figure out solutions. Statute is what it is now.

But that doesn't mean we are just saying if we see something needs to be done or needs to be addressed, that we don't intend to be reasonable. We are going to be reasonable. And that is one way to handle these complex issues.

MS. FRANZETTI: Final question.

23 Question 33.

2.1

Section 104.570(c)(6) requires a

1 30-day comment period. Does this prohibit the Board from approving the petition to modify in 2 3 less than 30 days? Must it wait at least 4 30 days before it rules on a petition to modify? 5 MS. TERRANOVA: We're going to take 6 33(a) and (b) as legal questions and respond in 7 writing. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: All right. Let me, 9 therefore, add -- I think you really need to consider this provision because based on what we 10 just finished discussing, if somebody is going 11 to lose the stay upon disapproval by the USEPA, 12 13 time will be of the essence to go back to the Board under a petition to modify. 14 15 And I submit you are going too far 16 with the public participation angle of this. 17 And a petitioner should not have to sit there 18 and wait 30 days. Nobody may comment. If they

So, I really would ask the Agency to reconsider a 30-day comment period. Because certainly, typically, when the Board allows for a comment period on any sort of motion, they

are so interested, they ought to get in there

and comment extremely quickly.

19

20

2.1

22

23

don't rule before the comment period ends. So I would really ask the Agency to reconsider that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

MR. ETTINGER: Ms. Tipsord, if we're going to have more testimony today as opposed to questions that should be scheduled for another proceeding.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: I appreciate what you're saying Mr. Ettinger. I believe that Ms. Franzetti is finished.

MS. PALUMBO: I just have one final question.

So in the clause in the Chicago Area Waterway System Rulemaking, USEPA participated with comment letters.

Does Illinois EPA anticipate that
USEPA's participation in the water quality
standard rulemaking take a similar form to that?

MR. TWAIT: I don't know if they'll

be participating in that way or not.

MR. SOFAT: But we will definitely be encouraging them.

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Any other questions?

24 Let's go off the record for just a

Page 249 1 moment. 2 (WHEREUPON, a discussion was 3 held off the Record.) HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: After 4 5 discussion was held off the record, it's been decided that the IEPA will submit comments to 6 7 the Board and the members of people on the 8 service list by November 14th, 2017. 9 Response comments and everyone else's comments -- or initial comments are due by 10 11 December 5th, 2017. And we will allow for the 12 right to reply by December 19th, 2017. 13 Mailbox rule doesn't apply. I know that's an old-fashioned term especially since we 14 15 do all electronic filing. It does not apply. Those should be in the Clerk's office on those 16 17 days. 18 Any other questions? 19 I want to thank everyone again for 20 their professional and for the good questions. 2.1 It's been a good rulemaking. Thank you very 22 much. We're adjourned. 23 MR. SOFAT: And the Agency would like

