	Page
ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD MAY 8, 2018	
IN THE MATTER OF:)) No. R18-22	
) (Rulemaking - Air) AMENDMENTS TO 35 ILL. ADM.) CODE PART 205, EMISSIONS) REDUCTION MARKET PROGRAM)	
REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS held in the above entitled cause before Hearing Officer Timothy Fox, called by the Illinois Pollution Control Board, taken by Steven Brickey, CSR, for the State of Illinois, 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois, on the 7th day of June, 2018, commencing at the hour of 10:06 a.m.	

,		
,		Page 2
1	APPEARANCES	
2	MS. KATIE PAPADIMITRIU, Chairman MS. BRENDA CARTER, Board Member	
З	MR. TIMOTHY FOX, Board Member MS. ALISA LIU, Technical Unit	
4		
5		
6	ALSO PRESENT:	
7	MS. LADONNA DRIVER MR. BUZZ ASSELMEIER MS. ANNET GODIKSEN	
8	MR. ALEC DAVIS MS. DANA VETTERHOFFER	
9	MS. DANA VETTERHOFFER	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

June 12, 2018

	Pag
1	MR. FOX: Good morning and welcome
2	to this Illinois Pollution Control Board hearing.
3	My name is Tim Fox and I am the Hearing Officer
4	for this rulemaking proceeding, which is entitled
5	Amendment to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 205: Emissions
6	Reduction Market System. The Board docket number
7	for this rulemaking is R18-22.
8	A very quick interruption
9	introductions. Present from the Board today there
10	in Springfield at the center of the head table is
11	the Board's chairman Katie Papadimitriu who is
12	also the lead Board member assigned to this
13	rulemaking and at her left is Board member Brenda
14	Carter. Here in Springfield here in Chicago
15	rather in addition to me to my left is Alisa Liu
16	of the Board's Technical Unit.
17	This hearing is governed by the
18	Board's procedural rules under which all
19	information that is relevant and that is not
20	repetitious or privileged will be admitted into
21	the record. Please bear in mind that any
22	questions that are raised by the Board members or
23	the staff are intended solely to help develop a
24	clear and complete record and do not reflect any

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

June 12, 2018

1 decision on the proposal or any questions or 2 responses that may come up during the hearing 3 today. I would ask for the sake of our 4 5 court reporter, who is here in Chicago of course, 6 to help him provide a clear transcript if you 7 would speak as clearly as possible, please let us 8 know if you need some additional volume on this 9 system, and avoid speaking at the same time as 10 another person. I do want to run through a quick, 11 quick background on this proposal. 12 IEPA filed it with the Board on 13 February 22nd of 2018 and this is the second, of course, of our two scheduled hearings. The Board 14 15 published notice of hearings on March 25th in the 16 State Journal Register of Springfield, on March 17 26th in the Chicago Sun Times and on April 20th in 18 the Illinois Register. After the first hearing 19 that the Board held on May 10th, the Board 20 received on May 17th IEPA's responses to questions 21 from the Board and from the Illinois Environmental 22 Regulatory Group, which we'll refer to as IERG. 23 Although the Hearing Officer had 24 directed participants intending to testify at this

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

June 12, 2018

	Page 5
1	hearing to pre-file testimony by May 24th of 2018,
2	the Board did not receive any pre-filed testimony
3	for this hearing by that deadline.
4	Yesterday, at approximately 4:00
5	p.m. however, the Board received from the Illinois
6	Environmental Regulatory Group a document
7	designated as the pre-filed testimony of its
8	executive director Alec Davis. Under the Board's
9	rules at Section 102.424(g), that written
10	testimony, among other filings for hearing, was
11	required to be submitted to our clerk's office at
12	least 24 hours before the scheduled start of the
13	hearing.
14	The Board did not receive
15	Mr. Davis' pre-filed testimony before that
16	deadline and in discussing procedural matters with
17	the participants before the hearing, I let the
18	parties know that the Board did not intend to
19	accept that as written, pre-filed testimony, but
20	Mr. Davis is clearly present here with us today
21	and suggested that he would offer oral testimony,
22	sworn oral testimony, and be available for
23	questions based on the oral testimony that he did
24	offer here today.

,	
1	Page 6
	So the proposed order of our
2	hearing is that we can soon swear you in,
3	Mr. Davis, to proceed with that and then the
4	agency has indicated that they have a witness, I
5	believe, Ms. Godiksen, it was Mr. Asselmeier who
6	testified at the first hearing who has some
7	testimony he may he will be offering and he
8	will be willing to attempt to answer some
9	questions as well. Once
10	MS. GODIKSEN: That is correct.
11	MR. FOX: Once we have wrapped up
12	with those two, we can see if there is anyone
13	present who wishes to offer any public comment
14	that they wish to to speak to the Board and
15	once we have concluded with those I think we'll be
16	prepared to adjourn. Any questions about our
17	proceeding at all or order, especially of
18	proceeding?
19	All right. Neither seeing nor
20	hearing any, Mr. Davis, I think it would be
21	helpful if Mr. Asselmeier and Ms. Godiksen I hate
22	to displace you briefly, but I think it would be
23	helpful if Mr. Davis sat at the head of the table
24	which would make him, I think, much more visible