to thank the Board for the time and the efforts

```
Page 250
     they have put into this. Thank you very much.
 1
                  HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
 2
                       (WHEREUPON, the proceedings
 3
                       were concluded at 4:13 p.m.)
 4
 5
                       (WHEREUPON, which were all
                       proceedings had in
 6
 7
                       above-entitled cause on said
 8
                       date and time.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
```

```
Page 251
 1
     STATE OF ILLINOIS )
 2
                         ) SS:
 3
     COUNTY OF C O O K )
 4
 5
            JAMYE GIAMARUSTI, being first duly sworn,
     on oath says that she is a court reporter doing
 6
 7
     business in the City of Chicago; and that she
     reported in shorthand the proceedings of said
 8
 9
     hearing, and that the foregoing is a true and
     correct transcript of her shorthand notes so
10
11
     taken as aforesaid, and contains the proceedings
12
     given at said hearing.
13
14
15
16
                 Certified Shorthand Reporter
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	1	1	ı	
A	26:4 29:22 30:6	addressed 47:5	216:4 218:5 224:8	98:22 101:13
A-N-T-O-N-E-T	40:24 56:11 59:16	50:9,10 51:11	adoptive 155:13	102:10 110:7,24
19:24	59:18 66:11 68:14	77:21 148:14	234:6	111:9 112:16
A-T 6:19	89:12 99:23	150:9 162:23	adopts 92:10	115:5,8 120:9,10
a.m 1:16	103:16 136:1	163:5 211:22	119:15 138:23	120:11 123:12,17
ABC 100:11,16	140:12 151:23	237:22 243:19	155:11 166:6	128:7,15,21 129:2
112:21	152:2 156:16	246:18	215:22	129:12,14 141:18
ability 123:21	162:19 164:17	addresses 134:21	advance 161:23	143:3 144:15
170:3	167:18 168:6	235:12	239:6	145:9,15,17 149:5
able 5:4 73:19	202:18,21 224:7	addressing 7:12,14	advantage 143:7	150:5,11 153:24
79:24 81:20 93:4	225:20 239:22	adequate 96:16	advantages 23:24	154:2,14,16 155:8
178:10 184:18	240:3,4,10	97:9,17 181:18	151:17	155:20 156:5,9,12
187:16 198:3	action 122:2 129:13	adjourned 249:22	adversely 199:14	158:18 161:5,12
210:19 221:20	242:3,4 245:20	adjudication 25:16	233:6	161:20 162:3,6,17
above-entitled 1:11	actions 90:19	adjudicatory	advisor 131:13	166:17 168:4,11
250:7	102:24 113:17	167:24 168:3,9	advocates 244:15	175:2 177:13
absence 11:22	active 20:24 22:11	169:5 183:20	affect 25:16	181:24 184:13
197:9 225:10	activity 152:5	184:4,9	afford 79:2,3	185:16 186:1,20
Absent 123:13	actual 73:13	adjust 81:21	afforded 20:21	187:7,24 189:24
absolutely 63:8	add 26:22 33:22	Adm 1:7 3:7 26:4	21:3 157:3	191:23 192:1
88:19 239:4 243:4	50:11 55:15 56:14	administration	affords 228:17	200:17 201:19
accept 231:5	59:15 72:16 88:23	28:11 195:17	aforesaid 251:11	203:19,24 205:14
acceptable 36:2	132:14 220:6	Administrative	afoul 95:12	206:21 207:1,15
63:16 125:8	222:18 247:9	168:2	afraid 243:5	211:17 212:9
accepted 111:1	added 45:15 157:8	admit 230:18	afternoon 148:20	215:16 217:16
190:12	197:19	adopt 9:18 10:6	AG 5:18	218:23 219:5,21
account 14:2 50:20	adding 5:14 7:23	30:12 40:9 60:18	Agencies 55:17	221:2,14,15
65:10	18:22 111:10	99:8 139:9 164:23	agency 3:24 5:22	222:24 225:24
accurate 89:21	160:24	167:20 224:15,20	6:8 7:20 8:7,10	229:18,21,23
achievable 79:17	addition 28:8 44:6	227:17	14:12 21:6,8	232:10,17 235:10
80:1 96:7 119:14	59:20 149:10	adopted 10:20	22:18 23:7 25:19	238:12 245:4
achieve 70:13,18	additional 8:5	24:18 35:20 86:13	25:21 26:5,6,19	247:21 248:2
70:20 71:12,15	88:24 119:10	89:22 91:4 96:23	27:11,20 28:5	249:23
77:17 93:2,12	169:20	126:21 132:21	33:9 34:4,13 35:6	Agency's 7:20 17:3
102:18 138:14	additionally 156:24	135:24 149:21	35:24 36:4 38:11	34:6 44:9 60:19
191:2	address 17:14	156:20 166:2	40:7 42:1,6,11,14	60:20 101:8 149:1
achieved 46:10	47:10 50:14 51:6	189:12 209:10	43:21 44:7,19	150:3 157:12,16
79:22,22 138:10	51:18,21 57:9	217:14 224:1	47:13,16 54:23	157:20 158:2
achieving 218:10	59:10 82:12	225:1 230:10	55:5 56:14,21	173:16 175:9
acknowledge 4:23	102:20 119:19	232:11 235:3	57:8,17 58:4	198:24 202:16
68:18 101:9,15,16	129:8,17 140:22	239:14	59:19 60:6,14,16	204:2 206:19
acknowledged 4:24	140:22 150:8	adopting 96:20	65:7 67:8 76:21	207:13 214:3
acknowledging	161:6 165:22	225:8	83:15 86:24 87:21	215:21 216:17
102:6	216:5 223:12	adoption 119:16	87:22 89:3 93:23	227:5 231:17
act 9:14 10:14,23	242:22	156:3 165:10	94:17 95:1 97:12	ago 23:1 176:4
, -				

	_	_	_	_
177:18 207:7,9	113:16	220:12,15 221:7	appearance 205:18	60:11 112:11
agree 33:19 35:24	alternative 130:4,8	222:13 225:12	appears 69:12	125:21 164:17,24
41:23 42:4,10,14	167:6 245:4,12	226:22 241:23,24	115:1,2	165:4 170:1,3
45:5 82:6 87:3,13	amenable 64:18	242:9,13	apple 213:23 214:9	175:11 176:1
103:19 119:24	161:12	angle 247:16	214:16,18 230:8	177:13 234:8,10
128:8 129:5 170:4	amend 155:10	animal 96:4	230:14	approval 25:2
175:2,13 197:8	219:12 220:6	answer 28:24 38:7	applicability 9:10	99:21 104:1
211:7,17 212:8	amended 155:23	51:22 84:24 151:1	9:11 27:24 214:1	121:20 124:7
216:19 217:3	176:17 177:3,7	151:6 169:12	applicable 11:7	135:14 136:16
228:24 231:24	207:15 213:19	172:17 176:3,21	28:3 36:12,15,22	141:21 142:14,15
237:18 238:6	214:5,20 215:8	176:22 201:7	44:13,17 55:21	142:22 143:8
239:7	216:4,10,13,21	203:14 206:4	86:15 94:23 119:7	144:23 145:10,18
agreeable 65:7	217:7,19 218:18	207:18,18 215:17	125:2 136:24	146:12 147:1,9
agreeing 76:9	219:20,24 221:9	215:20 226:24	137:13,14 142:5	166:4 209:20
agreement 176:4	225:16,21,23	227:3 231:12	149:9 205:21	233:7 237:10,24
agrees 10:19 59:19	226:6,7,8 229:6,7	234:4 239:6 243:3	234:15	245:10
120:11	229:9,12,17	answered 143:18	applicant 126:12	approval/disapp
ahead 3:13 8:14	230:13	202:14 206:1	150:10	146:22 234:13
20:18 49:10 70:4	amount 97:17	answering 214:13	application 11:3	approve 121:6
197:15 198:5	105:21 106:3	answers 4:3 6:8	25:15 49:14,23	145:22 147:15
227:23 233:1	109:20 188:4	84:10 186:10	109:23 125:18	162:3 187:20
Albert 2:14 9:3,7	207:4	anticipate 85:8	applied 115:23	188:5 234:14
16:22 76:9	analysis 16:14,16	151:8,22 176:22	143:20 221:3	approved 24:7,12
algal 159:4	78:4 98:2 101:23	201:4 236:5	applies 56:20	24:18 35:9 96:17
Alisa 2:5 3:21	106:16,17 112:22	248:15	117:10 149:5,11	103:17,23 104:12
alleged 235:13	128:12 164:10,18	anticipated 46:5	154:18 164:21	104:22 105:13
allow 4:9,10,16 9:4	165:1,10	Antonette 2:13	208:14 231:18	111:1 121:1
12:8 28:6 48:13	Anand 2:3 3:21	19:23	240:14	122:12,14 126:22
55:16 64:20 84:5	and/or 93:13	anybody 8:13 99:3	apply 9:20 10:1	126:23 127:13
93:13 201:5 214:4	149:17 169:22	191:4	15:11 28:9 32:16	136:2,3 142:20
216:17 217:10	218:23	anymore 63:11	76:19 77:3 81:15	171:14,22,23
223:24 236:24	Andes 2:15 15:1,2	81:11 147:19	97:22 101:4	188:10 232:11,23
242:5 249:11	15:2,20 16:14	212:17	105:17 150:19	234:11
allowed 83:4 182:3	49:11,12,22 50:5	anyway 83:13	154:24 155:1	approves 99:19,21
201:14 213:15	51:8 53:9 54:2	198:17	249:13,15	107:4 134:24
217:15	74:24 75:5,14,17	appeal 97:5 111:4	applying 7:20 10:8	135:5,21 141:23
allowing 155:8	77:9 78:18 79:1	135:11 139:15	105:19	142:3,12,24 145:6
236:6	89:15 90:5,12,15	204:4 232:5,19	appointed 3:4	145:21 232:21
allows 11:1 13:11	91:13,24 92:17	233:8,17,23,24	appreciate 187:15	approving 35:16
23:3 30:6 77:19	94:3 115:12,14	234:17 241:15,17	187:15 248:8	105:3 124:23
79:19 151:21	116:11 117:12	appealable 60:1	approach 10:16	146:5 147:20
237:6,8 247:23	118:9 126:18	appealed 204:1	171:1 182:23	232:8 233:2,18
alternate 33:1	127:2 211:21	241:15	245:4,11,15	247:2
96:23	212:13,18 214:17	appealing 241:19	appropriate 17:5	April 175:3 177:4
alternated 96:19	218:13 219:8,16	appeals 241:8	17:19 19:19 59:15	204:18 205:18
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

206.17	71.10 74.7 70 10	 	105.17.125.17	162.5
206:17	71:10 74:7 78:19	<u> </u>	125:16 135:17	163:5
arbiter 176:5	78:21 92:10 93:3	b 10:5 26:3,4 32:13	140:14 155:13	bias 5:9
area 13:4 20:8 128:19 248:12	93:5,10 114:4	37:7 42:9,14 45:7	164:17,23 171:8 176:21 185:16	biggest 122:12 billion 35:13
	115:8,10 118:23 119:9 137:8	60:12,15 61:3,6	202:9 207:18	bit 17:2 61:8
argue 238:2 arguing 232:23	138:15 164:10	134:11 156:11	202.9 207.18 209:20 210:2	183:22 184:9
arguing 232.23 argument 46:3,8	attained 96:8	169:13 176:20,22	211:18 223:7	199:11 202:14
95:7 244:19	attempt 41:6 129:8	247:6	237:4 247:10	bite 230:8
aside 76:11	218:3,10 221:11	back 6:24 23:1	basic 54:15	bites 213:22 214:9
asked 5:6 120:8	224:3	26:11 30:11 32:9	basically 16:16	214:16,18 230:14
172:18 176:18	attempts 220:20	62:5 64:8 67:22	Basin 7:17,22 8:6	blanket 10:8 18:7
178:18,19 204:14	223:15 226:3,11	67:24 68:2,21	basis 10:7,21 55:6	221:5
asking 16:23 39:8	attention 186:8	75:7 85:9,13,14	58:8 82:20 123:15	blanks 219:13
49:16,23 53:18	attorney 2:9,9,13	85:18 109:10	123:15 221:19	Bloomington 52:6
61:1 78:11 112:19	4:19 6:2 134:3,6	110:9 113:19	begins 59:3	52:21,24
127:15 128:1	attorney/advisor	130:8,11,14	behalf 22:24	Blue 3:12
144:14 153:21,22	2:6 3:19	136:11 139:5	167:12 192:6	BMP 27:21 31:8
155:23 164:1	audience 2:6 3:16	140:16,20,23 142:8 143:20,23	believe 45:13 46:19	97:20,23 98:23
181:2 185:20	author 9:15	142.8 143.20,23	49:19 51:16 61:17	106:18 112:7,21
189:6 193:24	authority 29:19	144.10 143.1	71:15 102:5 127:1	138:17,18 160:18
194:12 209:2	56:11 87:22 89:6	157:5 178:12,13	150:24 158:18	BMPs 31:18 160:18
244:21	94:17 97:8,12	187:14,24 188:3	161:14 162:17	board 1:1,13 2:3,4
asks 25:12 200:3	101:22 103:6	188:13 189:24	166:12 172:9,17	2:4,5,6 3:5,10,13
aspect 53:10 243:2	113:15 153:17	190:1,12 191:16	172:20 190:10	3:15,16 5:6,18 7:8
assess 109:22	195:19,21 198:14	196:6,20 197:14	196:12 198:13	8:2,9,20 21:4
assessment 59:1	199:2 205:20	203:10 204:16	201:7 202:9,24	22:17 23:7 24:18
155:13 229:15	225:8	206:5 207:21	207:24 220:9	31:9 34:12,14
240:12	authorized 89:8	210:1,4 211:3,21	228:3,19,24 230:2	36:8,16 38:3,5
assimilative 48:3,8	156:18 164:15,22	213:7 230:16	248:9	39:12,22 40:13
50:7 51:1 199:3,7	165:18,21	235:4 237:20	believes 57:8 58:15	55:10 56:24 57:15
199:21 200:19	authorizing 86:13	238:9 247:13	86:24 87:21	58:4,11,14 60:3
associated 183:7	87:14 88:6,10,17	Barnes 15:2	155:20 179:5	60:12,17 63:14
assume 38:6 199:17	automatic 243:10	base 75:10 154:13	beneficial 151:11	65:10,16 66:3,4,5
assumes 77:7	automatically	based 9:15 34:7	benefit 13:22	66:8 67:10 85:12
assuming 72:12	245:13	35:20 36:8 40:6	112:15 224:4	86:2,5 88:9 93:18
137:23 165:24	avail 124:24 125:10	44:9 51:15 55:11	best 27:15,18 31:4	93:19,24 95:21
193:3 201:22	availability 63:10	55:22 58:9 72:6	31:12 38:10 41:3	96:5,10,11,22
assumption 73:17	available 35:5	74:22 78:3 80:9	114:14,18 116:7	97:6,7,12,19,24
77:8 78:12	61:18 72:6 80:18	80:17 84:13,18	138:12 160:15	98:11,11,14,16,18
assurance 46:16	86:10 108:1	88:15 94:16 97:14	161:7 185:17	98:23 99:19
attachment 86:23	162:19	101:20 102:3	better 17:17 60:18	100:14,20 102:4,8
196:6	avoid 161:11	105:18 106:17	72:10 152:16	103:7,12,24
attainable 26:14,16	235:14	108:1 113:19	beyond 54:10 237:6	104:12 105:20,22
26:20 32:2,6 55:4	await 204:4	114:13 116:16	237:8	106:3 107:2
70:9,14,16,17,24	aware 122:3,6	117:6 118:1,2	biannual 162:24	109:15 110:4,7,17
			<u> </u>	

111:1,4,8,15,23	203:17 204:8,18	183:3	bring 30:20 51:17	capacity 48:3,8
112:6,11,16 113:9	204:21 205:1,5,12	bodies 14:15,18	bring 30:20 31:17 bringing 123:13	50:8 51:1 181:1
113:14,19 114:9	205:18,20 206:11	19:3 49:17 53:23	brings 211:3	199:3,7,22 200:20
115:2,5,6 120:8	208:4,11 209:7,11	194:24	broad 45:1,6	caption 67:18
121:24 123:14,15	209:15,17 211:12	body 9:22,22 10:11	Broader 196:10	caption 67.18
121:24 123:14,13	211:13 213:17,19	10:11 11:23 12:20	Broom 192:6	care 4:18 11:12
126:8 128:6,20	213:24 214:7,22	12:21 13:7,8	brought 240:9	20:15 48:11,12
120.8 128.0,20	215:3,22 216:6,16	16:21,24 17:5,19	build 5:7,13 9:1	185:8 186:15,16
,			built 82:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
131:20,23 132:6	216:23,23,24	18:4,5,6,14,17		195:4 213:3
132:15 133:6,8,18	217:6 218:4,7,11	19:8,16 23:5,9	burden 23:18,20	Carrie 2:4 3:10
134:15,18 135:5,9	218:23 219:6,6,8	29:18 43:8,8,18	39:3,6 47:12,16	Carter 2:4 3:16
135:24 136:8,21	219:22 220:10,24	43:18 44:1,5,5	67:18,22,24 68:7	case 15:17 21:18
136:22 137:4	221:13 222:12	49:7 50:1,2 51:12	68:10,12,20,21,23	48:13 51:13,20
138:23 139:23	223:21 224:15,20	52:9 53:11,13,17	69:5,11,21 78:17	78:9 81:12 84:17
141:19 142:8,14	225:7,20 226:9,9	54:7,17 56:18,18	96:14,15 163:15	87:15 121:5
142:21 143:2	226:13,20 227:17	83:16,17,18 107:4	163:17 172:21	122:23 135:4
144:6 145:21	228:5,18 229:7,9	107:16 114:17	180:13 181:3	170:7 173:5
148:24 150:3	230:11 231:5,20	118:24,24 119:5,5	186:17 194:5,8	178:24 179:6
151:20,21 152:24	232:7,8,21,23	119:8,8,22,22	211:8	180:10,19,21
153:11,14,16	233:7,17,18	120:3 152:23	burdensome 11:13	182:10,12 183:8
154:17,21 155:11	234:18 235:3,11	153:2 154:9	bus 78:8	183:13,13 191:7
155:12,18,21,23	236:4,6 237:14,14	171:23 173:18	business 251:7	194:23 210:16,17
155:23 156:3	237:21 239:13	174:9,17 177:1		210:19,21,24
157:11,22 158:2	243:20 244:8	179:8 185:16	<u>C</u>	211:1,5 212:16,21
161:21 162:2,8	245:5,8,14,16	186:16 191:2,5	c 2:1 37:7,11 43:14	222:11 223:20
166:6 167:19,22	247:2,14,23 249:7	195:5 199:8,22	43:20 69:23,23	239:9
168:7 169:5,18,19	249:24	201:23 202:9	70:7 120:10	case-by-case 98:2
169:21,24 170:5,8	Board's 4:15,17 5:7	205:10	134:21 141:17	101:23 112:21
171:1,3,5,5,17,19	34:13 56:11 57:22	boom 181:13	143:19 229:5	cases 72:1 73:19
171:22,22 172:11	58:10 63:12 64:14	border 54:10	245:1 251:3	74:5,20 152:16
172:15,17 173:7	67:17 83:10 85:21	boundaries 117:6	calculate 31:18	183:20 184:4,9
173:19 174:16	87:1 95:18 98:6	117:20	71:21 84:14 159:3	226:15
175:14,19,22	125:9,16 130:2	box 117:8	calculated 35:11	categories 167:23
176:5,9,10,17	132:20 134:22	Boyd 2:15 22:23,23	117:6 162:14	category 168:7
177:4,9,14 180:24	135:1,20 136:15	24:9,15,21 25:3,7	calculating 71:19	171:21 172:1
180:24 181:4,13	141:23 143:16	40:2,3,15 69:14	80:17 158:23	198:20
182:1,11,24 183:1	145:16,19 149:13	69:15 118:15,22	call 235:19,19	cause 14:4 20:7
183:14 184:17	167:21 174:5	121:16,21 122:1	242:3	24:11,17 48:14,15
186:19 187:4,6,24	184:20 186:2	brand-new 230:9	called 1:12 90:22	51:16 54:15 71:6
188:19,19 189:16	191:19 199:2	break 85:8,16	121:10	189:4,11 201:1
189:23 190:8,9,14	203:20 206:8	99:12 146:9,13,15	calling 91:19	211:4 250:7
190:19 191:16	207:24 208:14	148:10,16 169:22	calls 202:21	causing 16:1 29:11
195:15,18 197:18	226:18 233:1,8	213:7,8	Canal 173:23	51:4 53:19
197:22 198:4,21	237:1	Brenda 2:4 3:16	candidate 21:16	caution 170:9
200:5 201:20	Board-approved	briefing 245:8	capability 138:13	183:16
	- -	_		

cautious 131:11	165:3,6 190:7	242:23	37:23 38:13,16,17	combine 26:1
Center 1:13	199:9 200:4	circumstances 19:5	38:22 174:7,10	combined 175:7
central 83:12	202:13 218:7	71:19 143:6 165:8	181:6 203:21	180:13
certain 9:22 22:5	changed 8:8 36:7	201:10	208:9,11 209:23	come 17:22 37:16
24:23 38:19 46:23	45:14 55:7,7	citation 86:22	Classes/Deadlines	38:8 58:1 74:16
57:23 72:4 91:15	80:11 120:24	121:17,18,19	203:18	79:12,15 82:2
92:1 93:12 152:16	127:7	156:23	classification 35:2	85:8,13 109:10
176:23 188:4	changes 9:4 65:4	cite 10:7	classified 203:7	110:9,23 129:6
198:5,8 223:17	69:4 164:10	Citgo 187:21 188:9	classify 203:6	130:8,11,14 132:1
246:11	changing 25:13	191:9 239:9 242:7	231:21	132:10 140:1
certainly 116:14	37:11 45:16 65:8	citizen 100:10	clause 248:12	148:11 184:16
237:18 242:10	160:23	240:9	clean 9:14 10:13,23	187:7 197:2 202:4
243:11 247:23	characterized	City 251:7	28:23 30:5 68:14	210:1,4 213:7
certainty 141:8	199:2	claiming 109:11	69:9 89:11 99:22	221:18 223:18
188:4 246:5	charge 100:16	claims 199:6	103:15 136:1	230:5,11,12
Certified 251:16	check 61:19 65:24	clarification 35:7	140:12 156:16	comes 27:3,5 29:7
cetera 63:24 64:2	66:14 87:2 241:21	69:16 87:11 129:9	239:21 240:3,3,10	62:3 110:1,21
179:9 246:7	chemical 174:2	147:5 154:16	clear 33:14 37:12	146:20 164:6
CFR 7:12 11:8	178:8 204:19	195:24 230:20	47:23 72:19 75:6	184:3 187:3
27:10 59:15 61:5	205:3 208:3	clarified 148:2	94:2,12 132:15	190:11 217:11
62:5 65:11,16	209:22	210:10	179:19 211:15	223:24 229:5
68:17 89:14 97:1	Chicago 1:14 2:16	clarifies 207:13	226:24 227:1,5,22	230:6,10,22
164:12 223:6	13:4 14:1,3 15:4,8	clarify 12:23 15:5	229:16 239:5	237:20
Chairman 2:5,6	16:23 17:1 20:8	34:22 36:1 37:6	clearer 37:17 38:1	comfortable 220:4
3:18	173:22 248:12	41:18,23 43:5,13	clearest 181:22	coming 16:8 18:12
challenge 223:1	251:7	53:9 56:10 59:7	clearly 198:11,20	29:10 65:23 66:7
243:7 246:11	chloride 13:3,24	60:11 70:6 82:9	217:14	66:13 74:17
challenges 243:4	14:3,9,11 15:9	86:4 88:3 92:17	Clerk's 249:16	123:19 154:7
246:13	16:12 17:22 18:22	120:18 125:20	climate 117:19	198:16,17 229:4
challenging 244:5	20:6,12 24:10,16	131:8 133:16	clock 142:13	230:17 242:18
chance 74:11	36:13 72:2 74:9	138:21 153:16	close 86:10 216:24	commencing 1:16
148:12 184:20	151:20 189:4,11	158:11 177:10	230:3	comment 6:5 7:14
219:12 220:16	chlorides 23:2	179:3 200:6	closed 89:8 148:4,6	9:2,13 26:15 27:9
chances 222:8,14	115:20 151:11	210:15	closely 27:4 189:3	27:17 28:1 32:14
change 25:20,22	161:2	clarifying 25:12	closing 9:2	33:5 34:20 39:9
26:8,11 28:6	choose 17:15	49:12 120:9	Club 2:14 9:8	44:2,15 45:22
35:24 36:5 41:24	150:19 152:14	128:19	Coburn 22:24	46:13 54:20 57:2
42:2,5,7,9,10,12	182:9	clarity 17:17	code 1:7 3:7 26:4	59:4,14 60:10
42:15 44:8,20	chooses 23:17	181:21 188:24	28:11 168:2	62:16 68:11 74:2
48:18 50:17 60:7	187:13	class 36:17 39:2	241:20	85:24 95:10,11,13
65:2 68:22,24	chose 224:7	144:6,8 173:20	cold 115:22	120:16 128:4,6
69:21 80:5,21	chosen 152:21	174:4,11,17 204:9	collective 149:4	129:2 157:8 172:9
81:5 82:4 103:4	circuit 241:9	205:11,23 207:23	153:1	227:22 242:5
113:13 117:19,21	circulation 63:6	208:1,13 210:2	collectively 151:23	245:7 247:1,18,20
120:12 163:14	circumstance	classes 21:5 36:10	152:2 223:12	247:22,24 248:1
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

		•		<u> </u>
248:14	92:14 93:14,17,21	concepts 29:7	confusion 71:16	185:23 186:3
commenters 164:7	94:8,10,15,21,24	72:19 75:24 89:16	72:16,17 75:1	construct 90:8
203:9	95:10,17,20 96:1	concern 24:3 28:21	78:5 161:12 169:7	consuming 50:7
comments 8:23,24	97:2,9,17 98:10	29:1 57:10,11	229:4,22 230:17	contact 184:15,22
10:19 55:20	98:15 100:15	58:9 59:7,11	conjoining 243:12	185:23 186:3,9
140:15,22 237:16	101:10,14,19	63:19 116:14	conjunction 92:15	187:17
242:14 249:6,9,10	102:1,5,7,15,18	188:22 212:20	92:18	contain 217:15,22
249:10	102:22 103:6,22	222:6,10,13	connection 110:4	contained 118:18
common 22:5	103:24 104:3,8,13	concerned 48:1	consider 15:16 21:8	contains 251:11
195:5	104:16,23 105:1,4	73:7 94:16 179:12	31:19 53:21 54:2	contemplated
commonality	105:5,13 106:4,6	180:5,24 186:1,1	54:11 65:16 83:15	197:22 233:15
195:13	106:8,9 111:3,12	191:8 236:18	97:16 102:11	236:2
communicative	111:24 112:2	concerning 144:20	109:17 115:2,6	contemplating
239:2	113:5,7,20,22	concerns 131:8	232:3 245:4	29:22
companies 149:17	114:6,20 115:10	223:11 237:21	247:10	content 44:3,16
company 100:11,16	116:19,21 117:3	245:21	consideration	46:14 96:2
209:22	129:1 155:13,15	conclude 10:22	46:12 48:7 66:3,4	contentions 231:5
compared 164:9	155:20,24 156:5	concluded 155:19	156:21	contents 34:21 39:8
165:13	177:9 181:15	250:4	considerations	40:4 86:1 102:13
complaint 156:1	190:16 209:1,5	concludes 234:7	65:10	context 11:6 16:17
231:9	212:4 213:17,23	conclusion 245:7	considered 12:15	45:11 69:19
complete 5:7	215:7 216:14,22	condition 32:3,6	14:17 15:7,19,21	104:18 190:15
152:10 207:2	217:2,21 218:11	55:4 70:9,14,16	53:12 96:14 115:3	continue 4:10
220:16 225:17	219:7 226:14,17	70:18,24 71:10	153:4 163:11	80:24 81:22 88:20
233:10	229:8,14 230:7,12	78:19 79:18 80:1	234:3	197:10,11 209:19
completed 4:3	231:7	92:10 93:3,5,10	considering 6:7	236:24 244:8
completely 145:14	compliant 60:4	96:7 114:4 115:8	34:6 234:19	continues 78:3
completion 166:4	67:7 128:24	115:10 118:12,17	consistency 28:4	229:10
complex 143:7	155:16 213:20	118:24 137:8	consistent 10:23	continuing 27:14
165:12 221:10	215:4 218:4,24	138:15	12:3 24:8 41:2	141:15 181:16
223:18 246:20	219:3,11	conditions 30:20	59:18 61:5 65:11	contribute 51:17
complexity 165:7	complicated 159:1	39:1 76:19 77:2	69:1 86:11 96:13	54:16
165:20 220:22	comply 15:12 50:11	106:23 110:23	96:24 172:13	contributing 13:17
compliance 18:18	74:12 78:7 91:5	113:10 117:20	173:1 182:13	16:2 51:5
24:5 45:24 46:2,8	94:8 97:23 98:1	121:11 137:21	188:10 191:11	control 1:1,13 29:5
46:10 59:1,17,21	106:10 107:23	150:19 221:1	229:20	30:8 111:11
74:13 75:11 77:18	138:1 181:2	conduct 167:19	consisting 173:21	119:11,14 126:8
82:13,17,21 83:2	218:22	206:21	consolidate 151:21	176:9 217:6
83:6,12 86:5,6,9	complying 88:5	conducts 207:15	169:20 195:16	controls 30:10
86:12,17 87:7,17	94:9 103:11	conference 64:1	consolidated 152:1	138:16,17
87:23 88:11,17	116:24 199:24	conflict 46:17	152:5 169:23	convenience 180:6
89:7,9,13,18 90:1	conceivable 237:12	confused 12:14	212:1	181:7
90:3,13,16,20,23	concept 24:4 65:20	41:4 67:16 70:7	consolidation	convenient 41:16
91:2,5,10,10,18	90:13 140:19	70:22 77:5 78:23	43:22 151:22	conventional 90:12
91:19,23 92:4,12	175:1 181:10,15	230:19	constant 184:22	conversation
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

191:18	Counsel 202:15	87:6	216:15,24 218:7	66:6 134:13,23
conversations	country 127:17	CSR 1:23	219:15 220:11	135:1 175:12
211:18	County 173:24	cumbersome 62:21	221:6,13,16,21	176:24 180:4,4
conversion 207:7	251:3	current 33:7 36:20	223:14 226:13,19	204:5 211:23
convert 222:17	couple 19:11 25:9	44:9 71:3 72:22	229:6 233:12	217:2 233:9,17,19
converted 155:5	82:10 94:3 134:8	92:9 190:7 201:15	deadlines 57:2,16	234:17 235:2
213:14 214:13	183:10 185:22	currently 3:11	57:18,24,24 58:16	237:1 238:4,5,16
215:16 217:11,17	course 49:6 137:22	44:13,17 82:12	133:4 185:9,10	243:22 245:3,6,9
218:14 222:15	201:23	136:14 220:13	186:9,19,21 187:5	decision-maker
224:2,11 225:15	court 5:3 43:10	228:21	187:6,22 203:22	183:24
230:6	231:8,9 233:9	cycle 72:11 141:8,8	204:10 232:6	deemed 177:8
convoluted 37:8,14	234:18 240:10	221:23 235:16	deal 35:22	217:20
38:9	241:9 243:8 251:6	221.23 233.10	dealing 18:11 118:6	deems 187:4
coordinate 154:1	cover 43:5,14 236:9	D	deals 25:11 228:13	defense 99:17
copper 19:9,11,12	coverage 21:4	d 43:5,14,20	dealt 212:14	100:23 101:1
47:7,9 71:22	22:12,13,18 30:18	damage 48:14	debate 104:18	104:21
copy 5:14 134:18	34:2,12,12,17	data 46:4 164:18	Decatur 2:17 192:8	deficiencies 155:15
correct 15:14 16:16	201:19 205:14	164:24 165:5,9	December 249:11	216:5 235:13
48:9,16 49:18	covered 19:4 22:14	date 37:1 46:10	249:12	244:9
53:14 75:11,16	29:4,24 30:1,21	132:9 142:13	decide 16:7 23:19	deficiency 244:16
80:2 81:9 89:17	31:2,6 33:3,7,17	150:13 250:8	23:22 24:1 30:8	deficient 216:11
90:24 92:23 94:6	34:9 35:17 49:18	day 1:15 4:13 65:21	39:13 50:20 55:23	define 12:1 38:22
110:21 116:3	50:3 117:8 154:15	101:17 142:23	63:1 72:7 79:10	39:23 76:13,16,23
126:24 130:9	217:10	152:24 189:3	84:18 89:6 95:3	77:2 117:5 174:16
140:5 147:11	covers 37:22	190:2,10 227:16	97:8,13,14 98:18	defined 20:11 26:2
157:14 160:11	creat 53:22	230:16 238:13	100:20 101:18	39:10,14,15,17,18
175:16 178:1	create 13:9,10	days 8:19 36:24	110:14 111:8,23	39:21 129:3
183:5 208:17	14:10 15:24 30:6	37:3 145:7,18	113:16,21 175:10	159:16 205:12
213:13 214:19	40:24 41:13 61:19	146:1 187:13	175:23 179:16	226:19
215:8,13,24 216:6	126:11 154:10	188:1 190:1	182:11,22 186:24	defines 111:16
216:7 217:7,8	168:6 197:18	215:22 216:3	187:20 191:4	definitely 30:2
220:14 227:13	198:21	218:5,9,20 219:21	196:15,24 203:6	64:22 182:7
236:17 239:14,18	creating 169:6,13	219:23,24 225:2	212:7,16	209:24 221:5,23
240:12 242:5	CRF 7:14	225:21,22 233:13	decided 71:5 72:23	221:24 248:20
251:10	criteria 23:7,12	242:13 247:3,4,18	249:6	definition 26:16,20
correctly 87:21	34:13,17 35:17	249:17	decider 176:6	27:10,12,18,21
215:1,20	83:19 124:10,12	de 231:19 232:1	decides 23:6 31:22	28:10 45:9,10,16
correspond 72:3	124:14 125:3,10	deadline 33:23 36:9	52:6 100:10	89:13 129:6 157:6
138:7	125:14 126:5,12	36:16,18 67:8,13	101:18 118:1	183:18 184:6
corresponded	126:13,16 127:4	132:19 133:17	171:18 188:7	206:15 207:23
134:10	164:20 205:13,15	149:14 155:16	233:17	definitions 25:24
corresponds 136:9	208:11,12	156:2 177:3	deciding 31:20	26:3
138:9	criterion 119:10,12	186:12 187:13	94:18 97:2 111:23	degree 202:22
cost-effective 11:14	119:20	188:20 214:11	112:16 116:5	deicing 161:4
61:12	cross-reference	215:24 216:9,12	decision 5:8 23:11	delay 232:11
	-	-	-	-

				<u> </u>
deleted 57:3	describing 46:4	158:24 160:6	242:20	28:9 34:19 36:17
deliberately 224:7	description 44:4	165:3 180:11	disapproving 105:4	37:23 38:13,16,17
delineate 14:12	82:7	189:22 194:24	146:5 147:21	38:23 48:2,9
delineated 20:4	design 117:10	195:1 199:16	233:18	53:24 54:4 91:5
delineates 56:5,16	designated 164:20	245:11	discharge 23:5	124:10 125:12
57:23	165:3,6,13	differentiate 62:24	46:23 52:7,9	153:4 154:18,22
delineating 14:14	designed 137:19	68:12	79:20 99:16	173:21,22 174:5
delineation 56:7,12	designing 13:24	differently 158:21	100:14 108:21	174:17 175:5
delivers 219:21	desire 19:3	163:18	115:16 209:23	179:14 182:17,19
demonstrate 46:15	determination	differing 178:6	discharger 10:21	198:8,10 199:21
70:11 113:2 114:3	59:22 112:12	difficult 159:7	21:18 22:10,14	201:6 203:21
126:13 152:11	164:14 175:4,14	directly 36:6 59:9	23:17 29:23 31:12	205:11,23 207:23
demonstrated	186:2 213:24	disadvantage 30:5	31:15 35:2 46:22	208:1,2,9,14
171:7	215:3 216:14	disagree 37:14 65:9	47:4,8,11 48:12	209:13,16 211:10
demonstrating	231:6 245:16	81:8 139:4 171:20	50:8,15 51:5 52:3	211:19 212:6
125:13 172:13	determinative	171:24 183:1,2,4	52:22 53:2 54:17	234:9,10
demonstration	33:16	disagrees 28:5 36:4	56:18 71:20 75:8	discharging 19:11
15:23 39:5 52:1	determine 138:4	97:4 131:13	76:19 93:3,11,21	19:12 47:6 50:1
68:19,24 69:12,17	155:24 170:19	disappear 83:24	97:15 100:6	50:18 52:10,14,18
69:19,21 80:16	175:19 220:2	disapproval 104:2	102:14 104:5,14	98:9,15 99:15
96:15,16 114:11	221:8	139:20 144:1	109:7 113:9,11	100:7,12 105:11
114:13,20,21	determined 165:20	145:1 147:23	114:15 115:18	108:8,14,16 192:9
152:10 153:9,23	168:11 218:23	184:21 209:21	117:21 119:3	192:16 194:23
163:15 164:2	determines 207:16	210:17 211:12,17	120:3 125:24	discretion 55:17
170:11 172:20	determining	234:17 235:1,8,13	152:17 153:5	58:10 232:14
178:11 180:14,20	110:18,19 196:17	236:7 237:3,12,17	154:6 162:5	discussed 59:6
191:11 210:2	209:1 231:8	237:23 238:1,2	170:21 171:9	161:2 183:14
denotes 168:21	detrimental 152:6	241:7,8 242:5	170.21 171.9	225:3 236:1,8
deny 110:20 229:9	develop 156:18	243:7,13,19	174.7,10,11 173.0	243:18
232:9	163:11	244:18 245:2,10	180:15,16 181:24	discussing 102:9
dependent 207:4	developed 10:16	245:13 246:3	*	224:17 239:12
214:21	160:2 222:16	243.13 240.3	182:3,10,11 191:6 192:9,15 199:5,6	247:11
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
depending 39:2 67:11 122:19	developing 221:8 devote 165:18	disapprove 134:22 147:15 188:7	199:13,15,18,19 199:20,23 200:7	discussion 63:21,22 83:1 135:18
165:7		236:3	201:20 206:18	
	dictated 227:8,10 Diers 2:9 6:4			136:12 152:18 168:19 196:5
depends 18:19,23 57:19 107:8 109:3	difference 16:20	disapproved 104:15 144:4	207:17 212:14,15 212:16 220:23	
			239:23	223:3 235:22
136:21 143:6	159:21 164:2 differences 160:14	237:20 240:1,11 240:13		236:12 238:15
152:3 210:15,24 214:6	different 21:14		Discharger-Speci 196:10	244:7,10,15 249:2 249:5
derail 190:7	39:1,4,5 43:6,15	disapproves 139:11 139:23 140:2	dischargers 9:21	discussions 235:24
derived 89:5		141:23 142:7		236:8 243:17
Des 14:4 15:11	64:16 68:19 72:15 72:18 90:24 96:4	141:23 142:7	10:3,12 12:18	244:1
		209:10 239:13	15:8,10,18,19	dismiss 231:8
24:11,17 describes 91:8	106:21 114:13,19 119:3 124:1	240:19 242:2,10	16:1,3 17:18 18:6 20:23 21:5 22:4	distinction 106:12
uescribes 91.0	117.3 124.1	240.17 242.2,10	20.23 21.3 22.4	uistilictivii 100.12
	l	l	l	l

1.4. 1.106.1	D 1 172 22	242.12	6 1994	211 12 22 210 16
distinguish 196:1	Dresden 173:23	243:12	enforceability	211:12,23 218:16
district 2:15,17	due 75:2 249:10	efficiency 210:22	138:4,22 139:2	218:22 237:19
15:4 124:24 192:8	duly 251:5	effluent 35:3	enforceable 90:18	238:4 239:1 242:2
243:8	DuPage 36:13	173:21	90:22 98:24 100:1	242:4,10,20 243:7
divided 167:23	duration 18:16	effort 165:17	136:5 137:19,21	243:10,12,19
docket 139:8 190:2	72:8 100:21	efforts 249:24	139:7 142:6	245:13 248:15
191:17	111:16 142:17	eight 81:21	enforced 22:15	EPA's 87:21 89:17
document 27:2		either 7:2,23 34:10	enforcement 98:7	164:13
124:21 153:12	<u>E</u>	73:1 80:24 88:1	102:24 103:11	Equal 158:4,5,7
196:9,13,17,23	E 2:1,1 3:8 9:18	102:1 118:5	105:12,18 117:9	equally 143:6
197:2,10 208:22	EAP 241:9	124:19 129:12	137:15 239:23	equivalent 126:15
234:14	earlier 31:16 79:5	141:22 155:21	engage 221:15	Eric 2:15 22:23
documentation	91:1 107:24 122:7	161:9,13 174:8	ensure 156:20	error 42:18 68:5
61:2,5,12,14,15	135:18 136:8	181:13 198:8	166:18	especially 99:6
61:16,18,23 62:2	151:5,10 152:13	204:9 205:4,7	enter 57:1,22 245:9	118:5 209:20
62:3,7 64:20	158:10 161:3	208:5 240:23	entered 173:20	231:1 249:14
149:17	170:9,16 190:22	elaborate 38:12	entering 5:10	essence 247:13
documents 219:10	199:12 211:18	80:16 155:21	entertain 226:10	Essentially 143:20
doing 18:2,9 23:15	239:4 240:18	156:9 239:24	entire 47:6 66:5,8	establish 190:24
33:13 58:7 72:14	ease 195:17	electronic 63:13	66:10 128:14	205:12
74:10 77:22 80:15	easier 71:2	249:15	entities 205:3,17	established 36:10
90:21 96:12 110:3	easily 220:6	element 31:23	206:8	93:9 127:4 149:14
115:21 116:13	East 173:22	elements 198:6	entitled 3:6 134:9	158:10 181:8
117:1 128:3 138:2	easy 41:17 63:14	eligibility 125:10	196:9	203:17 229:7
154:12 172:5	economic 121:5,9	125:14,24 127:4	entitlement 198:11	establishes 57:1
173:2 179:18,21	124:14,21	eligible 15:13 205:6	entity 149:4	establishing 173:20
190:9 209:8 223:4	economics 55:8	eliminate 13:11,21	Environmental	174:4,7 203:21
226:16 251:6	78:14	else's 249:9	3:23 4:19 20:1	estimate 162:11
doubt 181:3	effect 174:4,6	emphasize 245:23	145:9,17 148:22	estimation 112:11
downside 197:3	218:17,18,19	encourage 154:15	162:19 167:18	et 63:24 64:1 179:8
downstream 11:10	224:21 235:5	154:17,21	envision 30:4 98:8	246:6
11:18,18,19,20,24	236:9 240:21	encouraging 149:1	161:20	Ettinger 2:14 8:15
12:2,14 13:9,11	241:16 243:14	248:21	envisioned 198:18	9:6,7 11:17 12:4
13:21 15:6,15,17	245:3	ended 141:1,5	227:16	12:13 13:23 14:7
16:3,15 46:12,18	effected 51:14	235:7 239:22	envisioning 29:7	47:21,22 48:11,20
46:20 47:1,4,8,10	effective 37:1,20	endpoint 76:14	EPA 6:3 10:19,22	49:1 58:20 67:16
48:1,8,12,12,16	86:13 99:22	107:12,13	11:1 31:1,14 67:1	67:23 68:3,6 70:2
48:21,22 49:3,5	103:15,18 135:3	ends 67:13 131:1	75:2,4 76:11	70:5 72:17 73:21
49:17 50:2,8,15	135:16,19,24	132:6,12 133:11	86:14 89:3,19	81:7,18 82:8
51:5,10 52:3,8,14	136:2,18 145:12	137:17 139:13,16	93:14 104:7,10,15	113:23 114:22
53:2,11,14,21,23	163:5 166:7	139:21 140:19	122:2 125:11,13	127:8,23 201:4,9
53:23 54:3,9,16	182:20 219:18,23	141:4 142:23	126:15 127:6	201:13 248:3,8
199:14,19,23	228:14 239:17,17	218:20 240:21	128:5 134:13	evaluate 165:14
200:19	239:21	246:9 248:1	165:9 166:23	evaluated 163:18
draft 8:18 41:12	effectiveness 136:9	enforce 99:3	177:17,19 178:1	163:20
G. 10 11.12		- CIII (CC) /	177.17,17 170.1	103.20
	ı	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

1				
evaluation 72:9	excluded 7:18	expressly 168:20	154:11 171:17	198:4,11
162:11 206:19,22	excuse 17:10	215:6 224:8 232:4	185:2 225:6	figure 35:13 38:3,5
207:2,16 209:5	136:16	extend 228:18,20	227:15 237:22	72:2 73:17,19
evaluations 17:3	executive 129:10	236:13,17 242:22	factor 72:20 78:15	74:21 200:24
event 237:23	exercise 246:2	extended 226:21	78:17 121:5 153:3	223:19 225:2
events 117:11	exhaust 139:14	228:8	180:19 193:22	246:14
eventually 72:23	exhausted 81:2	extension 13:14	211:2	figuring 222:24
74:6	exhibit 5:11	14:22 18:19,19	factors 21:7 80:12	file 8:20 25:1 28:7
everybody 34:8,15	exist 135:11	43:1 110:10,10,15	94:22 96:13,14	
		, ,	,	33:22,23 34:11,11
36:17 53:17 74:11	existing 32:19,20	128:10,13 130:11	97:15 124:19	36:17 57:11 67:12
75:24 95:4 98:21	35:3 36:14 39:12	140:18 218:9	152:21,22 163:19	67:12 121:23
108:6,7 127:22	40:6,13,16 41:15	221:1 222:3 228:5	172:19	128:5 140:18
150:6 152:19	42:18,20 43:1	241:20	facts 46:7	149:2 155:22
153:13 154:4	72:6 74:22 80:18	extensions 128:11	factual 231:5	157:22 172:12
214:16 222:3	84:18 87:6 108:1	extent 18:24 46:5	failure 46:6	185:4,13 186:4,10
223:14 245:21	114:13 166:21	183:14 200:18	fall 93:22	189:5 192:1
evidencing 168:6	200:1 205:9	extinguished	falls 23:21	193:18 203:12
evolve 78:3	exists 138:5	229:11	familiar 3:3	205:4,8,18 206:10
evolved 197:12	expanded 53:13	extremely 247:20	FAQ 196:7	207:14 208:8,22
evolving 26:24 35:8	expect 24:21 118:3	Exxon 2:16 182:20	far 3:15 54:9 57:17	209:16 212:5,7
122:8	149:8 161:5 207:2	192:6 204:19	58:4 74:6 76:5	214:4,6,20 215:3
exactly 118:13	234:12	205:4 206:17	94:15 97:2 108:2	216:4,12,21
138:11 179:23	expense 222:5	207:7,10,16 208:3	179:12 180:5,23	217:12 218:3
194:11 224:1	expensive 62:21		185:24 186:1	219:19 221:12
example 12:5,5	experience 185:7	F	191:8 246:10	225:16 226:9
13:3,24 14:9	239:9 242:7	f 65:5,17 224:16	247:15	227:21,21 228:17
16:22 19:15 20:6	expiration 161:23	F-R-A-N-Z-E-T	fast 66:15 184:3	filed 36:18,23 67:6
20:12 31:4,11	expire 243:23	17:6	feasible 119:10	103:10 142:14
35:1 43:6,15 58:3	244:18	F1 92:9	federal 10:8,14,18	149:19 151:19
71:2 72:2,21 74:9	expires 213:21	faces 3:3,3	26:17 28:4 30:13	152:19 156:1
84:3,6 92:5,7 93:7	225:21,22 245:13	facilitate 152:18	40:14 45:10 55:2	166:1 172:5
94:4,4 98:9 109:5	expiring 245:22	171:13 175:11	55:16 63:1 68:17	177:11 195:3
118:19 124:16	explain 16:20 56:4	facilities 19:12 22:4	71:9 73:15 86:22	204:20 205:1
151:20 159:2	61:1 65:13 66:22	33:3,7 35:15	89:1 95:13 121:17	206:11 208:5
161:22 168:3	76:22 150:5	38:19,20 121:7	145:24 158:18	209:14 213:14,18
175:21 181:21	160:13 235:9	123:3 144:5 149:6	161:15 168:24	220:1 233:12
182:22 188:12	explanation 19:20	149:9,18 178:7	171:14 197:5,7	234:1 243:20
189:2 200:13	explicit 236:12	192:10,17,20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
215:19 228:7	243:24	193:12,20	202:19,23 234:18 240:10 241:3,12	files 149:4,13 191:24 208:15
		facility 19:10 35:19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
examples 17:21	explore 242:2	90:8 160:22 161:3	241:20 242:14	217:13 229:6
19:20 246:2	243:1,2,15	161:6 178:23	243:8 fodg 62:16:20:65:20	232:7,16
exceeding 51:2	expose 105:12	facing 188:14	feds 63:16,20 65:20	filing 63:13 123:12
52:16,18 53:24	exposed 102:23	fact 28:24 63:13	feedback 187:10	128:8,16 151:13
excepting 84:12	express 5:8	110:22 130:24	feel 40:7 199:19	152:7 155:16
excess 46:23	expressed 239:4	110.22 130.24	feels 39:22 82:11	157:8 160:3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

172:24 173:16	fits 11:5 20:17	186:23 195:11	196:8 197:3,14	G
177:3,23 208:18	five 12:18 18:15	221:1 226:2,4	198:2,15 200:14	g 66:18
215:8 216:10	71:6,12,21 72:23	force 23:22 152:14	201:2 202:11	gas 207:7
228:4,20 229:1	73:6,24 75:23	foregoing 251:9	203:2,16 204:2,7	Gen 5:18 173:24
249:15	76:1,3,24 77:8,11	foresee 214:16,17	204:14 205:16,24	177:5,24 179:5
filings 217:19	77:16,16,23 78:10	forgive 189:13	206:16,24 207:12	182:9,21 196:6
218:2	78:16,18,20,24	form 62:14 127:9	208:18 209:2,9	204:16 205:19
fill 219:12	79:2,3,6,9,16,17	175:8 186:15	210:6 211:6 213:2	204:10 203:19
final 57:1,23 59:21	79:21,24 80:1,5,6	248:17	213:12 214:12,23	213:11 215:18
89:20 106:11	80:6,8,23 81:1,14	formal 238:14	215:11,15 216:2,8	216:2,3,9,21
135:20 136:15	81:15,19,24 82:3	formed 150:7,12	216:19 217:5,9	217:5
156:14 175:20	84:4,7,8,16,17	formulated 126:15	218:8 223:22	general 2:13 4:19
203:22 204:5	90:6,8 95:6 100:9	forth 36:2 37:2	224:19 227:12	20:7 27:23 63:6
209:1,5 217:1,22	105:12 107:14,24	157:14 162:18	231:2,13,16,23	64:20 78:6 88:5
224:5 226:1	108:12 109:9	228:7	232:20 233:5,15	95:13 99:13
237:17 238:3,14	132:24 133:22,23	forward 57:13	233:21 234:5,16	121:14 134:7
238:15 241:7	136:23 137:6	166:9 205:10	234:24 235:9,18	150:15 174:24
245:9,19 246:22	210:16	212:2 221:19	235:23 236:15,22	General's 134:4
248:10	five-year 79:4	four 130:4,6,22	237:7,11 238:8,24	generally 167:22
Finally 164:7	81:11 109:9	131:2 132:7	243:16 244:4,13	244:5,7
financial 124:12	128:11 130:23	186:13	244:24 246:22	generation 2:14
financially 77:10	131:21 132:23	FR 10:17 156:23	247:8 248:9	4:20 17:7 148:9
find 61:16 62:9	133:2 137:16	164:6	Franzetti's 98:8	167:13 173:12,15
104:6 179:1 215:5	fix 56:22	frame 76:20 134:12	Fred 2:15 15:2	178:8 181:21,23
226:15	fixed 7:23	Frank 6:19	81:13	207:4 208:7
finding 212:4	flexibility 63:2	Franzetti 2:14	Fred's 224:24	generic 93:7
213:16	Flint 2:16 173:24	16:19 17:6,10,12	front 42:23 189:16	generous 221:4
finds 213:19	175:4 182:17,21	17:15,24 28:13,20	fulfill 212:8	geographic 56:5,16
fine 47:1 153:14	192:7	29:21 33:12,13	full 156:21 212:24	204:9
161:9 211:15	flipside 182:16	34:5 38:11,21	fully 222:9	getting 16:1 50:12
finished 247:11	244:14	62:13 87:20 88:23	fun 3:2	75:21 84:3 104:15
248:9	flow 200:24	89:18 92:6,22	function 94:18 95:2	105:11 123:16
finite 235:15	focus 191:9,9	94:6 95:7 102:10	96:11,22 97:11	148:19 221:3
firm 192:5	folks 131:12	103:19 105:8,20	105:6	222:14,19 225:1
first 16:6 20:3 26:1	follow 4:16 8:13	106:2 124:4,22	functions 112:23	227:9
26:10 42:24 50:9	14:8 27:4 31:2	125:5,19 127:21	113:14	Giamarusti 1:23
56:13 73:16 84:15	40:2 56:8 61:8	146:7,10 167:12	fundamental 70:6	251:5
87:12 91:3 128:21	224:21	167:14 168:15	further 5:14 53:8	give 63:16 64:12
134:10 148:23	follow-up 24:10	169:3,12,16 170:4	70:2 128:1 167:8	79:19 97:4 121:17
172:3 183:12,17	40:3 122:2 189:19	170:15 171:16	173:13 198:9	121:18 132:7,10
213:17 214:24	227:24 241:6	173:9 174:12,16	206:19,22 242:1	142:20 148:12
217:20 218:21	following 6:9 45:12	174:23 175:13,17	243:1,15	158:2 174:8 180:1
219:9,20 221:2,22	105:17 115:18,19	176:2,20 181:19	future 13:14 14:24	200:8,9,10,13,17
224:3 251:5	115:24 136:7	182:15 185:1	29:5,14 30:3 48:4	200:22 218:8
fit 12:24 13:1	143:15 156:12	189:20 195:11,20	116:9 197:2 209:8	224:7,10 238:22

given 63:10 103:7	191:16	216:15 221:4,10	guess 8:16 67:16	14:23 24:22 46:21
130:4 183:21	going 8:17,17 9:1,3	221:20 222:7	72:17 82:9 95:22	47:18 74:14 82:3
184:9 185:10	14:23 19:14 20:18	226:18 231:2,10	116:17 117:17	100:3 116:9 117:9
188:24 204:22	29:20 30:11 37:10	231:12 237:8	121:2 123:18	200:16 202:3
	46:24 47:17 49:2		132:20 135:14	
210:6 217:9		238:23 239:10		238:23 239:3,10
228:21 245:2	49:3,7 52:4,7,11	240:6 242:6 245:1	138:12 145:11	happened 115:16
251:12	52:12 53:3 57:16	245:19,24 246:19	154:19 189:12	116:8 118:2
gives 29:18 63:1	57:18,22 58:1,11	247:5,11,15 248:4	226:16 242:24	127:11 128:2
104:24 137:5,6	58:18 62:13,20	good 3:1 7:10 9:9	guidance 27:2	223:3 244:22
216:3	63:13,15,20 67:23	13:15 19:13,15	124:14,21 180:2	happening 53:1
go 3:13 5:19 7:3	68:21 69:4,18,20	21:16,18,21 88:9	196:9,23 197:4	81:8
8:14 18:15,16	71:8,18 72:1,20	120:23 124:17	guiding 186:20	happens 52:3 55:9
20:18 23:1 25:1	73:1,19 74:1,1	143:6 149:23	guy 244:22	98:13 108:23
49:10 55:13 60:5	79:18,18 82:3	151:16 162:14	guys 148:12	130:6,13 139:6
61:16 62:5 64:6,8	84:9,13 87:2 95:4	196:4,13 222:5		140:13 145:3,21
70:4 71:11 72:5	96:6 99:7 101:24	249:20,21	<u>H</u>	147:13 186:7
76:5 77:15 83:10	106:14 107:11,23	gotten 238:4	H-O-U-S-E-R	190:3,13 219:3
85:9,13 92:13	108:6,7,17,18	grant 14:3 110:20	192:5	happy 244:2
93:19 95:9 100:12	112:7 114:9,22	granted 21:10 23:9	HAC 26:20 31:5,18	hard 66:15 184:3
101:7 108:2	115:6,9 117:14	103:12 141:19,24	31:20,20,23 32:1	harm 29:11 102:6
113:19 123:11,21	118:16 122:22	143:17 176:7	71:19,23 72:4,7	hat 98:6
128:1 130:19	123:16 132:20	granting 93:24	72:13,14 73:11,18	HAU 72:3 74:7
136:11 137:19	135:20 136:10	201:5 245:14	73:20 74:18,21,22	81:3 84:1
140:16,19,23	137:24 138:12	grants 93:18	77:20 78:2,16,16	head 74:10 201:24
143:20,23 144:3	141:10 147:14	171:19	79:6,10 80:15,17	heading 68:22
144:11,12,16	152:2 153:23	great 8:5 63:19	80:20 81:18,23	headquarters
145:1 146:1	163:14 169:10	greater 2:16 15:4	82:17 83:14 84:6	178:13
171:20 178:12	172:4,15,22 173:4	77:23 202:21,22	84:22 94:10	heads-up 238:22
180:9,22 181:4,5	173:7 174:23,24	greatest 119:13	101:12 105:14	hear 43:11 99:6
182:16,23 185:18	176:14 177:19	ground 236:5	106:16 107:9,20	181:19 189:12,13
196:3 197:14	178:12,15 180:13	grounds 243:18	111:16 114:12,16	190:1 196:19
203:10 204:4	180:14,19,24	group 4:20 9:21	114:19,23 116:6	heard 188:22
218:19 221:11,14	181:16,24 184:14	11:5 20:2 54:3	117:5,6,10,13,24	hearing 1:11 2:3
227:23 228:15	184:15,17,18,21	148:22 149:3,7,10	118:7 128:12	3:1,5,14,22 4:10
230:15 237:6	184:22 185:7,12	149:16,18 151:17	137:23 146:20,24	6:9,11,20,23 7:6
247:13 248:24	186:3,4,5,14,15	154:13,23 189:4,8	147:18 158:23	8:12,21 11:16
goal 73:12 76:21,23	186:16 187:16	grouped 22:2,7	159:3 162:14	15:1 21:23 22:22
81:23	188:5 189:1	210:22	HAC/HAU 27:1	25:8,23 26:7
goals 191:2	190:20,21 191:5,6	grouping 11:1	half 85:9 132:8	28:12 30:16 31:24
goes 68:2 96:17	190.20,21 191.3,0	groups 21:20,22	213:5	32:4,8 33:11
99:20 104:1	195:16 194:4,20	28:7 30:23 150:7	hand 4:22	35:21 36:21 40:1
135:10 138:24			handful 55:24	42:22 45:17 47:20
142:7 144:23	198:2 202:1,12 204:16 205:24	150:12,18,21	handle 100:18	49:10 52:2 53:7
		151:3,12 154:1,12	185:12 246:20	
145:11 157:5	207:3,21 210:8	180:9,9	happen 8:17,18	54:24 55:20 57:4
171:4 183:2	211:4,24 212:2	growth 159:5	паррен 0.17,10	57:14 58:17 59:24
			<u> </u>	[

60:6,24 61:7,11	225:14 227:4	hypothetically	167:17 168:2	include 33:9 34:1
61:14,20,21,23	helping 18:2 23:15	75:22	248:15 251:1	34:16 44:3 45:11
62:4,8,11,20 63:2	175:11 191:1,1		imagine 72:24	49:2 51:23 53:14
63:9,15 64:10,13	helps 58:14	I	immediate 3:20	54:21 60:16 61:11
64:24 65:22 66:2	Hepler 192:6	idea 38:21 118:16	immediately 73:1	63:4 64:19 67:14
67:20 68:1,4	hey 23:22 102:4	149:23 162:15	89:4 93:4 233:8	86:5 102:15
69:14 70:4 75:4	108:20	174:24 177:19	impact 11:24 12:2	103:21 118:7
79:11 80:3,20	Hi 192:4	181:8	13:9,11,21 14:4	119:1 123:4 133:9
85:3,6,18 86:18	higher 116:13	identification 44:1	15:6,10,14,17	150:2 160:18,21
95:17 98:5 99:1	highest 26:13,16,20	44:10,13 61:11	16:15 47:1,3,4	164:16 179:1
	32:2,6 55:4 70:8	identified 119:11	49:16,17 50:14	208:2
100:4,24 101:6 106:24 107:15	,	129:11 149:11,12	53:10,21 54:3	included 7:17
	70:14,15,17,24 71:10 74:7 78:19	151:9 175:5 244:9	199:14 211:3	27:21 28:16 34:15
108:3,15 111:2 115:12 118:14		identifies 168:1		34:23 35:14 40:17
	78:20 79:17,24	244:17	impacted 50:17	
120:5,13 123:10	92:10 93:3,5,10	identify 9:6 34:14	impacting 50:21 207:10	48:23 57:7 59:10
124:2 127:10	96:7 114:4 115:7	38:22 44:16 56:17		61:22 120:19
128:18 129:7,19	115:9 118:23	62:7 198:3	impacts 11:10,18	122:17 205:23
129:22 130:1	119:9 137:7	identifying 10:10	35:12,14,20 46:12	209:22
134:2 139:22	138:15	44:4 61:15	46:20 50:2 54:11	includes 106:18
141:2 144:7,11	Hill 192:7	IEP 9:24 186:19	121:4,14 161:4	174:21
148:7,18 151:10	Hills 2:16 173:24	IEPA 2:9,9 4:3	impaired 83:16,18	including 27:9,17
157:10,18 158:5	175:4 182:17,21	36:3 53:6 54:20	163:11	34:20 46:13 49:16
158:11 159:12	historically 41:1		implement 156:16	55:22 57:7 85:24
167:10 168:14	hold 54:23 55:19	56:4,8 61:2	implementation	102:12 120:22
183:9 185:19	holder 32:15 41:20	127:10 128:1	112:2 119:17	124:11 157:8
187:2,9,12 189:9	holders 32:19	173:15 185:11	implemented	173:23 225:20
193:14 196:19	206:13	188:18 196:23	160:10	income 124:16
198:10 213:4,10	holding 144:7	249:6	implementing	incomplete 220:7
227:23 229:3	holds 174:12	IEPA's 9:20 10:5	10:24 92:1 109:4	incorporated
240:16 241:1,5,14	homogenous 180:8	33:6 88:16	import 191:13	102:22 150:22
241:23 243:3	193:3	IERG 2:13 5:18	important 156:19	increase 52:12
245:7 248:7,22	hope 94:12 184:18	148:9,12	importing 41:14	201:6
249:4 250:2 251:9	227:21	IERG's 20:16	impose 232:9	increased 201:12
251:12	hopefully 4:17	202:15	imposed 39:1	201:14
hearings 64:1	hoping 168:12	III 1:7 3:7 26:4 82:8	232:24	Indiana 126:22
169:1	hour 85:9 213:5	Illinois 1:1,12,15	impressed 154:11	indicate 143:22
heated 173:21	household 124:16	3:23 4:19 6:3	improved 55:8	indicated 89:18
held 1:10 249:3,5	Houser 2:16 192:4	12:10 14:5 20:1	improvements	118:9 147:7
Hello 6:1	192:5,15,22 193:1	28:10 30:24 31:14	16:10 201:18	indicates 144:22
help 5:7 19:4 27:1	193:6,9,11,16,23	41:1 52:5 125:5	202:2	individual 11:5,7,9
72:16 108:11	194:2,7,12,15,22	125:13 126:15	in-taking 52:17	21:19 23:5 34:19
131:8	195:6 207:21	127:15 128:5	inability 199:22	34:23 35:15,19
helpful 16:19 32:11	208:13 211:16	134:6,13 148:21	inactivity 57:10	46:22 120:18
87:18 132:13	hypothetical 17:13	154:4 162:18,24	59:11 132:16	121:7 122:23
133:3 143:22	77:7 136:11	163:5 166:22,23	Inaudible 193:13	123:4,15 125:12

	İ	İ	İ	
125:17,18,23	injunction 243:9,11	intervals 131:21	181:13 189:23	K
149:6,9 150:9	input 156:18,24	introduce 6:12	219:22 220:21	K 225:7 227:14,19
151:19 152:21	inserting 128:22	invalid 25:15	223:18,18 242:1	251:3
154:22 173:17	installed 119:15	involved 14:21 19:1	243:15 246:21	Kansas 122:13
174:11 176:15	instance 142:12	21:14 47:13	issuing 9:15	Kathryn 2:13
177:1,12 179:13	144:1 145:4	126:12 168:16		134:5
179:14 180:14,16	147:22 237:21	involves 164:14	J	Katie 2:5 3:18
192:11,17 193:9	239:16	Island 173:23	James 1:13	Keenan 2:6 3:17
193:19 194:1,3,5	instances 183:24	issuance 104:19	Jamye 1:23 251:5	keep 4:6 53:2 58:14
194:10,11,16,20	237:19	136:15 145:18	JCAR 26:9 58:18	69:5,22 72:14
194:21 195:2,7,8	instructing 189:24	issue 11:10,12,24	59:7 128:22	113:24,24 159:12
195:12 205:4	insufficient 65:22	12:2 13:3,12	jeopardized 170:12	174:23 179:18
208:7,8,16	insulated 116:2	15:18 16:6,7 19:9	jeopardy 62:15	183:23 184:1
individually 152:20	integrated 162:24	22:5 27:1 51:3,7	Jerry 2:6 3:17	216:14 225:23
180:18 191:4	163:6,12	51:18 53:20 64:4	join 153:7 169:19	
208:23	intend 8:15 141:14	69:9 75:1,10	206:11 209:14	kept 62:18 167:1 key 116:17
individuals 151:23	149:5 166:18	76:13,18 77:20	joined 149:20	· ·
industrial 19:10	169:9 224:10	93:16 100:19	169:22	kind 35:8 66:7,12
22:4 35:2 38:20	246:18	102:8 104:7 118:7	joining 3:9 152:22	70:5 72:4 87:8
178:6	intended 5:6 30:13	119:19 122:8	153:16 170:10,13	109:21 110:12
industries 180:11	160:9 169:21	135:9,22 138:5,6	211:11	111:11 117:7,11
industry 22:6	232:1 237:13	147:14 153:15	joint 149:2 205:5	120:24 123:18
infinite 235:15	intends 9:24 223:24	168:20 169:10	221:18	127:3 172:6 178:1
236:18	238:12	173:13 179:15	jointly 208:23	186:22 188:16
information 11:4	intent 9:20 10:6	180:12 182:4	Joliet 174:1,1	202:8 242:3,19
33:10 34:18 35:1	28:6 32:18 40:8	185:1 186:22	Josh 2:16 192:4	244:19
44:9 51:15 56:14	62:6 101:9 156:13	188:14 199:8	judge 171:3	kinds 52:7
63:17 72:6,7	157:13,17,21	203:11 206:6	judged 25:15	knew 224:1
74:23 75:19 80:18	168:6 171:2	211:8,9,22 219:5	116:21 117:3	know 4:4,7 5:19
80:19 84:14,18	175:10 185:22	219:5 220:4	judicial 113:15	14:17 16:11 18:3
88:24 96:6 108:2	198:24 204:3	222:22 223:16	181:1 229:10	18:8 19:4 20:14
112:12 114:14	231:17	225:3 229:19	July 24:18 25:4	23:17,20 25:1
120:21,23 122:17	intention 25:5 27:1	231:7 236:1	jump 173:11 231:2	26:24 28:24 34:8
120.21,23 122.17	27:4 33:21 214:4	238:15 241:24	jumped 197:15	37:10 41:8,10
125:3,14,17,19	216:18	242:4,9,16,17,22	jurisdiction 28:14	46:24 51:10 52:24
158:2 191:19	interchangeable	242:24 245:5,18	28:19 29:16 31:11	53:16 62:17 63:16
195:14 212:5,9,10	159:23	issued 92:18 115:18	jurisdictional	63:24 64:3 75:19
220:7 222:18	interested 166:19	141:18 158:13,17	30:22	75:20 77:7,15,22
initial 213:20	247:19	204:12,18 232:19	justification 112:9	78:12,14,23 79:1
217:19 236:10	interim 77:2 119:9	242:8	188:15 189:7	79:13,14 81:15
		issues 13:9 21:16	justified 176:19	84:16 90:5 96:3
237:23 238:1,5 249:10	119:9,12,12,20 203:23 238:2		justifies 212:11	97:17 101:21
		24:23 76:8,9 77:14 107:2 129:9	justify 90:2 94:19	103:1 107:13
initially 213:18	interpret 58:11		95:5 97:24	108:1,2 110:18,20
initiate 162:6 initiated 161:21	168:4	129:9 143:9 150:9	justifying 122:22	116:8 117:11
minateu 101.21	interpretation 87:4	155:15 156:22	J 125011 J 111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	122:12 127:8,18
	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

127:20 128:23	law 66:11 192:5	112:21 130:3,5	93:8 94:1 137:7	221:9 229:23
131:9,11 143:10	238:8 240:3	142:12 148:10	little 17:2,17 37:12	230:16,24 241:19
144:9 150:11	lawsuit 103:10	181:20 182:16,22	37:14,17 38:1,9	looked 35:10 121:3
151:3 170:13,16	lay 116:18	189:23 201:21	61:8 66:13 70:7	121:12,13 172:18
172:19 173:6	laying 120:2 226:1	211:1 214:23	70:22 93:16	looking 54:4 73:9
179:23 184:2	lead 151:12,16	215:18 218:14	173:13 182:8,24	171:6 190:16
189:10 203:9	154:3 223:7	219:17 221:6	183:21 184:9	228:12 229:20
208:1 209:7	learn 78:1	223:19 240:10	199:11 202:13	looks 40:4 66:5,8
210:11,20 219:18	learned 191:10	241:24 248:24	230:18	110:19,21 178:23
222:6,20 223:13	learning 222:2	letters 248:14	Liu 2:5 3:21 9:9	loop 148:4,5 235:15
226:18 235:19	leave 49:4 97:11	letting 184:5 244:8	10:5 26:21 27:7	236:19
236:2,12 241:11	104:17 122:21,23	level 30:13 63:23	27:22 32:13 34:18	lose 222:23 246:6
241:18 244:10	123:24 177:6	71:7 79:13 95:4	44:12 45:21 68:9	247:12
246:6,10 248:18	188:6 243:13	103:8 115:16	120:14 128:3	loses 188:6 217:23
249:13	leaves 148:8	116:12 139:2,19	load 62:19 210:24	losing 214:1 222:21
knowing 217:14	leery 178:5	140:7 164:8 165:1	loading 201:14	lost 32:7 211:19
knowledge 150:22	leeway 183:22	165:17 171:14,15	loadings 45:4	220:7,9
knows 102:17	184:10	171:18 180:20	logic 224:22	lot 18:2 21:15
154:4 166:19	left 3:18,19,20,21	188:15 189:7	long 10:21 57:10	74:24 115:22
188:17	33:15 85:20	202:17,22 239:18	59:11 70:13 71:11	127:10 195:13
	legal 6:7 28:21	liability 116:3	73:12 77:17,20	238:15
L	168:12 225:13,24	liable 116:15	79:6 84:19 90:21	low 15:10 24:11,17
lack 152:4	227:2,5 229:19	LICENSE 1:24	91:17 94:19 98:1	lunch 85:10,10,14
lagoons 38:18	231:11,22 234:3	lies 53:5	103:1 106:18	148:10,16 213:6
laid 134:23 162:8	243:14 247:6	life 200:15	107:10 113:22	
171:12,13 214:10	legally 151:3	limit 43:2 71:21	114:3 115:24	M
225:14 227:8	legislation 223:4	75:8,10 90:6,9	127:6 162:11,15	Mackinaw 52:4,11
238:11	235:17	134:17 218:1	191:6 211:14	52:13,15,17
Lake 7:17,21	legislative 113:15	limited 13:18 18:5	212:23 216:16	Mailbox 249:13
Lakes 8:6	168:6	74:16,16 80:11	226:9 228:14,14	main 191:12,13
language 36:1,5,7	length 50:16,20	81:4,10 115:17	longer 83:16	mainstream 18:22
36:20 37:5,7,15	73:4	165:16	132:23 140:3	80:11
45:12 56:22 57:6	lessons 191:10	limits 88:21	240:22	making 66:5 72:19 96:12 102:13
59:9 60:11,13	let's 5:22 12:5,17	line 3:12 20:17	look 5:19 21:11	112:9 154:7
63:1 65:2,11 66:19 68:12,17	17:8 18:7,12,13	240:14	35:15 37:13,15	157:10 172:24
70:11,23 71:9	18:16,18 19:9	lines 147:6 244:11	38:8 62:12 66:10	175:14 180:18
73:3 82:9 87:16	29:4 51:13 52:6	link 62:9 63:17	69:20 100:12	227:21 230:5
114:1 128:17,20	52:12 71:3,17,23	list 33:2,6,20 64:12	107:11 109:16	231:6
128:24 146:10	72:21 74:14 75:5	64:19 66:23 67:1	123:8 127:14	management 27:15
230:1,22,24	75:22 76:11 77:9	67:5,9,11,14,21	138:3,12 139:8	27:18 31:4,13
235:20,24 237:5	77:13 78:13 79:1	154:17,22 157:9	148:13 162:2	160:15 161:7
large 38:18 165:19	79:7 80:23 83:4	163:1,7,12 249:8 listed 129:13	169:9,10 171:11	map 44:6
lasts 70:20 105:23	84:17 85:6,12 90:7 99:21 108:12		172:11,16,18	March 196:11
late 230:16	108:15 111:10	listing 33:15 175:24 liter 24:16 92:11	176:18 178:20,22 181:1 220:24	197:4
250.10	100.13 111.10	11101 24.10 92.11	101.1 440.44	
	l			l

Marie 1:12 2:3 3:4	41:19 56:4 57:20	83:14,20 84:6	misplaced 67:21	221:18 228:4,18
marked 69:16	58:12 59:7 61:2	172:20 186:2,17	missing 45:23 46:1	228:20 231:8
material 80:10	80:6,23 103:8	Metropolitan 2:15	mistook 240:18	232:7,13,17 233:3
191:22	106:15 110:3	15:3	misunderstanding	247:24
math 97:14	152:20 188:21	Michigan 7:17,22	145:13	motions 157:22
matter 1:5,11 4:1	222:21	126:22	mitigating 124:19	236:6
5:12 166:16	meant 166:14	Midwest 2:14 4:20	mixing 22:3 47:8	move 25:9 57:13
188:18 195:9	measures 115:19	5:18 17:7 148:9	199:23 200:8,17	120:6 134:3 166:9
199:9 200:4	mechanism 32:24	167:12 173:11,15	200:21,23	183:10 188:21
244:16	78:1 166:15,16,20	173:24 177:5,24	Mobil 2:16 182:20	198:5 201:3 213:3
MDV 12:19 13:8	180:7	179:5 181:21,22	192:7 204:19	221:6 223:14
21:21,22,24 23:19	mechanisms 1:6	182:9,21 196:5	205:4 206:17	233:1 245:1
23:23 35:9,11	3:7 29:6	204:16 205:19	207:8,11,16 208:3	movement 109:19
51:13 56:18 122:5	median 124:16	206:9 207:4 208:7	modification	moves 205:9
122:13,22 144:4	meet 15:9 31:4	208:15 213:11	130:20 143:21	232:22
150:14 152:17	35:18 46:6 47:8	215:18 216:2,3,9	145:3 210:18	moving 26:12
171:10 172:18	50:18 78:10 82:17	216:21 217:5	modifications	58:23 60:23 169:4
174:9 176:14	84:7 87:24 88:16	milestones 90:18	140:24	169:16 175:17
178:4,6,11 179:8	89:4,20,23 90:5,9	milligram 93:8	modified 136:4	176:20 199:3
179:12,14 180:17	93:4 105:9 109:12	94:1,4	220:10 235:5	202:11 203:16
180:22 181:2,3,5	112:3 115:7,9	milligrams 92:11	modifies 235:3	204:15 205:16
181:5 183:8	121:12 124:10,14	98:19 106:14	modify 64:9 91:22	206:3,16 208:18
186:15 191:5	126:13 137:11	137:7	139:9 140:1 141:3	multi-discharger
192:12,19 193:2,6	181:3 205:14	mind 4:6 9:3 17:22	142:9,9,10 147:1	22:1,7 34:24
194:1,11,13 195:4	206:14 208:12	62:19 69:22 158:2	147:18 209:14,16	38:14,16 43:7,16
196:5 205:10	217:20 233:12	179:23 183:23	211:11 221:13,16	120:20 124:6
208:5 210:23	meeting 36:9 74:4	184:1 189:19	222:11 231:18	125:7 126:4
MDVs 11:23 35:9	137:12 157:11	196:14	234:19 235:12	169:17,24 170:22
123:2 180:5,8	meetings 168:17	mindful 153:20	236:6,10 237:2	173:18 174:19,22
196:15	meets 11:7	154:6	243:20 247:2,4,14	175:7 177:2
mean 11:17,18	member 2:3,4,4,5,6	minimization 44:22	modifying 88:1	182:23 183:4
21:21 29:3 50:10	3:11,15,17 5:6	45:2 91:14 115:19	140:14 141:19,24	208:21 209:11,13
50:13 56:15 57:18	members 3:13	116:1,24 119:17	143:17 236:23	210:12 211:24
58:19 61:4 65:14	149:18 249:7	159:15,17,18,19	moment 50:22	212:3 233:22
66:23 69:19 78:9	mention 35:8 42:17	160:2,9,14,18	139:6 249:1	234:6
123:15 132:9	47:17 59:20 86:16	161:7	moments 176:4	multi-dischargers
139:23,24 152:1	87:8 102:4 144:15	minimum 60:15,19	177:18	198:7 212:11
159:9 167:4 176:2	mentioned 14:9	Minnesota 127:13	money 78:15	multiple 10:20 20:5
180:3 187:14	94:23 120:23	127:24	Montana 127:19	20:8 192:10,16,20
196:13 210:1,3	166:13 182:19	minor 244:16	months 13:5 16:13	multiple-dischar
236:1 246:16	207:22 210:5	minus 185:3	17:23 161:22	126:19
meaning 38:12	227:14	minute 76:12,13	morning 3:2 7:10	municipal 19:12
meaningful 16:9	mentioning 28:16	98:6 135:6 211:21	9:9 166:12	22:3
18:20 156:17	mercury 126:22	minutes 85:13	Morton 2:15 22:24	ът
means 16:7 18:4	met 30:20 81:1	misheard 240:18	motion 170:6,6	N

N 2:1	112:8,20 113:1	80:11 100:7 107:3	62:4,20 63:3,5,15	objective 14:19
name 3:4 4:24 6:15	114:3,5 119:20	126:19 143:21	64:13,14,18,20	31:17 94:20 95:23
6:18 19:23 41:19	120:20 124:24	155:14 167:4	65:22 95:9,11,13	106:20 110:16
41:20 44:4 166:15	132:8 133:12	179:20 181:9,10	157:9	137:20 141:10,13
167:5 192:4	144:11 146:3,13	181:10 199:24	noticed 184:10	157:20 141:10,15
named 206:8 208:1	146:24 149:16,24	201:11,20 202:4	notices 64:17	objects 129:14
209:13	152:11 153:18	218:16,17,22	notification 63:23	obligation 53:1,5,5
narrative 118:11	162:9 169:1 170:6	219:1,10,18,19,19	notified 130:17	obligations 212:8
158:13,17 159:3,7	170:11 171:9,10	219:20,23 222:18	131:9	obtain 213:16
159:10	174:10,11 180:21	222:18 225:23	notify 55:9 64:11	237:1
narrow 45:7 77:14	181:5 191:10	230:7	notion 5:9	obviously 170:23
nation 122:10	202:2,4 203:10,11	newly 89:22 91:3	notorious 4:4	245:11
national 63:23	205:4,8 209:7,18	166:2 213:14	November 249:8	occur 125:6 174:18
nature 18:10 43:21	210:9,23 211:10	newspaper 62:17	novo 231:19 232:1	occurred 125:9
46:5 97:15 167:15	212:5,17,24	62:22 63:6 64:15	NPDES 22:13,18	occurs 134:24
168:12 169:7	220:19 221:1,11	newspapers 64:21	28:3,15 32:15,19	141:22 142:2
necessarily 21:1	221:11 241:21	non 10:3 13:2,7,16	88:2,21 89:10	October 1:2,15
32:24 118:10	245:20 247:9	16:9 21:16 28:8	93:23 95:9 98:23	offering 131:4
123:20 144:3,12	needed 9:1 35:3	28:15,19 29:9,23	99:15,24 100:11	office 134:7 249:16
152:1,6	73:5 87:23 90:8	30:10,14,24 31:11	101:5 102:22	Officer 1:11 2:3 3:1
necessary 29:8 40:8	147:5 152:9	31:14,17,22	104:4,18 105:5	3:5 6:11,20,23 7:6
55:5 57:3,9 59:5	165:10 210:16	114:18 155:19	110:5 111:3,5	8:12,21 11:16
70:13 77:17,20	220:3 246:8	160:19 178:20,22	112:19 135:22	15:1 21:23 22:22
79:6 86:10 107:10	needle 109:19	178:23 203:6,7	136:3 138:3 142:6	25:8,23 26:7
153:9 154:9	needs 15:18 39:10	232:21	200:18	28:12 30:16 31:24
214:11	39:13 46:22 47:8	Non-101 27:7	number 72:1 75:23	32:4,8 33:11
need 5:13,19 8:23	51:6,18 62:18	non-101(a)(2)	89:20 90:7 102:19	35:21 36:21 40:1
9:4 12:14 13:14	63:2 72:11 77:18	68:15 69:2	105:16,23 106:11	42:22 45:17 47:20
14:15 16:10 21:2	83:5 94:19 97:3	non-adjudicatory	107:12 108:13	49:10 52:2 53:7
23:23 31:23 34:24	97:20 100:3	167:20 168:5,21	112:8 115:23	57:4,14 58:17
37:13,24 38:2,4	102:17 118:7,16	169:1 183:21	118:4,5,8,10	59:24 61:7,20
38:22 39:23 41:9	125:24 133:8	197:23 198:18	137:23 138:7	62:8,11 63:9
41:10 51:24 53:21	135:13 146:20	199:1	210:7 218:2	64:10,24 66:2
54:2,10 55:13,19	147:8 153:1 162:1	noncompliance	numbers 117:14	67:20 68:1,4
55:20 64:3 71:24	165:18 166:8	138:5,7 155:22	numeric 158:21	69:14 70:4 75:4
73:2 75:14 76:14	199:5 210:18	note 5:5 7:22,23 8:1	nutrient 52:18	79:11 80:20 85:3
80:7,23 82:16	212:15,21 221:18	8:2,3,9,22 10:13	nutrients 17:23,24	85:6,18 86:18
83:5 84:17,19,20	223:19 246:17,18	26:8 148:24	52:8,15,21 151:10	98:5 99:1 100:4
85:10 88:10 89:21	negotiations	151:20 169:18		100:24 101:6
90:6,19 91:5,9,22	235:20	183:12,17	0	106:24 107:15
91:22 93:11,13,24	neither 204:20	notes 169:19 216:6	O 251:3,3	108:3,15 111:2
95:4,5 97:16,23	never 30:14 74:14	240:18 242:15	oath 251:6	115:12 118:14
98:1 101:10,14,24	82:3 200:16,17	251:10	object 120:9 182:1	120:5,13 123:10
102:5,7 106:10	new 1:7 3:3,7 32:14	notice 26:10 55:6	objection 5:16	124:2 128:18
107:12 110:2	32:19,19 79:24	61:11,14,21,23	120:10	129:7,19,22 130:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				2
134:2 139:22	open 55:10 122:21	138:4 141:18,23	P 2:1,1	3:18 112:1,10
141:2 148:7,18	122:23 123:24	142:21 143:16	P-A-L-U-M-B-O	130:3,13,17 131:3
158:5 159:12	143:1 157:1	144:23 145:16,19	19:24	131:7 133:22
167:10 183:9	174:12 190:2	149:13 150:3	P-A-M-E-N-T-E-R	134:1 139:18
185:19 187:2,9,12	opened 239:23	154:19,19 162:8	134:6	140:7 142:11,18
189:9 193:14	opening 5:23 7:3	173:20 174:5	p.m 250:4	143:3,14 189:18
196:19 213:4,10	operate 187:21	175:3,14,20	package 24:6 25:2	189:21 190:6,11
227:23 229:3	opinion 67:5 85:22	176:12 177:5	41:7 96:17 105:2	191:15,23 192:3
240:16 241:1,5,14	86:2 100:20	181:13 184:20	105:3 109:17	paragraph 92:5
241:23 248:7,22	112:17 135:10	189:23 190:19	122:18 147:19,21	225:6
249:4 250:2	136:16 144:22	203:21,22,23	packet 184:19	parallel 45:10
officer's 243:3	145:16 238:14	204:4,11,18 205:6	Page 86:11	parallels 96:5
oh 18:13 80:9	opportunities	205:18 206:8,17	Palmubo 19:24	parameter 46:24
Ohio 126:22	213:16 214:4	207:24 208:14	Palumbo 2:13	47:6 165:15
okay 7:6 8:14 12:4	217:15 224:9,11	211:13 216:2,6	19:23 20:16 21:7	paren 89:8,8
13:23 17:12,24	opportunity 30:1	211.13 210.2,0	22:8,21 30:17,18	part 1:8 3:7 7:20
18:15 19:22 20:19	32:21 37:8 85:7	232:7 233:1,14,24	31:10 32:11 54:9	19:21 21:2 25:17
25:19,23 26:5	122:24 123:24	236:4 242:8	82:10,24 83:8,14	29:12,23 30:13
41:8 53:7 56:23	156:17 215:6	245:14	84:2,11 85:1,3,5	33:24 45:11 48:5
60:22 63:15,20,24	217:18 225:16	ordinarily 183:13	101:8 126:3,10,14	51:9,10 56:24
64:7 65:3,24	228:17 237:1,15	original 34:11 81:4	148:23 149:15,24	58:1 66:3 75:1
66:19 74:2 77:19	238:4 242:18	96:22 111:15,20	150:5,11,16,21	82:22 92:23 93:18
83:8 84:2,9,11	243:5,7	121:13 133:6,19	151:2,8,18 152:4	95:18,20 101:4
85:2 91:7 97:23	opposed 213:14	140:20 146:24	153:24 154:14	110:4 111:3 112:1
98:4,12,19 101:23	217:16 236:22	140.20 140.24	155:3 156:7 157:2	110:4 111:3 112:1
105:22 106:6	248:4	originally 33:22	157:12,16,20	132:20 147:6
116:6 118:1 125:5	optimistic 239:1	53:18 131:23	158:1,9,20 159:2	149:6,10 154:23
126:10 129:22	option 81:3 144:7	189:11	159:14,22 160:1,5	159:18 165:19
149:15 159:22	164:3 174:8,13	ought 123:4 247:19	160:13 161:1,11	167:19 169:6,14
160:1,7 161:11	optional 102:14	outlined 97:21	161:17 162:5,10	176:21 180:21
169:3 181:1	options 12:19	124:20	162:16,22 163:3	187:18 196:1,5
186:21 189:22	142:20 143:1	outlines 23:3	163:13 164:5	204:23 227:9,19
192:3 194:22	175:24 179:9,11	140:23	165:23 166:10	232:10 234:14
202:5 203:15,16	order 13:13 34:15	outside 117:8	167:2,8 239:11,16	241:21
224:21 226:22	35:16 57:1,15,23	overall 35:19 41:11	239:20 240:8	participant 156:10
232:5 244:24	58:5 67:5 85:23	overlap 115:1	248:10	157:4,13,17,21
old 166:22	86:3 90:8 93:18	overlaps 20:4	Pamenter 2:13	158:3 206:6,9,14
old-fashioned	93:20,24 95:18	overly 45:1,6	134:5,5,20 135:7	232:22
249:14	97:24 98:11,14,16	131:10	136:7 137:2,15	participants 4:16
once 24:24 59:8,10	98:23,24 100:14	oversight 7:19	138:6,20 141:15	157:6 203:9
83:14 99:19 136:3	105:20,22 109:15	overtime 73:10,11	143:15 144:17,19	210:11
140:2 214:21	111:15 113:20	overview 98:20	145:8 147:4,13,22	participate 21:6
225:22 238:13	124:11 125:9	owned 192:21	148:1,5 227:24	22:16 157:7 205:8
ones 54:6 138:16	129:10 135:10,12		228:12 229:2	205:20
online 64:6	135:20 136:16,21	P	Papadimitriu 2:5	participated
				r
L	•	•	•	

248:13	people's 105:6	36:23 97:18,22	215:8,16 216:5,10	141:11 152:6
participating 202:3	percent 124:15,17	102:14 113:17,21	216:13,21 217:7	155:9 158:8
248:19	124:18,18 138:14	144:8 152:10	217:12,13,20	178:10 180:1
participation 157:1	200:9,10,22,23	156:10 157:3,7	218:4,6,14,16,18	191:1 203:6,7
190:18 202:12,17	perfect 13:3 16:13	229:5 233:6,14,16	218:21 219:9,20	206:13 208:22
202:22 247:16	perform 55:3	personally 127:19	220:1,6,17 221:9	209:19 210:12
248:16	period 9:2 70:19	persons 27:24 28:4	221:13 223:17	218:15 219:11
particular 14:10	71:8 81:20 107:17	28:11 66:23 67:5	225:16,21,23	221:24 224:3,8,11
28:6 36:5 49:24	115:7,9 128:11	67:14 149:2 205:1	226:7,7,14,17	225:15 228:19
62:23 71:4 91:16	130:23 132:23	perspective 34:6	229:6,8,9,12,17	233:22
115:14 116:12	133:2 137:17	96:21 97:10 102:2	230:13 231:18	petitions 40:20
117:15 135:8	165:16 220:2	165:24 198:17	232:18 233:13,23	151:19,21 152:7
157:9 168:20	225:19 228:9	222:6	234:19 235:12	153:7,16 155:4,5
172:1 199:8	241:15 247:1,22	Pertaining 9:9	236:10 237:2	155:6,10,11 156:4
220:23	247:24 248:1	petition 22:9 23:4	243:20 247:2,4,14	168:2 169:20,23
particularly 222:15	periods 57:10	28:7 32:21 34:11	petition's 231:5	169:24 170:10,13
parties 156:8 158:7	59:11	34:11,21 36:23	petitioner 23:14,21	170:14 172:5,7
169:20,22 183:16	permissible 83:7,9	39:8 40:5 41:20	24:1 45:1 47:13	174:19 175:6
203:5,8 221:7	90:11	43:1 44:3,16	47:16 51:18,19	193:17 194:20
party 130:7 170:6	permit 22:13,18	46:14,15 51:21	54:10 57:17 60:4	195:3,8,13,15
192:21 205:21	32:15,15,19 86:6	62:4 66:4 67:7	69:5 70:11 84:5	212:1 217:11
217:10,11 220:5	86:12 88:2,5,11	86:1 95:20 96:12	84:13,23 86:4	222:15 226:8,16
220:16 232:6,16	89:7,10 92:13	101:11 102:13,20	87:16 101:9,14	246:12
pass 219:23	93:23 98:24 99:16	103:22 110:24	102:17 103:21	phase 72:14
passed 127:18	100:24 101:5	111:20 125:23	114:2,8 132:1,2	phosphorus 35:11
path 181:22	102:23 104:4,18	131:16 132:1,8	132:16,19 133:4	121:3,22 124:6
pattern 73:10	105:6 109:23	133:5,18 140:1	133:17 143:2	phrase 38:12 45:23
pay 186:8	111:3,5 112:19	142:9,10 149:2,4	155:21 161:5	46:1 59:3,4
PCB 53:6 173:14	114:10 117:1	149:12,19 152:3	162:7,13 166:8	236:19
183:18 204:17	130:16,20,21,23	152:20,22 153:6	170:19,23 171:7	physically 77:10
PCP 175:3,5	135:22 136:4,6	155:17,22,23	174:8 176:12	pick 174:13
pending 142:15	138:3 142:6	156:1 160:4	179:16 180:3	place 41:6,16 92:14
155:4,9 173:11	200:18 206:13	165:24 170:22	185:18 186:24	223:9 227:17
177:5 182:18	232:19	171:6 175:7,8	187:3 207:14	placed 22:19
190:8,13 204:16	permits 4:9 88:22	176:17,17 177:4,8	214:5 216:20	places 69:16 210:7
208:15 215:18	95:9 99:24 100:22	177:11,12 187:3,4	217:18,22 218:15	placing 169:4
234:17	232:19	187:10 188:1,2	221:18 223:24	Plaines 14:4 15:11
people 4:5 38:1	permittee 34:23	193:18 198:6	228:4 232:6,22	24:11,17
41:7 64:12,18	89:4,9 137:6,9	204:20 205:1,5,5	237:14 247:17	plan 96:1 111:3
67:11 99:10	165:15	205:9,9,10 206:11	petitioner's 46:3,7	159:17,18 160:18
138:18 148:2	permittees 28:3,15	207:15 208:5,15	123:13 173:8	161:13 162:9
152:7 153:2 181:8	120:19	209:14,16 211:11	petitioners 23:4	192:24,24,24
190:23 196:2	permitting 89:6	212:3 213:14,15	27:2 33:22,23	plans 44:22 45:2,8
210:16 222:1	94:17 95:1 101:22	213:18,19,20	41:17 53:6 67:6	192:23 193:3
223:6 249:7	person 25:15 31:2	214:5,13,21 215:3	82:16 126:3	plant 178:8
		, , ,	_	•
	-	-	-	-

				- 5 -
119:21 141:14	136:19 141:3,7	171:24 180:2	118:2	165:21
please 4:24 5:2,5	153:19 155:18	217:4	prefer 8:7	problematic 152:12
7:5,14 9:13 10:7	160:19,20 161:22	Possibly 127:6	preferable 104:6	problems 36:19
24:14 26:15 27:9	178:20,22,23	post 197:7 224:1	194:17	47:22 71:7
27:17 28:1 32:14	186:14 187:5,10	post-hearing 245:8	preference 64:5	procedural 87:9
33:5 34:20 38:7	187:18 189:6	post-rules 224:8	143:4	134:8 167:15
41:18 43:4,11,13	191:3 202:20	potential 43:6,15	preliminary 124:15	211:9 225:10
44:2,15 45:22	208:21 211:19	197:3 206:12	245:5,15	procedure 48:6
46:13 49:21 54:20	221:8 223:5	potentially 28:16	prepared 153:13	107:22 142:1
56:4,10 57:2 59:4	226:12 230:4	43:7,17 62:21	prescribe 206:20	143:19 145:1
59:14 60:10 66:14	238:18 239:24	102:23 105:12	presence 33:6	Procedures 27:23
66:22 68:11 85:24	241:2 246:9	161:4 182:19	present 2:8,12 3:13	proceed 158:21
120:16 128:4	pointed 93:6 114:1	198:7 205:13	46:5 223:20	191:7 225:8
138:21 146:14	points 82:1	207:10 212:18	presented 81:13	232:14
184:1 189:13	pollutant 14:11	potentially-affect	153:10	proceeding 3:6
192:14 230:24	17:9,11,12,14	206:18	presiding 2:4 3:10	14:11 20:24 21:2
	35:4 45:4 71:4	POTW 193:4		
plenty 238:22 plus 138:17 185:3	91:14 92:8 119:11		Presumably 200:10	22:11,17 57:12 93:9 151:6 156:9
_		power 169:19,21 178:8	pretty 71:19 184:3 196:13	
PMP 91:8,9 97:20	119:13,14,17	- , - , -		157:4,9,23 168:3
105:17,19 106:11	159:15,17,18,19	practicable 59:3	prevent 204:8	168:7,9,21,22
106:17,22 109:4	160:2,8,14,17	Practice 161:8	233:24 234:18	169:5,8 170:18
110:1 111:19	161:2,7 186:22	practices 27:16,18	preventing 199:24	173:12 175:6,15
112:7 137:18,19	192:10,16 194:24	31:4,13 160:15	prevents 22:14	175:19 177:1,5,21
137:20 138:2,2,13	199:8	pre-filed 3:24 4:8	previous 26:23	177:24 182:18
138:13,16,17,17	pollutants 12:9	4:11,18 5:12,16	41:5 72:11 82:24	183:21 190:8,13
160:8	151:9 154:8	5:17 20:16 27:12	previously 141:19	191:20 197:23
PMPs 45:15 97:24	160:24	148:8	141:24 143:17	198:19 199:1
106:22 110:1	pollution 1:1,12	preamble 86:8,19	169:23 226:19	203:8 204:10,17
111:17 138:9	13:3 16:8 18:10	86:20 88:12,13	primary 23:13,21	205:19 206:9,10
160:21	18:24,24 21:12,13	89:1 93:1 94:2,16	170:17	208:21 209:11
point 6:6 10:3	28:8 44:21 45:2	146:18 147:3	principle 54:15	210:12 211:24
12:16 13:2,2,6,7	126:8 160:19,20	156:14	prior 149:13 160:3	215:18 248:6
13:16,16 16:8,9	176:8 178:20,22	preceding 163:21	166:4 208:24	proceedings 1:10
18:17,21 21:16	178:24	precisely 74:18	209:4 211:12	20:9 166:3 167:16
28:8,19 29:9,23	Pool 173:23	81:17	215:17	167:20,22,24
30:4,10,14,24	pose 203:4	precluded 228:20	priorities 55:18,23	172:23 174:14
31:11,14,17,21,22	position 87:22	precludes 228:4	private 35:2 100:10	195:16,17 197:19
34:16 35:18 60:2	88:15,16 116:22	229:1	probably 57:16,24	250:3,6 251:8,11
69:15 74:13,15	177:15 202:16	preconceived 5:8	69:6 130:19 131:6	proceeds 199:10
75:19 79:23 80:22	207:13	predate 197:5	149:22 150:2,16	200:4 245:9
81:1,2 82:2 92:24	possibility 122:21	predecessors 39:9	182:2 198:3	process 11:14
100:6 101:22	189:14 240:15	39:11	221:10	15:21,22 23:3,15
102:21 106:3	possible 103:20	predicting 116:8	problem 18:4 29:12	35:9 40:10 41:12
112:18 114:18,18	130:20 134:19	prediction 96:2	70:23 73:22	47:14 55:14 116:2
115:15 118:16	145:14 149:2	predictions 117:7	104:11,13,16	117:13 121:1

107.7.122.17	20.22	. 12.22	102 11 102 16	46 16 10 21 40 12
127:7 132:17	propose 39:23	provides 13:22	102:11 103:16	46:16,18,21 48:13 48:15,19 49:4,6
135:11 140:4	56:22 65:2 82:8	56:24 125:18	135:23 136:1,20	, ,
141:12 144:3,13	86:4 126:5 128:17	141:17 164:13	137:16 140:10,11	50:12,18,24 51:2
147:23 148:2	201:19 203:20	167:18,21 204:22	150:14 166:7	52:16,19,23 54:5
158:20 161:18,21	proposed 1:7 3:7	providing 26:15	190:15 210:22	54:13,14,19,21
162:6,17 166:22	7:15 8:8 9:18,20	30:1 33:5 120:16	239:21 240:7	55:11,21 56:6,17
166:23 171:12	17:4 22:12 26:17	217:17	pursuant 87:17	56:20 59:22,23
180:2 181:12	27:19 28:2 34:22	provision 25:13,14	97:24 232:12	68:13 70:12,21
185:24 190:24	35:7 36:8,20	35:22 56:10 86:13	240:9	71:4,14 73:13,23
197:12 212:19	41:24 42:4,9,14	86:17 87:1,6,14	pursue 173:13	74:4 75:10,23
226:16 227:7	44:18,24 45:9	88:6,11,18,21	181:23	78:8 79:16 82:4
238:11,19 246:5,8	57:16 60:11,12,13	89:2 94:21 140:11	pursued 170:19	82:15,18,22 83:23
prod 178:16	65:3 66:19 68:15	223:9 224:14	put 12:9 33:21 41:6	86:7 87:24 88:7
product 160:23	86:1 102:11,15	225:6 228:3,16	61:13 76:11 98:6	89:1,23,24 91:4
professional	103:21,24 104:7	240:2,4 241:3	99:24 102:19	91:11 92:8,9,16
249:20	125:8 126:5 128:3	242:19 244:2,6	113:10 117:21	93:8 94:5 96:3,10
program 91:14	128:20 134:17	247:10	124:13 126:9	96:19,19 99:2,4,9
115:19 116:1	163:18 168:18	provisions 9:14	127:9 130:16	99:12,13,14,18,20
117:1 119:18	175:18 197:20	25:17 34:21 40:16	133:12 142:5	100:8,13,17 101:2
159:19 160:2,9,15	204:3,8 206:7,20	41:15 66:11 86:1	152:3 157:14	101:3 107:2,3,16
161:7,14,14	208:20 209:12	113:7 120:17	178:5 184:18	107:19,21 108:5
Programs 159:16	213:12 215:1,2	181:17 228:2	198:19 212:6	108:10,18,24
progress 13:15,15	217:10 227:6	public 35:1 55:20	235:4 238:18	109:2 112:24
14:20,21 18:20	231:4 232:2,3	65:21,22 95:9,11	250:1	113:17 114:24
19:5 76:6 110:12	234:9 236:23	95:13 156:17,22	putting 62:14 98:23	115:17 116:18
166:4	242:4	156:24 157:10	100:21 117:20	118:17 119:1,4,5
progressive 78:3	proposing 68:11	166:18,19 179:22		119:7,16,21
prohibit 10:15	235:10	190:17 202:11,17	Q	121:22 122:4
158:19 159:4	prospect 185:10	202:22 203:9	QBEL 88:21	128:14 131:1
247:1	protect 49:5	242:5 247:16	qualify 124:11	132:6,11 133:7,11
project 6:24	protected 72:23	publication 62:17	qualitative 118:11	133:19 134:14
projects 32:20	protection 3:24	publish 62:3,22	quality 7:16,21	135:2,16,19 136:1
prompt 57:1,3,7,9	20:21 21:3 104:24	64:14 241:11	9:16,19 10:1,9	136:5,10,17 137:5
57:18,20 58:11,16	145:9,17 162:19	242:14	12:10 16:2 19:7	138:8,24 139:3,10
58:19 148:19	167:18	published 63:6	19:16 20:5,13,21	139:12 140:4,24
187:5,6 188:20	prove 114:8 121:8	241:12	20:22 21:4,9,19	141:20 142:1,4
proof 23:18,20 39:4	proved 125:11	pulled 212:19	22:10,19,20 24:10	143:18 149:20
39:6 67:18,22,24	provide 44:8 45:18	purpose 3:22 7:11	28:22 29:17 30:19	151:13 152:8
68:7,10,13,20,21	67:8 86:21 89:7	48:17 88:4 91:13	32:16,22,23 33:1	155:1,6,10 156:19
68:23 69:5,11,22	93:23 95:19 103:6	156:14,15 170:15	33:3,8,17 34:1,3,7	156:20 158:12,13
78:17 96:15	149:16 156:17	197:24 201:17	35:3 36:12,24	158:16,17,22
163:16,17 180:13	215:6	purposeful 243:21	37:1 38:24 40:9	159:4 160:11
194:5,9 211:8	provided 11:3 26:3	purposes 17:16	40:19 41:8 42:19	161:19,24 162:23
proper 71:5 97:13	67:1 153:14	86:15 87:11 91:12	42:21 43:2,16,19	162:24 163:4,6,9
proposal 20:12	156:13 158:3	91:20 94:11 99:23	44:14,17 46:6,8	163:19,22 164:4,9

164:19,21,23	131:22 132:18	167:8 168:11	54:18 69:3,10	reasonableness
165:2,6,11,14,19	134:10 135:8	170:16 178:19	85:22 86:21 87:5	244:5
165:21 166:1,3,5	136:8 142:17	184:11 197:16	87:18 95:16,24	reasons 226:20
166:13 167:3,4,7	144:20,24 151:1,7	198:16 202:15	98:4 122:16 123:6	reassurance 189:10
173:19 183:19	154:20 155:3	203:14 227:2	133:13	recall 244:23
184:7 185:17	156:7 157:18	229:19 231:11	reach 65:18 73:13	receive 14:18 21:2
189:15 192:11,18	158:9 159:14	247:6 248:5,23	81:19 114:3	34:2 205:6 235:12
193:19 195:2	161:17 162:16	249:18,20	178:15 221:20	received 4:7,8 58:2
200:1,12 204:24	163:13,23,24	quick 40:3 207:22	read 5:20 26:2 32:9	receiving 19:8
205:2 208:6	164:1 165:23	quickly 122:1	41:7 42:20 46:4	200:9,11
224:16 225:9	166:11 167:15	247:20	60:14 69:17 70:10	Reclamation 15:3
240:20,21 242:11	168:13 169:17	quite 60:14	88:12,14 92:6	recognizes 165:9
248:16	173:11,14 177:16	quote 89:4 167:19	183:6 196:13	recognizing 73:11
quasi 113:15	184:13,24 185:6	167:22,24 168:1	223:6 229:5,13	73:12
question 4:21 7:12	185:20,21 186:7	204:23 206:18,19	231:1	recommend 196:24
8:16 9:11,17 10:5	187:23 191:15	206:22,22 233:6	readily 80:18 236:4	recommendation
15:5 16:23 20:3	192:14 194:6	quotes 156:15	reading 60:15 86:8	21:8 56:9 60:7,9
20:17 23:6 24:14	196:12,22 197:15		86:19 94:16	60:16,17,19,21
25:11,24 26:21	197:17 199:4	R	225:13,24	67:2,13 123:12
27:7,15,23 28:1	200:3 202:12	R 1:13 2:1	reads 61:9,24 227:6	128:6 143:13
30:23 32:13 33:2	203:2,4,17,19	R18-18 1:6	227:6	150:4 176:10
35:21 36:2 37:6	204:7 206:1,24	Rabczak 2:6 3:19	ready 25:9 85:20	179:7 185:5,13
39:8,24 40:7,15	207:14,19 208:19	19:18 39:7,16,20	103:15 120:6	186:5 190:5
41:22 42:3,8,13	209:3,9 211:22	39:24 41:18,22	226:18	195:24 219:5,22
43:4,24 44:12,21	213:3,10 219:16	42:3,8,13 43:4,13	real 40:8 179:15	recommendations
44:23 45:7,21	222:15 224:24	43:23 56:2,23	189:14 200:15	128:9,16 173:1
46:11 49:21 50:6	226:3,23 228:1	58:23 59:13 60:8	207:21 222:22	184:16 221:16
50:9 51:23 54:18	231:3,14,22 232:5	60:22 65:1,13	realize 51:20	recommending
56:2,23 59:2,5,13	233:5,21 234:3,5	66:17,21 131:14	really 6:5 17:1,16	143:12
60:8,23 61:1,10	234:16,24 241:6	131:22 132:13	18:23 19:4 24:2	reconcile 98:17
62:1,14 65:4	243:4 246:22,23	133:3,16 138:21	37:13 62:2 88:9	reconsider 58:5
66:17,21 67:20	248:11	139:14 140:13	88:10 96:11	210:8 232:7,13,17
68:7,9 69:18 70:3	questioned 164:7	195:23 196:16,22	115:22 176:2	233:4 247:22
73:24 77:6 78:12	questioning 20:18	raise 4:22 20:18	177:14 180:17	248:2
78:23 83:11,12	127:24	146:8	185:7 190:24	reconsiders 156:4
84:10,24 85:21,23	questions 4:1,2,6	raised 58:10 156:22	191:12,13 210:15	232:22
88:9 92:23 95:22	4:12,14,15,17,18	raising 29:1	219:9 223:1,16,18	record 5:5,7,12,13
98:7 99:5 103:2,4	5:1,4,5,10,17,21	Randolph 1:14	226:2,12 247:9,21	5:15 19:21 26:8
103:4,14 107:1	6:7 7:3,4,9 8:22	rank 125:21	248:2	57:5 66:5,9,10
108:12 112:20	14:14 25:10 27:13	Rao 2:3 3:21 7:10	reason 33:21	85:19 88:14 150:6
115:13 116:10,23	49:12 65:1 67:17	8:1,7,11 14:8	103:20 144:5	183:11 184:2,12
117:23 120:7,14	67:21 82:11 85:12	26:12 27:6,14	166:24 187:19	193:15,15 196:8
123:11,19 124:8	120:2 128:21	33:2 43:24 44:11	210:3 229:22	248:24 249:3,5
125:16,20 127:9	130:2 134:4,9	44:21 45:7 46:11	reasonable 109:18	recourse 58:3
127:15 129:13	148:9,13,21,24	47:12,19 51:9	246:19,19	rectifiable 236:4
			<u> </u>	
	-	-	-	-

	1	1	1	ī
reduce 92:1 160:23	193:4	relation 155:4	reporter 5:4 43:10	246:24
reduction 45:3	reflect 119:13	relatively 130:5	251:6,16	requiring 45:1
119:13	156:21 197:7	144:10	represent 5:1	114:12
reductions 138:14	reflected 123:7	relevant 40:21 41:5	represented 151:4	resolve 244:9
redundant 66:14	150:1	45:15 127:3	representing 17:7	resolved 143:9
reevaluate 79:23	regard 11:1 70:8	156:22 167:19	request 4:15 102:7	232:13
131:21 162:15	168:17	195:14 204:23	107:9 143:2	resource 31:13
reevaluated 132:24	regarding 87:7	240:7	241:20	resources 2:17
reevaluates 156:4	134:14 232:15	relief 1:6 3:6 11:15	requested 45:15	55:23 165:12
reevaluating	245:22	32:24 45:15 51:14	103:23 171:6	182:17 192:7
128:13	regardless 20:14	96:18 153:21,21	204:5	respect 45:23 62:16
reevaluation 55:4	206:10 214:15	162:20 166:8,14	requesting 53:18	134:20 135:12
55:13 72:9 77:24	Region 179:21	166:16,20,24	232:8	136:8 197:6 198:5
77:24 79:9 80:9	register 121:18	173:17 174:9,9	require 20:8 71:7	198:6 199:12
80:21 81:20	241:12	175:10,24 176:18	114:8 115:2	211:9
109:11 110:16	registry 242:15	176:19 199:15	124:24 165:12	respects 215:5
120:15,17 128:4,9	regulate 28:22,23	200:18 204:5	209:12 225:3	respond 3:24 4:2
128:12 131:15,19	29:19	207:5,6,9	required 31:7	84:10 168:13
131:19 132:5,9,10	regulated 30:24	remain 89:9	46:10 55:1 66:9	169:11 188:2
132:17 133:1,5,18	166:18	remains 103:4	69:17 100:23	189:24 222:10
135:5 140:18	regulating 29:3	remarks 157:10	101:15 110:11	237:15 238:5
144:21,22 145:6	regulation 10:18	remember 6:24	112:6,22 128:5	247:6
145:12,16 146:6	46:9 94:23 96:24	243:24 244:22	138:18 164:8,10	responded 191:16
146:17,19,19	130:16 202:19	remove 12:2 60:20	165:1,5 168:24	response 10:17,19
147:19 161:18	regulations 10:14	144:8 153:17	185:4 188:16	26:23 55:16 56:8
162:9	10:24 26:18 31:3	removed 129:4	189:7 201:21	60:9 61:19 67:1
reevaluations	39:12,14 40:6,9	removes 65:4	202:17,19 219:1	102:3 113:13
128:10	40:11,13,17 41:15	removing 65:9	223:1 224:2	129:18 137:22
refer 5:17 56:11	46:9 55:2,16 75:3	165:13 211:3	requirement 31:1	173:16 178:1
235:21	87:1 125:8 144:15	renewed 10:21	44:24 46:14 51:24	202:15 224:23
reference 39:21	158:19 188:11	130:8	93:2 96:1,2 117:1	227:15 245:17
45:14 59:12 64:21	200:22 202:23	renewing 88:1	145:23 146:4,5	249:9
89:11 130:24	204:8 219:1	reopen 139:8	156:16 164:21	responses 8:24 9:5
227:19 232:4	222:17,19 227:7	repeat 24:13 43:11	171:10,10 212:24	responsibility
referenced 160:16	234:9	49:20 163:2	217:21	23:14,21 130:7
204:11 205:17	regulatory 1:6 3:6	192:13 228:10	requirements 8:5	170:18
206:21	4:20 20:1 63:1	replace 65:5 163:9	11:7 31:3,8 39:1	rest 129:23 131:11
references 204:19	148:22 166:14,16	replacing 69:11	44:3,16 65:12	restriction 226:10
referencing 65:16	166:20,24	129:15	88:16 95:12,14	resubmit 133:11
134:9	related 82:11 166:2	replies 8:24 9:5	116:1 129:10	176:16
referring 39:17	173:10	reply 249:12	177:7 181:10	revenue 35:5
50:23 148:24	relates 156:7	report 1:10 100:11	211:15 221:3	review 54:19,22,24
171:17 215:23	159:15 206:5	163:1,6,12	222:1 232:10	55:3,6,12,14
refers 27:23 163:14	relating 45:8 66:17	reported 1:23	requires 110:10	62:24 66:9 95:21
refinery 178:7	66:21	251:8	111:12 145:7	96:5,9 104:4

109:16 113:20	183:7 214:1	179:20,22 181:9	80:14 83:7 94:14	30:3 43:15 72:15
134:10 135:14	222:21	191:12 196:1	98:3 100:5 104:9	236:3,16
139:4 141:16,21	risks 169:6	197:20 204:3	107:5,6,11 111:13	schedule 75:11
144:23 146:10	River 12:6,8,9,11	206:7,20 208:20	113:4,14 116:11	77:18 82:14,17,21
164:13 218:5	12:18 14:1,3,5	209:12 210:8,9	117:8 122:17	83:2,6,12 86:5,6,9
231:17,19,24	15:8,11 16:23	213:13 215:1,2,6	124:5 140:2 141:4	86:12,17 87:7,17
232:1 233:10	17:1 24:12,17	215:23 216:4	146:24 147:17	87:23 88:5,17
238:10 245:16	52:4	217:1,6,10,14,14	170:17 171:2	89:7,18 90:1,3,13
reviewed 235:6	road 115:22	217:17,22 218:1,6	172:17 174:20	90:16,23 91:2,5
reviews 234:6	role 84:4 141:14	218:16,17,19,22	176:3 179:7,9,18	91:10,11,19,23
revise 63:3 210:8	room 1:14 7:1	219:10,18,19,21	181:20 182:7,8	92:5,12,15,18
revised 28:2 155:15	111:17 196:20	219:23 220:12	186:21 187:15	93:14,17,21 94:9
220:15	rule 7:15 8:8 9:20	223:8 224:1,2,17	189:1,12 200:15	94:10,21,24 95:10
revising 44:2,15	26:17 28:2,4	224:21 225:1,2,10	200:16 201:3	95:17,20 97:3,9
161:13 204:9	69:13,21 73:15	227:15,17 230:7	202:1 211:7	97:18 98:11,16
232:3	78:7 86:22 87:9	230:10 231:4	212:10 216:8	100:15 101:10,14
right 3:15 6:11 7:3	94:14 95:2,14	232:2,3 233:16	223:13,22 224:6	101:19 102:1,5,8
7:4 14:6 25:8	113:2,4,5 143:23	235:10 236:5,23	224:13,14,24	102:16,18,22
38:4 48:23 49:1,9	145:5,24 147:6	237:6 247:4	225:1,4 227:13	103:6,22 104:1,3
50:4 60:14 62:10	156:14 168:24	ruling 216:22	229:21 232:20	104:8,13,17,23
69:10 75:17,24	171:11 172:22	218:11	238:17,20 241:6,7	105:1,5,5,13
78:20 80:22 82:11	175:18 185:11	run 73:12 95:12	246:17 248:8	106:5,7,8,9
90:10 92:2 95:17	197:5,7 216:11,23	161:4	says 29:4 36:22	111:12,24 112:4
97:16 102:9,19	218:4 219:6		60:3 63:4 64:11	112:13 113:6,7,20
103:3,8 104:20	222:11 224:5	$\frac{S}{S - 1}$	72:9 86:11 95:6	113:22 114:6,20
109:19 110:6,8	229:21 248:1	S 2:1	98:11,13 99:16	115:11 131:24
111:1,22 115:21	249:13	S-A-N-J-A-Y 6:18	100:11,13 105:21	132:21
116:13 117:2	ruled 219:8	S-O-F 6:19	106:3 119:6 137:8	scheduled 248:5
118:20 120:4	rulemaking 166:15	salt 2:15 22:24 92:1	145:10 146:3	schedules 88:11
125:22 131:4,16	167:23 168:8	115:23 161:3,6	147:15 173:14	89:13 94:15
132:15,22 134:2	198:20,21 248:13	sampling 116:16,22	185:13 187:24	scientific 164:8,18
143:24 157:13,17	248:17 249:21	Sanitary 2:17	190:12 224:15,19	164:24 165:5
157:21 170:24	rulemakings 184:4	173:22 192:7	225:7 226:6	scope 56:5,16 204:9
172:1,2,6,17	rules 9:14 10:8	Sanjay 2:10 6:3,17 14:8 185:20	230:11 237:9,16	Scott 2:10 6:4,14
186:12 187:8	17:4 27:19 40:14	196:21	238:19 240:4	88:14 166:12
188:8 189:9	87:5 94:22 101:21	Sara 2:9 6:1	242:19 251:6	207:22
190:18 202:9	102:12 118:19	satisfies 125:2	Scale 196:11	screening 124:15
210:24 220:20	123:7 125:22	satisfy 125:14	scenario 12:24	Scrivener's 68:4
223:2 224:9 227:1	126:5,20 127:13	177:8 215:7	18:23 30:3 73:17	second 23:1 50:6
236:20 239:12	127:16,18 132:14	saw 14:14	74:3 91:3 116:5	76:18 147:16
244:24 247:8	132:15 134:17	saw 14.14 saying 13:20,22	131:15 138:23	172:8 215:6
249:12 rights 157:3 220:11	147:2 150:1 153:9	29:15,16 32:9	145:12 147:17	218:10
rights 157:3 229:11	155:11,14 156:4	37:19 48:5 53:12	189:22 236:14	section 7:11,13,15
rigor 164:8 165:1	161:13,15 167:21	58:7 73:18 79:12	239:11	7:23 9:10 25:12
risk 104:14 182:24	169:4,6 172:14	50.7 75.10 77.12	scenarios 13:1,18	26:13 27:15,22
	<u> </u>	l	l	I

34:22 37:16 39:7	111:4 143:7	195:23	Ship 173:23	sir 142:18
39:10 40:23 41:19	148:13 163:24	sentence 42:24	short 51:22 85:16	sit 247:17
41:23 42:9 43:5	178:15 188:24	73:16 88:13	146:15 148:16	site 220:23
44:18,24 45:10,22	197:12 198:9	144:21 145:15	213:8	site-specific 11:4
46:15 56:3,7,9,9	203:11 215:9,12	separate 40:23 41:1	shorthand 251:8,10	situation 12:22
56:24 58:24,24	224:12 229:3,22	41:13 104:21	251:16	13:10 30:7 34:9
59:2,4,14,15,16	230:3,17,19	112:23 113:24,24	shortly 3:10	53:22 72:24 75:8
59:17 60:9,23	245:18 246:17	202:7	shot 222:19	75:15,17 115:15
65:6 66:18,22,24	seeing 5:21 78:5	separately 115:4	show 11:4 13:14	116:16 121:9
67:2,3 68:7,10,14	100:19 103:10	214:24	98:16 172:19	137:8 141:13
68:15 70:3 85:22	105:7 228:16	separating 113:14	199:13 226:13	183:15 185:12
86:2,3 89:12 93:1	seek 11:14 22:12	sequence 100:2	showing 112:5	198:4 200:2
102:13 118:22	49:7 71:11 125:24	serious 58:9 246:1	114:5 125:2	211:16 220:22
120:8,15,18	143:21 145:2	serve 3:5	shown 14:22 49:8	228:7 242:20
131:15 134:9,21	174:8 200:3	served 233:13	114:24 198:11	243:18,21,22
135:8 141:16,17	210:13	serves 88:4	side 106:10	situations 15:24
144:20 145:14	seeking 32:14	service 64:12,19	Sierra 2:14 9:8	43:6 102:17 239:5
146:2 149:1 156:8	102:14 153:3	249:8	silent 144:1 228:23	six 78:15,17 79:7,8
159:16 160:16	191:14 199:13,16	session 148:20	similar 22:6 27:10	80:7 107:14
162:18 163:1,7,16	199:18	set 35:17 36:2,16	38:7 43:21 59:5	142:22,23 143:11
163:20 164:12,13	seeks 165:22	55:17 57:15 60:5	121:9 126:5	211:2 six-month 222:4
164:16 166:24	seen 122:7 150:20 sees 217:22	87:23 97:20	144:20 231:7 248:17	
167:1,17,21 168:1 168:5,18,20 169:5	segment 10:11	100:15 110:7 115:7,9 121:11	simple 143:10	six-year 142:13 size 22:6 35:3
169:18 202:18,21	12:20 13:8 19:8	131:23 132:9	144:10 145:23	skip 202:12 205:24
203:11,20 204:12	19:14,16 43:9,18	131.23 132.9	simpler 25:10 99:5	sleeping 190:23
204:22 205:3	44:5 56:19 118:24	136:13 148:23	Simplifying 128:19	slim 184:21
210:9 213:13,15	119:5,8,22 171:23	161:21 162:18	simply 28:3 29:4	small 38:18
223:23 228:13,21	173:18 174:9	177:4 187:5,6,13	89:24 102:4	smaller 123:2
228:23 229:13	176:11 177:1	188:20 222:16	106:13 111:23	socioeconomic
231:19 232:12	178:18 179:8	228:7	143:23 146:3	211:2
233:8,23 234:19	205:10 208:6	sets 37:2 57:24	180:6 186:20	Sofat 2:10 6:3,17
235:2,4 238:3	segments 9:22	125:9 208:11	188:21 190:22	6:18 7:4 8:10,19
243:17 244:20	segregate 198:8	222:18	210:21 223:13	11:22 12:12,16
246:24	selected 106:18	setting 16:12,13	242:8	14:6,13 15:16,22
sections 26:2 69:13	self-implemented	seven 71:24 80:10	simultaneously	16:18 17:8,11,13
129:11 229:24	146:21	90:6 98:19,21	234:21,23	17:21 18:1 19:22
see 3:2 5:13 8:17	self-implementing	106:15 107:14	single 11:2,6 23:17	23:13 24:13,20,23
12:16 18:2 24:4	72:12	202:13	71:20 113:8,11	25:5 26:22 28:18
30:4 37:5,16 38:8	send 105:2 134:19	sever 153:18	114:15 152:17	29:2 30:2 31:16
40:23 47:22 53:20	139:5 232:17	169:22	165:15 170:20	31:24 32:2,5,10
62:6 64:8,23	233:1	severance 170:10	171:9 175:6 179:6	38:10 39:22 40:18
71:17 84:10 96:5	sense 39:20 77:6	170:13	180:22 181:23	48:22 49:20 50:4
96:11,21 100:11	79:8 113:9 124:3	share 239:3	182:2,10,11 191:6	50:22 51:4,12
101:22 109:18	154:20 177:20	sheds 10:15	195:6 212:16	53:4,15 54:8,12
			<u> </u>	

I				
55:15 56:21 58:6	185:15 186:11	sorry 24:9 26:22	spell 6:15 234:13	105:9,10 106:21
58:22 61:17 62:5	187:8,11 188:9	32:3,5,8 40:1	spells 73:10	107:3,16,19,21,21
62:10,12 63:8,18	189:17 190:4,9,15	43:10 103:1	Spoon 12:6,8,9,18	107:24 108:10,18
64:22 65:15 66:16	191:21 192:1,13	166:11 193:17	SS 251:2	108:24 109:3
69:8,11 70:1	192:20,23 193:2,7	sort 48:2 82:13	staff 5:6	113:17 115:17
71:17 73:14 74:2	193:10,13,21,24	112:2 123:11	stakeholder 168:17	116:18 118:18
75:13 77:5,13	194:4,8,14,18	131:8 145:3 147:6	stakeholders	119:2,4,7,16,22
78:22 79:5,12	195:4,10,18,22	149:16 151:12	188:23	121:22 122:4
80:4,22 81:17	196:4,12 197:1,4	162:10 181:10	stakeholders' 57:9	128:14 130:4,9
82:6,19 83:3,9,17	197:9 201:11,16	221:5 222:2	59:10	131:1 132:6,11
84:9,12 85:2	202:24 203:10	239:22 247:24	stand 18:3 87:8	133:7,11,20
86:23 87:10 88:3	207:20 209:6	sought 51:14	169:13	134:15 135:2,16
89:22 90:10,14	210:14 211:14	204:24	standard 7:16,21	135:19 136:5,10
91:2,20 92:2,20	212:15,20 220:18	sounds 19:18 63:19	9:16,19 10:1,9	136:13,18,18
94:3,7 95:15,16	221:17 223:2,23	225:12	15:9 16:3 19:17	137:5 138:8,24
95:22 96:9 98:18	224:13,23 226:2	source 14:20 18:21	20:13,21,22 21:4	139:3,10,12
99:19 100:19	227:14 228:10,23	21:11 28:8 29:23	21:10,20 22:10,19	140:17,20 141:1
101:3,16 103:3	233:3 235:22	30:10,24 31:12,14	22:20 23:8 24:11	141:20 142:1,4
104:20 105:14	236:11 237:4,9	160:19,20,23	24:16 28:23 29:17	143:18 146:2
106:1,6,24 107:8	238:7,10,24 239:8	178:20,22,24	30:19 32:17,22,24	149:21 152:8
107:20 108:11	239:15,19 240:1	sources 10:3 11:14	33:1,8,18 34:1,3	155:1,10 156:21
109:1,24 110:8	240:13,16,24	13:2,2,6,6,7,16,17	36:12,13,14,24	158:13,14,16,17
111:6,9,22 112:5	241:4,10,18 242:6	14:21 16:9,10	37:1 38:24 40:9	158:22 159:4,8,11
112:14,18 113:12	242:12 243:24	18:12 19:1 21:12	40:19 41:8 42:19	160:11 161:19,24
114:11 116:4	244:12,21 245:18	21:14 28:19 30:15	42:21 43:2,17,19	162:20,23 163:4,9
117:4,22 118:13	248:20 249:23	31:17,21,22	44:14,17 46:6,9	163:10,19,22
118:15,21 119:24	solutions 246:14	114:18 202:3	46:17 48:19 49:4	164:3,4,9,23
121:19,23 122:5	solving 80:15	speak 5:2 172:10	49:6 50:12,19,24	165:2,6,11,14,19
137:18 138:11	somebody 23:16,22	215:2	51:2 52:16,19,23	166:1,2,3,7,14
139:20 140:6,9,16	53:18 54:1 57:11	speaking 5:3 106:7	54:6,13,14,19	167:3,4,7 173:19
141:6 142:16,19	77:18 83:4,24	130:5 193:13	55:11 56:6,17,20	179:22 184:7
143:5 144:14,18	94:7,9 95:5 97:3,4	238:3 239:8	59:22,23 68:13	185:17 189:11
145:5,23 146:9,13	97:9 102:3 104:21	speaks 228:1	70:13,21 71:4,5	192:12,18 193:19
146:17 147:12,16	105:19 107:11	specific 10:12	71:14 72:22,22	195:2 200:1,12
147:24 148:3	110:8,13 111:10	112:19 165:8	73:13,23 74:5	204:24 205:2
150:14,17,24	140:17 152:14	174:18 223:9	78:6,8 81:6 82:4	208:7 214:2 215:7
151:5 152:13	153:18 173:3	227:2	82:15,18,23 83:23	224:16 225:9
154:2 157:19,24	183:8 186:15,17	specifically 10:10	83:23 86:7 87:24	231:17,24 232:4
158:4,7,23 159:9	188:6,8 220:20	16:5 70:8 89:19	88:7 89:23 91:4,6	240:14,20,22
160:3,12 161:16	222:7 226:3 229:1	114:2 121:15	91:11 92:8,16	242:4,11 248:17
162:13 163:8,23	246:6 247:11	154:17,22 204:17	93:8 94:5 96:10	standards 12:10
168:23 169:9,15	somebody's 100:22	209:21 210:5	96:19,20,23 99:2	15:13 20:5 33:4
170:8 171:5 172:3	222:14	236:1 237:9	99:4,9,12,13,14	34:8 46:7,18,21
177:18 179:3	soon 59:3 134:19	specified 49:15,23	99:18,20 100:8,17	48:15 53:24 54:21
182:6,7 183:6	sooner 104:6	164:16	101:2,3 103:9,12	55:21,24 89:2

				_
119:6 151:14	59:9 66:9 139:21	steps 91:15 92:1	126:1 132:1,2,4	229:14 230:7,12
155:7 156:19	185:11 223:10	100:2,21 109:9,13	132:19 133:5,17	231:7
164:15,21 166:5	225:5 227:8,11	109:18 134:22,23	134:13 141:18	substantially 60:4
232:24	230:3 237:6,8	143:24 213:1	145:7,15,24 146:3	67:7 128:24
stands 163:15	238:19 246:15	stick 181:20	147:1 162:9	155:16 213:20
227:20	statutory 37:5,7	stop 173:6 238:18	225:22 247:15	218:3,24 219:2,11
start 3:14 4:5 7:8	128:23 230:1,22	stopped 141:9	249:6	225:17
7:10 74:22 77:13	230:23 237:5	stopping 179:7	submits 245:15	substantive 177:7
78:8 80:14,17	stay 36:8,12,15,19	storage 161:3,6	submitted 86:14	211:8,14
85:21 108:8,14,22	37:4,20,21,22	storm 116:12,16,22	123:20,23 124:9	substitute 173:7
142:17 148:11,20	38:5 57:12 81:22	117:15	135:13 145:8	successfully 237:22
started 246:2	91:18 139:1,10,12	stormwater 161:4	146:11 147:9	suddenly 37:19
starting 107:17	139:16 140:3,6,10	straightforward	211:11 218:15,18	52:7,20 108:8
starts 142:21	140:15 141:1,5,9	71:20 74:21	219:10 245:6,10	sue 127:21,23
state 4:24 10:22	149:5 154:18,24	197:17	submitting 6:8	suffice 65:18
35:12,20,22 54:10	174:24 185:23	stream 19:9,14	49:13 212:9	sufficient 181:18
55:2 89:3 92:10	188:6 211:19	47:7 50:17,21	Subparagraph	187:4 188:1,2
103:8 119:15	213:21 214:1	176:11 178:18	89:12	suggest 68:16 82:16
121:4,6,14 126:9	217:23 219:15	200:9,11,20 208:6	subpart 1:8 3:8	84:5 86:9 87:15
127:16 135:23	220:8,10 222:21	streamline 122:9	9:18 25:14,18	186:13 196:18
136:20 139:2,18	222:24 225:23	180:6	26:4 41:14 65:17	218:6 230:15
139:20 140:7,10	228:1,5,8,8,18,21	streamlined 11:13	224:16	suggested 173:17
140:10 165:17,21	229:10 235:1,4,7	Street 1:14	subsection 26:2	suggesting 12:7
166:7 171:14,18	235:11,16 236:8,9	stricter 232:9,24	42:3,13 43:14	69:3,8 101:13
183:11 190:24	236:17,24 237:20	strike 154:19	60:12 61:2 65:5	122:18 181:4
226:24 231:9	239:2,22 240:2,5	strikes 73:8 81:10	66:18 69:4 134:11	suggestion 101:11
233:9 239:17,18	240:6,7,22 241:16	81:12 114:4 242:1	134:21 141:17	suggestions 58:1
240:3,17,21,22	241:16,21 242:23	stringent 72:12	143:19 225:7	suggests 167:5
241:3 242:10	243:10,14,22	146:20,23 147:10	227:14 228:11	suing 127:19
244:1 251:1	244:6,8,18 245:3	147:17	subsequent 191:17	suit 240:9
stated 147:2 156:13	245:12,22 246:6	struggling 17:2	216:3 236:7 237:2	suited 152:16
224:4	247:12	109:15,22 177:11	subset 198:10	supplement 190:4
statement 5:24 7:3	stayed 142:15	stuck 3:12	substantial 24:4	support 26:11 28:9
227:5	staying 173:9	stuff 246:7	48:14 59:1,17,21	43:21 44:19 46:2
states 30:9 83:22	223:12	subdocket 198:1	61:21 128:24	46:7 95:8 102:12
113:6 128:2	stays 36:22 38:3	subdockets 197:18	155:12,14,19,24	153:23 155:8
145:17 156:18	228:14 236:13	198:21	156:1,5 159:20	156:6 165:5,10
164:14,22 206:17	Stefanie 2:9 6:4	subject 95:11	177:9 181:15	195:14 201:16
statewide 122:24	step 47:17 75:7	206:18 241:2	190:16 191:22	supporting 61:4
123:14 126:21	93:20 142:2	submission 45:8	209:1,5 212:4	supports 7:20
stating 74:19	156:20 190:17	125:1 177:14,23	213:17,23 215:4,7	25:21 26:6,19
Station 173:24	211:21 242:1 Stopen 174:2	179:2 submissions 125:13	216:13,22 217:2 217:21 218:10	27:11,20 35:6
174:1,1 statute 36:6 38:4	Stepan 174:2 182:20 204:19	submit 19:19 34:24	217:21 218:10 219:7 222:20,21	42:1,6,11 44:7 suppose 242:20
41:12 57:8 58:20	205:3 208:3	45:2 49:22 120:20	226:14,17 229:8	suppose 242:20 supposed 31:19
+1.12 37.0 30.20	203.3 200.3	+3.4 4 3.42 140.40	440.14,1/449.8	supposeu 31.19
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

242:11	154:3 162:2,12,15	technical 2:3 3:20	234:2 247:5	33:19 35:8,13
sure 6:14 23:16	177:14 180:19	7:8 164:17,24	testifying 4:5	36:19 37:12,20,24
24:15 26:10 28:21	181:23 203:13	165:4	157:10	38:2,4 47:15
30:7 39:14 41:4	212:24 213:6	technically 144:6	testimony 4:8,9,11	51:22 52:11 53:5
45:18 47:23 53:4	214:23 229:23	technology 55:7	127:10 157:14	58:3,7,13 60:2,5
63:20 65:20 87:3	230:16,24 241:24	80:12 91:21	248:4	60:18 61:9,24
87:13 88:19 89:15	242:13 244:13	111:11 119:11,14	thank 8:11 14:7	62:18 63:10,18,21
96:12,22 113:5	247:5 248:17	162:20	22:21 25:7 27:6	64:6 65:17 70:5
114:7 116:4,10	taken 39:11 40:13	tell 23:24 181:17	32:4,12 43:3,23	73:14,16 74:3,18
117:18,23 122:14	40:16 85:17 90:19	182:5 188:7	44:11 47:19 50:5	74:24 75:1,9 76:1
124:5 143:8	146:16 148:17	226:20 245:20	51:8 60:22 64:24	76:3,4,6,8 77:10
153:22 154:7	213:9 251:11	telling 61:15 100:6	69:24 70:1 87:19	77:11 80:2 81:7
170:11 172:15,24	takes 66:3 71:18	188:18 215:17	120:13 124:3	83:10,11 84:15,22
178:16 180:1	138:18 139:3	temporary 83:21	134:1 138:20	85:20 89:20 92:22
181:12 182:13	213:2	ten 76:1	143:14 148:6,7,15	92:24 93:16 94:2
190:21 192:15	talk 17:8 64:3,8,22	tend 183:15	148:18 167:9,10	94:13,17 95:19
193:1 194:10	68:20 76:16	tentative 245:6	167:14 192:3	97:7 101:6,17
206:3 210:18	117:17 178:12	term 39:9,17,21	207:12 229:2	104:3 109:21
221:24 222:23	181:16 184:5	70:12,16,24 76:2	249:19,21,24	113:12 114:22
227:10 229:20	186:4 193:15,15	76:7,15 77:3 79:4	250:1,2	116:5,6 117:22
236:11	196:20 197:11	82:18 84:5 90:3	theirs 121:2	120:5,22,24 122:7
surely 241:16	229:11	90:19 91:16 96:8	theoretically 240:8	122:11,20 123:4
Susan 2:14 17:6	talked 64:4 72:15	117:15 160:10	theory 158:15	123:22 127:11,12
suspect 25:10	82:13 83:1 107:10	167:2 168:5 203:5	210:24	128:7,15 129:5,16
swearing 4:4	107:24 124:1	249:14	thermal 178:24	131:12,13 133:4,8
switching 214:13	161:18 178:3,4,17	terminated 235:1	208:2	133:9 134:3 141:6
sworn 4:2 6:13,21	226:15	terminates 235:11	thing 78:3 87:12	142:20 143:5
6:22 251:5	talking 6:24 8:4	terminating 245:3	90:24 125:6,9	144:10 147:9
synonymous	17:9 20:6 21:13	terminology 71:16	178:17 208:10	151:15 153:19
232:18	23:2,16 24:24	72:18 73:22 81:9	things 14:23 24:5	154:3,15,20
system 44:10	57:21 71:13 73:4	89:17 114:23	27:3 57:23 60:7	158:10 159:6
248:13	75:18 88:7 90:16	terms 30:20 38:23	84:21 90:21 91:8	161:10 169:2,3
Т	90:17 91:1 99:6	54:4 76:12,12,22	91:17 93:12 94:3	170:2,20,21,24
TERRANG	101:21 106:14	87:24 89:5,19	104:21 115:21	172:8,10 173:6
T-E-R-R-A-N-O	119:2 120:1,3	106:23 116:19,20	116:14 117:2	174:19 176:10,21
6:2	172:23 177:17,19	127:3 129:3,4	128:2 154:6	177:13 178:9
T-W-A-I-T 6:16	179:18 185:1	132:16,17 138:22	158:24 159:7	179:17 180:8,10
take 4:17 12:4 14:2	186:11 188:19	139:6 159:23	160:6,21 179:4	180:18,23 181:19
20:15 37:15 38:7	201:24 225:11	161:1 164:2	181:7 183:10	183:7 184:16
42:17 50:19 65:10	230:14	180:18 196:14	186:13 188:21	185:6,15 187:16
66:10 69:6 85:6,7	talks 10:16 37:23	198:24 227:1	234:20 240:5	188:14,17 197:10
85:10,10,13,14	88:12 113:5	Terranova 2:9 6:1	245:22	200:14 202:14,20
99:9 106:19 109:8	118:23 146:18	6:2,14,17 168:10	think 5:11 9:2	203:1 206:1
121:7 123:8	229:14,15	203:13 206:4	11:12 16:12 20:10	207:17 210:14
148:10 151:12,16	Tanya 2:6 3:19	231:10,15,21	20:15 25:9 26:12	211:18 212:10,23

213:2 217:24	137:7,11,13,17,20	82:18,22 83:22,22	42:22 45:17 47:20	173:12 174:13
220:18,21 221:9	138:1,1,2 180:11	86:6 92:15 99:8	49:10 52:2 53:7	175:19 176:6
221:17 222:7,8,13	186:23 187:19	99:20 100:8 107:1	57:4,14 58:17	177:2,20 178:18
223:3,9,16,23	192:23,24 193:11	108:4 109:2	59:24 61:7,20	181:24 183:3,5
224:6 225:24	193:16,20 194:6,9	116:17 118:17	62:8,11 63:9	197:18 198:6,12
226:6 227:1,4	194:19 195:1,16	119:1,4 121:2,22	64:10,24 66:2	199:13,15,19
229:4,18 230:4,19	223:15	122:3 128:14	67:20 68:1,4	200:3 202:23
230:21 236:19	threshold 112:4	131:1 132:5,11	69:14 70:4 75:4	204:5,20 205:6,8
237:5,7 238:10	tie 185:18	133:7,10,19	79:11 80:20 85:3	205:11,21 206:11
241:10 242:7	tied 230:23	134:14 135:2,15	85:6,18 86:18	209:10,13 215:22
243:13,14 246:13	time 4:8,10 5:2	135:19 136:4,10	98:5 99:1 100:4	224:20 232:8,9,11
247:9	13:15 24:6 42:17	136:17 137:5	100:24 101:6	232:21 233:2,7,19
thinking 17:18	43:1 56:1 67:4,15	138:8,23 139:2,9	106:24 107:15	234:11 235:3,5
19:6 61:21 62:7	71:8,14,15 72:19	139:12 140:4,24	108:3,15 111:2	236:4 239:13,20
84:23 160:6 178:2	73:2,4,5 76:20	141:20,24 142:4	115:12 118:14	240:11 245:14
180:7 197:7	82:2 89:21 93:11	143:17 149:20	120:5,13 123:10	TLWQSs 119:23
thinks 170:1	104:10 105:21	151:13 152:8	124:2 128:18	197:5
185:16 227:7	104:10 103:21	154:24 155:6,9	129:7,19,22 130:1	TMDL 83:20
229:21	112:20 115:7,9,17	158:12,16 160:10	134:2 139:22	today 3:9,14,16 4:9
third 168:7 193:5	119:15,21 125:17	161:19,23 162:22	141:2 148:7,18	4:12 5:11 29:13
232:16	128:9 134:12,16	163:3,8,19 164:3	158:5 159:12	170:17 185:22
third-party 102:24	136:19 137:1,3	164:20 166:1,3,13	167:10 183:9	192:6 199:12
Thompson 1:13	138:22 139:3,8	167:3 173:19	185:19 187:2,9,12	210:7 224:17
22:23	140:17 149:19	183:19 184:7	189:9 193:14	225:11 238:20
Thornburg 15:3	162:2 165:12,16	189:15 192:11,18	196:19 213:4,10	248:4
thought 28:13 32:7	175:23 177:23	193:19 195:2	227:23 229:3	today's 3:22
40:21 41:11 66:13	187:14 189:16	200:11 204:23	240:16 241:1,5,14	told 184:14 239:10
117:2 120:24	208:21 221:3	205:2,11 208:6	241:23 248:3,7,22	Tom 6:19
127:7 176:4 185:9	225:18 226:19	224:15 225:9	249:4 250:2	tomorrow 4:11
197:12 238:11	236:2 240:15	240:20,21	Tipsord's 102:21	217:12,13 218:3
239:3	243:16 247:13	timeline 110:18,21	TL 96:6 98:10,12	topic 82:11 173:10
thoughts 76:22	249:24 250:8	times 91:16 137:17	99:8 105:9 113:11	total 53:12
threatened 233:6	time-limited 7:16	185:22 214:11,20	122:19 139:24	totally 114:19
three 54:24 92:11	7:21 9:15,18 10:1	227:20	TLs 99:7	touch 172:4
92:13 93:10,12,15	19:16 20:20,22	timing 110:23	TLWQS 7:16	touched 199:11
93:19,22 94:1	21:3,9,19 22:9	111:20 113:10	16:21,21,24 17:19	203:3
95:6 98:10,12,19	28:22 30:19 32:16	165:24	17:20 51:10 89:2	tough 62:16
99:9,14 100:8,14	32:21,23 33:3,7	Tipsord 1:12 2:3	93:9,19 94:1	track 53:2 188:8
105:9,11,14,16,22	33:17,24 34:3,7	3:1,4 6:11,20,23	95:14 102:12,15	trading 29:6 30:7
105:23 106:4,14	36:11,23 38:24	7:6 8:12,21 11:16	103:23 104:11,15	traditional 97:12
107:3,5,6,13,18	42:20,21 43:16,19	15:1 21:23 22:22	124:8,11 125:1,7	traditionally 90:2
108:6,8,17,22	46:16 54:5,21	25:8,23 26:7	125:11,22 167:16	106:7
109:8 117:13	55:10 56:6,17,19	28:12 30:16 31:24	167:20 168:21	train 35:4
123:3 124:20	59:23 68:13 70:12	32:4,8 33:11	169:7 171:19,21	training 128:22
136:15,19,24	71:14 79:15 82:14	35:21 36:21 40:1	171:23,24 172:2	transcript 251:10
				_

transitioning	116:12 237:23	164:6 166:6,21	122:19 152:14	210:21,24 211:1
246:12	Twait 2:10 6:4,14	167:6 170:2 174:6	153:20,21 154:9	212:21 214:2
translate 74:4	6:16 7:19 8:3	174:15,21 175:9	170:18 172:6	241:2
transmit 162:3	9:24 10:13 11:20	175:16,22 176:8	175:10,15,19	understand 37:4,18
transmittal 232:15	19:7 20:10 21:1	178:3 194:19	176:6 177:20	38:1 48:5 70:23
transmitting	21:11 22:1,16	197:24 198:13	178:21 196:3,18	71:9 87:20 89:16
232:11	25:21 26:6,19	200:6,21 201:7	196:24 197:22	100:5 108:12
treat 234:9	27:11,20 28:5,17	203:24 204:6,13	238:2 246:12	124:5 125:19
treatability 35:4	31:6 32:18 33:9	205:7,22 206:12	types 14:21 120:3,4	127:17 135:15
treatment 35:4	33:19 34:10 35:6	206:23 207:3	174:13 175:24	142:16 145:11,20
91:21 137:9	36:4 38:15 39:3	208:4,17,24 209:4	180:11 186:23	148:2,3 163:24
160:24	39:11,18 40:12	209:18 211:20	190:22 196:2	168:16 170:16,23
tribe 165:18,21	41:21 42:1,6,11	212:12 214:3,15	typically 150:22	196:2 198:23
tribes 156:18	42:16 43:3,20	214:19 215:9,14	151:3 160:19	200:15 201:2
164:15,22	44:7,19 45:5,13	216:1,7,16 217:4	200:8 247:23	211:6 215:11,20
trick 198:16	45:20 46:1,19	217:8,24 218:12	typographical	222:1,6,9,9 223:2
triennial 54:19,22	48:10,17 49:9,19	219:4,14 220:9,14	42:18	223:11 236:15
54:24 55:3,5,12	50:16,23 54:23	232:16 233:11,20		244:4 245:21
55:14	56:13 57:6 59:8	234:12,22 235:7	U WAA 02 5	understanding
tries 218:22	59:19 60:2,13	235:14 236:21	UAA 82:5	17:17 55:12 70:15
trouble 62:14	61:4 65:7 66:20	248:18	Uh-huh 54:8	74:20 76:24 82:20
true 90:14 95:15	67:4 68:16 69:6	two 17:21 18:1 26:1	159:24 216:1	82:21 92:3 94:13
111:6 126:20	75:16 81:5 82:1	47:22 49:12 64:16	239:15	101:5,20 135:9
190:17 231:6	86:8,18 92:4,21	71:1 72:15,18	ultimate 72:3 73:18	146:4 172:10
240:24 251:9	92:23 93:6 120:11	75:24 76:8,9	73:23,24 74:13	174:3 215:1
truly 202:1	120:22 122:16,20	84:21 104:21	78:6 81:23 97:7	understands 150:7
try 15:5 38:3,10	123:8,22 124:13	108:21 112:23	171:3 176:5	undertake 155:12
47:17 62:24 71:17	125:4,15 126:2,7	119:10 124:19	ultimately 24:1	unit 2:3 3:20 7:8
89:15 117:10	126:11,17 127:1,6	129:24 142:20	104:2 137:24 171:18 175:23	123:16
210:14 242:21	128:7 129:5,16,21	159:21 167:23	183:3 214:6	United 145:17
trying 17:14,16	129:24 130:10,15	182:18 192:24		unnatural 159:4
37:13 40:22,24	130:19 131:5,18	194:24 195:16	unacceptable 71:7 unclear 93:17	unpredictable
41:3,13 77:4	132:4,22 133:8,15	207:6,9 210:23	177:6	118:6
92:24 101:18	133:21,23 134:16	212:22 213:16,22	uncover 102:16	unreasonable
109:7,7 122:9	135:4,23 136:20	214:9,16,18	undefined 159:17	236:16
124:4 125:20	137:4 139:11,16	215:10,12,12	underlying 22:20	up-front 73:20 94:9
135:15 136:14	140:5,21 141:5	217:15,18 220:20	36:11 48:18 55:6	97:14 125:22
145:11,20 152:17 170:12,22 182:5	142:3 144:2 149:8	222:18 223:15	70:20 81:6 82:4	172:24 179:16
182:15 198:16,23	149:22 150:2,8,23	224:8,9,10 226:3 229:24 230:13	83:19,23 96:24	181:8
200:24 216:21	151:15,24 152:9 155:2,18 156:12	242:1	103:12 107:21	up-to-date 67:11 updated 33:20
227:3 236:13	157:5,15 158:15	two-second 146:13	130:15 140:17	updating 30:12
turn 7:7 176:12	157.5,15 158.15	type 13:2 18:12	146:1 153:15	63:12
turned 130:22	160:17 161:9	21:9,12 22:5	163:9,21 164:3	Upper 173:23
turns 115:23	162:1,7,21 163:2	38:19 118:6	166:5 210:16,20	ups 8:13
turns 113.23	102.1,7,21 103.2	30.17 110.0		ups 0.13
	I		l	I

	1		1	1
upstream 15:19,24	141:20,22 142:3,7	13:24 14:2,18	178:21 179:6,13	54:16 99:3,17
48:6 53:3 54:6	142:11,15,19,22	15:7,12,21,22	181:14 185:17	101:1 108:9,23
199:6,12,17,20	142:24 143:8,16	16:15,17 17:4,5	187:20 188:5,16	109:2,14 110:3
200:7,24	144:4,23 145:6	18:8,17 21:17	189:5 197:18	116:15 117:21
usage 92:1	146:5,11 147:2,9	22:2,7 23:8,10,11	199:5 201:5,13,23	violations 50:24
use 9:10 13:19,23	147:14 156:13	24:6 29:3,8,12,17	212:11,17 220:22	voice 159:13
20:7,14 26:14,16	162:4 166:4 171:4	30:12 31:7 34:24	224:16 230:6,9	voluntary 29:22
26:20 31:17 48:7	171:20,24 172:4	35:16,19 38:14,17	234:7,7,11 235:3	
52:4 55:17 58:8	172:23 173:4	40:6,10,17,19	235:5	W
68:17,19 72:21	179:19,21 180:12	41:9 46:17,20,23	variances 10:15,20	wait 4:22 103:16
73:8 74:8,16,17	181:17 182:4,12	47:2,9 48:6,6,14	10:22 11:9 12:24	131:24 135:5
78:15 81:4,4	183:2,3 184:15,17	48:18,23 49:3,7	13:1 16:1,5 18:2,3	198:9 217:1 247:3
83:19 88:20 89:24	184:20,23 185:3,8	49:16,24 50:3,13	23:3,5 41:2 55:22	247:18
91:22 92:14 94:22	185:8,13,23 186:8	51:6 52:10 53:13	81:11 96:1,10	waited 219:17
99:23 119:9,12	186:14 187:13,21	54:1,5 57:12	109:16 122:10	waiting 233:9
129:10 140:14	188:2,6,17,22	59:23 70:19,19	126:21 154:5,9	waive 38:6
146:2 159:10	189:1 190:1,11	71:11 73:5,9,15	155:5 164:9,19,22	wake 190:23
161:13 163:10	191:8,14,18 196:9		164:23 165:14	walk 74:5
	, ,	75:15,21 76:2,8		want 6:5,12,15 7:2
164:9,16 165:3,6	197:2,7 209:10	76:14,15,20,23	169:17 174:18,22	12:5 15:24 18:19
165:13 168:4	210:5 232:12,15	77:1,3,12,19	179:21 182:3	23:1 24:2 25:1
173:11 197:11	232:18 233:2,10	79:13,16,19 81:16	183:19 184:8	26:10 32:9 37:19
200:19,23 203:5	233:17 234:6,12	88:1,7 89:6,24	186:23 189:15	41:16 47:23 62:2
210:11 215:18	234:17 235:1,6,8	90:18,20 91:11,16	190:22 196:10	62:15,19 63:3,19
239:17	235:13 236:3,7	91:20 92:19 94:11	201:11 202:9	81:9 84:7 87:12
useful 29:13 40:18	237:2,10,12,15,16	96:3 97:20 98:20	various 157:2	87:13 88:18
usefulness 127:15	237:22 238:12,21	100:13 101:24	vary 73:11 165:7	
USEPA 9:14 10:17	239:12 240:1,11	102:18 103:8,9,13	verbally 75:12	103:21 104:14,17
23:16 24:6,7,12	240:13,19 241:6,8	104:23,24 105:4	verify 88:18	110:10,14 113:1
24:19,24 27:3,4	244:10,17 245:2,6	105:15 106:13,21	versus 16:21 17:5	113:23 114:7
35:8 40:10 64:17	245:10,16,19,24	107:2,6,7,17,22	17:19 23:23 38:13	116:6 117:18
64:23 65:18 66:14	247:12 248:13	108:5,6,7,17,19	164:3 173:15	123:23 128:1
74:19 75:5 76:12	USEPA's 118:18	109:10 112:24	226:4	146:8 148:4,5
87:2,13 88:4,19	140:22 209:20	113:1 117:16	video 64:1	153:20 158:11
89:3 92:24 94:14	211:17 248:16	119:7,16 120:20	view 103:5,7	172:8 173:10
96:17 99:21,21	uses 20:11 27:8	121:1,2,8,9,13	104:20,22 109:24	176:14,22 179:17
101:21 103:17	68:15 69:2 74:19	122:8 124:6 125:7	112:24 173:7,8	179:24,24 180:8
104:1,2 107:4	97:12 164:11,20	126:4,9,19 127:13	180:23 215:21	180:15 181:11,11
118:9 120:24	usually 109:16	132:22 138:9	223:5,19 229:18	183:10 184:1
124:9,22 126:19	utilized 175:20	140:19 147:1,18	viewpoint 173:1	187:1 188:21
126:23 133:1		150:20 152:15,23	violate 12:10 52:23	191:5 194:9,10
134:10,14,17,22	<u>V</u>	153:2,8,10,22	99:2	196:15 198:7
134:24 135:14,21	validity 25:16,17	159:10 162:17	violating 98:14	206:4 214:20
136:2,3 138:24	variance 10:9 11:3	165:2,7,11,19	100:16	219:15 221:23,24
139:4,11,20,23	11:6,11,23 12:6,7	166:21,22 168:1	violation 16:2	226:8 233:23
140:2 141:3,11,16	12:21 13:8,19,20	169:7 171:9 172:6	48:15 51:17 53:19	246:1 249:19

		1	1	
wanted 87:8 153:15	73:13,23 74:4	171:23 173:18,19	64:9 74:18 75:2	248:3 249:22
184:11 235:15	75:10,23 78:7	174:9,17 177:1	80:9 88:24 90:17	we've 6:3 10:15
wants 23:9,10	79:16 82:4,14,18	179:8 183:19	95:2 97:19 125:21	36:5 39:11 57:6
102:4 115:7	82:22 83:15,17,18	184:7 185:16,17	131:15 136:23	58:2 71:5 72:23
124:24 202:4	83:23 86:7 87:24	186:16 189:15	172:11 173:5	105:9 129:11
205:7 217:1	88:6 89:1,11,23	191:2,5 192:11,18	183:6 185:17	154:15 161:17
wasn't 144:5	89:24 91:4,11	193:19 194:24	191:19 202:10	178:3,17 243:6
219:16	92:7,16 93:7 94:5	195:2,5 199:8,22	214:9,14 222:10	web 63:11
wastewater 38:18	96:3,10,18,19	199:24 200:11	235:21 238:10	website 33:6,10,15
water 2:15 7:16,21	99:2,3,9,11,13,13	201:14,23 202:8	242:22 246:20	63:4,12 64:14
9:14,16,18,22,22	99:17,20,23 100:8	204:24 205:2,10	248:19	websites 63:24
10:1,8,11,11,14	100:13,16 101:1,3	208:6 214:2	ways 18:1 41:5	weight 158:1
10:15,23 11:5,7	103:16 107:1,3,4	224:15 225:9	71:1 157:8	went 26:9 53:23
11:23 12:10,20,20	107:16,16,18,20	239:21 240:3,4,10	we'll 5:16,17,19	weren't 131:9
13:7,8 14:15,17	108:4,9,18,23	240:20,21 242:10	7:10 8:20 21:11	210:4
15:3,15 16:2,21	109:2 112:24	248:16	23:24 25:1 33:22	West 1:14
16:24 17:5,19	113:16 114:17,24	waters 10:6,9 11:2	34:1 38:10 51:17	white 38:2,5
18:4,5,6,14,17	115:17 116:17	15:6	55:9 62:5 64:8,22	widespread 16:8
19:3,7,8,15,16	118:17,24,24	watershed 9:12,15	67:22 85:9,13	18:11 150:8 211:2
20:5,13,20,22	119:1,4,4,5,5,7,8	9:19,21,23 10:2,4	97:22 101:7	211:4
21:3,9,19 22:9,19	119:8,15,21,22,22	10:7,10 11:2,11	128:16 130:19	willing 44:8 64:23
22:20 23:4,9	120:3 121:22	11:19,19,21,22	134:18 143:12	winter 13:4 16:12
24:10 28:22,23	122:3 128:14	12:1,6,8,17,23	148:11,20 179:18	17:23 74:16
29:17,18 30:6,19	131:1 132:5,11	13:1,10,19,19	185:14 197:10,11	Wisconsin 35:10,10
32:16,21,23 33:1	133:7,10,19	14:10,12,16 16:5	201:16 246:14	121:3,19,21
33:3,7,17 34:1,3,7	134:14 135:2,16	16:11,15,21 17:1	we're 6:24 8:17 9:3	122:11 123:1
36:11,24 37:1	135:19 136:1,1,5	17:4,18 18:2,7	21:13 23:2,15	124:6,9,23,23
38:24 40:9,19	136:10,17 137:5	19:6 20:4,20,23	25:9 39:14 45:18	124:0,9,23,23
41:8 42:19,21	138:8,24 139:3,10	21:17 22:9,11	47:23 49:13 57:21	127:11,24
43:2,8,8,16,18,18	139:12 140:4,12	23:2,10,23 28:7	67:19 72:24 73:3	wish 29:24 102:19
43:19 44:1,5,5,13	140:24 141:20	29:18 30:23 34:7	74:1 75:18 81:10	238:24
44:17 45:4,9 46:6	142:1,4 143:18	36:14 43:8,18	85:11,20 90:16,17	Witness 2:10,10
46:8,16,18,20	149:20 151:13	49:14 56:19 149:3	109:15,21 110:19	47:15
48:13,15,16,18,21	152:8,23 153:2	149:7,10,16 150:7	114:22 120:6	witnesses 3:23 6:12
48:22 49:3,4,5,6,7	154:8 155:1,6,9	150:12,18,21	127:10 128:18	6:21,22 127:16
49:17 50:1,2,12	156:16,19,20	151:2,9,12,17	130:22 135:15	157:18
50:18,24 51:2,12	158:12,13,16,17	151:2,9,12,17	145:20 168:12	wonder 131:7
52:8,9,16,17,18	158:21 159:3	152:10,25 135:2,8	169:10 175:11,23	wondering 58:18
52:23 53:11,12,14	160:11 161:19,24	154:10,12,23	177:10,18 187:19	96:4
53:17,23 54:5,6	162:23,24 163:4,6	201:23	190:21 214:24	word 41:19 45:23
54:12,14,16,18,21	163:8,12,19,21	watersheds 23:4	216:11 220:1,4	46:2 57:2,3,7,8,19
55:11,21 56:6,17	164:4,8,19,21,23	Waterway 248:13	221:4 222:17,24	58:13,15 129:15
56:18,18,20 59:22	165:2,6,11,14,18	way 5:19 21:6 22:3	227:1,2,9,10	129:15 163:10
59:23 68:13,14	165:20 166:1,3,5	25:1 41:12 61:9	230:4,23 239:12	187:20 210:11
70:12,20 71:3,14	166:13 167:3,4,6	61:24 62:6 63:3	245:24 247:5	words 25:13 26:3
10.12,20 /1.3,14	100.13 107.3,4,0	01.27 02.0 03.3	473,47 471,J	WUIUS 23.13 20.3
			I	I .

58:8,9 59:16 65:9	172:16 173:4,4	<u> </u>	101.108(a) 167:21	213:13
168:8 171:22	189:13 244:21	Zalewski 2:4 3:10	101.108(c) 168:1	104.545(a) 59:2
204:11 213:22	wrote 75:2	3:11 109:5 110:6	101.202 157:6	104.550 56:10,15
work 16:10 30:7		110:17 111:7,19	206:15	60:9 67:3
55:24 74:1 99:7	X	110.17 111.7,19	101.510 25:11	104.555 60:23 65:6
114:23 149:3	X 105:16,21,23	zone 199:23	104 1:8 3:8 39:15	66:18
150:17 154:13	106:3 107:12		65:17 168:2 169:6	104.560 66:22
185:7 189:1,4	112:8 138:14	zones 200:8,17,21 200:23	224:17	68:10,15 70:7
221:23 238:12	153:5 202:6	200.23	104.204(b)(3) 39:13	163:16
242:19 245:24	XYZ 112:7	0	39:19	104.560(b) 163:20
worked 244:8		084-004183 1:24	104.500 7:11	104.565 85:22 86:3
workers 35:14	Y		104.505 9:10	233:8,23
working 76:20 84:3	yeah 15:23 32:11	1	104.510 25:12	104.565(d)(2)(A)(
108:22 122:13	62:11 63:18 78:6	1 7:12 37:22 42:9	104.515 26:13	66:24
141:11 150:18	98:21 121:21	45:22 60:20	45:10	104.570 120:8,9
154:10 189:3	122:7 129:24	167:15	104.515(b) 159:16	134:9,21 135:8
238:21 242:21	130:10 140:9	1(a 169:4	104.520 27:22	141:16
worry 41:9	141:2 143:10	1.2X 202:6	149:1 169:18	104.570(b) 232:12
worse 137:10	151:15 158:24	1.5X 202:6	104.520(a)(2)	104.570(c) 140:23
worst 30:13	175:22 185:13,14	1:30 148:11,11	213:15	142:8 145:2
worth 63:7	188:8 197:9	10 1:2 18:15 34:18	104.520(b) 156:8	231:19 234:20
wouldn't 30:18	198:13 210:23	71:8,10,15 73:1,2	104.525 35:23	104.570(c)(6)
57:13 125:7 144:2	year 95:6 107:13	76:3,4,7 77:1,11	228:1,13,21	246:24
144:12 152:12	108:9,21 115:22	77:16,18 78:20	104.525(a)(3) 36:1	104.580 120:15
195:9 207:8 208:2	132:7	79:3,6,14,18,20	104.525(b) 37:11	133:14 144:20
239:6 243:10	years 18:15,15 55:1	79:22 80:6,7	104.525(b)(2)(B)	145:10
WQBEL 89:5	71:24 76:2 77:16	81:14,16,19 83:4	235:2	104.590 69:23
WQS 89:5	77:17,23 79:9,16	84:7,19,20 85:15	104.530 34:22 39:7	105.570(c) 235:4
write 88:21 130:21	79:17,21 80:8	92:9,13 98:9,15	40:5,12 43:14	10th 1:15
214:8 238:13	81:14,19 84:7	99:10,15,16 100:7	44:18,24 45:13,22	11 35:22 45:1,14
writes 136:22 137:4	90:6,7,7 95:6,6	100:12 108:2,13	46:15 59:17 86:2	79:22 124:18
writing 6:9 19:20	98:20,22 99:10	108:16 115:16	104.530(a)(11)	204:7
45:18 112:18	100:9 105:16,23	136:14,18,24	41:23	11:00 85:15
130:23 168:13	106:15,22 107:12	137:12,12,16,20	104.530(a)(8) 39:10	12 35:22 38:6
169:11 203:12,14	108:13 109:9	163:13 203:17,19	104.530(a)(9) 41:19	115:24 173:11,14
206:5 226:24	111:13 112:8	10-minute 213:7	104.530(b)(1)	204:14
231:12 234:4	128:23 130:5,6,22	10(g) 96:14 152:20	160:16	12:30 85:14
247:7	131:2,20 132:7,24	153:3 180:20	104.530(c) 43:5	12:35 148:10
written 44:4 64:12	133:22,24 136:23	193:22	104.535 56:9,15	12:40 148:10
64:18 95:2 125:15	137:6 142:22,23	100 1:14 200:9,10	67:2	120 219:23
129:18 131:16	143:11 187:20	200:22	104.538.13 69:22	122.44D1 12:3
136:22 139:21	188:12 189:16	101 26:4 28:11	104.540 56:7,24	122.47 89:14
185:10 220:13	207:6,9 Var 95:5 221:15	39:15	57:5 203:20	12th 175:3 177:4
225:5 228:22	Yep 85:5 231:15	101(a)(2) 68:14	204:12	204:18 205:18
wrong 170:24	yesterday 244:22	69:1 164:11,16	104.545 58:24	206:17

				Tage 203
13 39:8 174:24	37:2,21,22 42:14	30-day 247:1,22	5	90-day 177:3 216:9
175:17 197:13	60:20 61:6 69:23	303(c) 164:13	5 159:14 179:21	216:12,15,24
204:14	124:15,17,18	303(d) 163:1,7	199:4	220:2 225:18
131 186:2	155:3 169:17	309.148 86:17	500 7:24 74:12,13	
131.14 24:8 41:2	2(b) 129:20	87:14,17 88:4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
59:15 61:6 65:17	20 43:24 71:5 72:22	30th 86:14	500-milligram	
96:13 112:22,24	73:1,2 75:24 76:7	31 60:23 61:1 234:5	24:16	
118:19 182:14	77:16 79:13 108:8	234:16	502 89:12	
223:6	108:14,21 209:9	32 65:1,4,8 234:24	510.36 89:2	
131.14(b)(2)(B)	20-year 81:16	33 65:1 66:17	51041 86:11 164:7	
68:18	2000 86:14	246:23	51042 156:23	
131.14(b)(ii)(B)	2013 124:1 196:7	33(a) 247:6	520 156:11	
119:6	196:11 197:4	34 66:21 67:20	525 228:11 231:1	
131.15 86:15	2015 24:18	35 1:7 3:7 26:4	530 43:20 51:24	
			540 56:3	
131.20(a) 55:1	2017 1:2,15 175:3	28:10 36:24 37:3	545 229:13 231:1	
131.20(b) 156:15	249:8,11,12	68:9 162:18 168:2	560(c) 114:1 115:1	
131.21(c) 86:12	2018 25:4	233:13 246:12	565 67:18,19,22	
131.3(q) 27:10	21 8:19 44:12 45:21	36 85:21,23	570(c) 144:16	
131.5(a)(a)(4)	187:13 188:1	37 120:7	147:24	
164:12	190:1 213:3	38 120:14	5th 249:11	
13110G 11:8	21-day 186:12	38.5 40:23 59:16		
132 7:13,15 8:5	188:20	65:17 167:17	6	
14 8:19 39:24 42:4	22 44:21,23 213:3,5		6 26:21 27:7 35:13	
204:15 212:22	213:11	202:18,21 223:23	141:17 202:12	
14th 249:8	22nd 190:10	224:6,12,14	60 219:21,24	
15 41:22 85:13	24 46:11	235:17,20,24		
131:20 132:7	25 54:18 200:23	238:3 243:17	7	
205:16	25.5 156:24 169:2	244:20 246:13	7 27:15 161:17	
15-minute 85:7	25.5(e) 65:11	38.5(b) 204:22	196:12	
16 42:3 206:3 212:5	26 56:2 231:3,3	38.5(g) 59:12	75 10:17	
212:8	26th 190:2	38.5(h)(1)(c) 36:7	75762 10:17	
16-19 173:14 175:3	27 56:23 231:16	38.5(k) 224:18		
175:5 204:17	28 59:2 232:5		8	
16-9 183:18 184:6	29 59:13 174:1	4	8 27:23 162:16	
185:2	233:5	4 25:24 60:20 61:3	203:2,14	
17 42:8 89:12		120:10 158:9	80 156:23	
206:16 207:19	3	4:13 250:4	89 218:5	
212:6	3 1:8 25:11 37:23	40 7:12,14 11:8		
18 42:13 207:14	60:12 61:6 69:23	27:10 59:15 61:5	9	
19 43:4 208:19	156:7,11 197:15	62:5 65:11,16	9 20:17 33:2 174:1	
211:22	229:5	68:17 89:13 96:24	203:14	
19th 249:12	30 60:8 128:23	164:12 223:5	9-040 1:14	
1/UI 47/.14	145:7,18 146:1	401 28:9 32:20	9:07 1:16	
2	233:21 242:13	408 164:6	90 215:22 216:3	
2 9:11 27:8 36:21	247:3,4,18		218:9,20 225:2,21	
, <u> </u>	, , , , , , , ,		225:22	
	l	l	l	l