	Page 7
1	to us in Chicago and perhaps a little more audible
2	for our court reporter. I appreciate you moving
3	for him. Thank you very much.
4	Mr. Davis, once you're situated,
5	let us know if you're ready to be sworn in.
6	MR. DAVIS: Yes, I'm ready.
7	MR. FOX: Very good. Steven, if
8	you'd go ahead and swear in Mr. Davis on behalf of
9	IERG, please.
10	WHEREUPON:
11	ALEC DAVIS
12	called as a witness herein, having been first duly
13	sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:
14	MR. FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you very
15	much for your your willing to testify today.
16	Again, the Board is not as a result of its
17	procedural rules able to accept the written
18	testimony as written testimony as submitted, but
19	if you have oral testimony that you would offer to
20	the Board, please go ahead and then we will
21	proceed to any questions that that raises on the
22	part of the participants.
23	MR. DAVIS: Thank you. Good
24	morning, everyone. I want to thank you, Chairman

June 12, 2018

1 Papadimitriu and Member Carter and you also, 2 Hearing Officer Fox, for providing the opportunity 3 to testify today. 4 Again, my name is Alec Davis and I am the executive director of the Illinois 5 6 Environmental Regulatory Group, or IERG, where I 7 previously served as general counsel. The 8 Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group represents 9 industries interests in developing and negotiating 10 environmental regulations and laws in the State of In my previous and current roles at 11 Illinois. 12 IERG, I advocate on behalf of Illinois' business 13 community regarding environmental legislation and 14 regulations. Before returning to the Illinois 15 Environmental Regulatory Group, I was an attorney with the Illinois Farm Bureau's Office of the 16 17 General Counsel. In that capacity, I represented 18 the interests of the Farm Bureau's members on a 19 wide array of subjects including environmental 20 laws and regulations. 21 Before my legal career, I worked 22 for the Illinois State Geological Survey in 23 Champaign. I hold a juris doctorate and Bachelor 24 of Sciences in geology, both from the University

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

June 12, 2018

	Page
1	of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign.
2	IERG strongly supports ending
3	the ERMS program for the same reasons that have
4	been expressed by the Illinois Environmental
5	Protection Agency, or Illinois EPA. Several of
6	IERG's members are subject to ERMS. IERG members
7	that are subject to ERMS have an obligation to
8	hold allotment trading units, or ATU's, in an
9	amount not less than the facility's applicable
10	seasonal VOM, volatile organic materials,
11	emissions.
12	Such IERG members also have
13	recordkeeping and reporting obligations under the
14	ERMS requirements. IERG supported the ERMS
15	program at its inception as an innovative and
16	efficient approach to VOM emissions regulation.
17	Two decades later, as the Illinois EPA has
18	demonstrated in its rulemaking, the ERMS program
19	is no longer providing environmental benefit due
20	to newer regulatory emission requirements as well
21	as facility shutdowns.
22	Therefore, IERG supports the
23	Illinois EPA's efforts to end the ERMS obligations
24	for the regulated community as well as the

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

June 12, 2018

	Page 10
1	Illinois EPA. While IERG encourages the Board to
2	approve Illinois EPA's proposal here, it does have
3	a concern about the sunset date. As stated by the
4	Illinois EPA at hearing, Illinois EPA has not
5	issued ATU's to regulated sources for the 2018
6	season and I would direct you to the May 10th
7	hearing transcript page 29. Illinois EPA further
8	stated at hearing that "If the rulemaking is
9	approved as proposed, regulated sources would not
10	have a regulatory obligation to hold ATU's for the
11	2018 season, complete required recordkeeping or
12	submit seasonal reports." And, again, that's the
13	same transcript at page 30.
14	However, Illinois EPA
15	acknowledged at hearing that regulated sources do
16	have ERMS requirements in their Federally
17	Enforceable State Operating Permits, FESOP, and
18	Clean Air Act Permit Program, or CAAPP, permits.
19	Again, that same transcript at page 28. Under
20	both types of permits, sources must report
21	deviations from permitting requirements. Under
22	CAAPP permits, sources must submit annual
23	compliance certifications which detail a source's
24	compliance or non-compliance with each CAAPP

June 12, 2018

	Pag
1	permit condition. Therefore, FESOP or CAAPP
2	permittees who have ERMS requirements in such
3	permits, are required to report non-compliance
4	with the permitted ERMS conditions.
5	Illinois EPA stated at hearing
6	that it was not likely that the United States
7	Environmental Protection Agency, US EPA, would
8	approve the ERMS sunset as a State Implementation
9	Plan, or SIP, revision before the ERMS sources
10	deadlines for holding ATU's, submitting seasonal
11	reports of 2018. And that was referenced in the
12	transcript at 30 to 33.
13	When questioned at hearing as to
14	the concern about ERMS permit requirements for
15	2018, Illinois EPA responded that without a
16	regulatory requirement to enforce, a regulated
17	source could apply for a permit modification.
18	And, again, that transcript at page 34. Illinois
19	EPA responded further to these concerns in its
20	response to the Illinois Pollution Control Board
21	and the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group's
22	questions regarding the sunset of the Emissions
23	Reduction Market System response filed on May
24	17th, 2018. If it would be a benefit, I can

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

12

	Page
1	reiterate the relevant portion of that submittal.
2	MR. FOX: Mr. Davis, if you would go
3	ahead, I think that's likely to be the subject of
4	some some question or further testimony and it
5	would be helpful.
6	MR. DAVIS: Absolutely. Paragraph
7	three IERG's representative asked several
8	questions about how changes to the permits of
9	applicable sources would be handled during the
10	first hearing regarding the ERMS sunset rulemaking
11	held May 10th, 2018. IERG asked the agency
12	several questions about how changes to the permits
13	of applicable sources would be handled for the
14	2018 season and the time gap between when the
15	state program sunsets and the Illinois SIP is
16	revised.
17	The agency has confirmed
18	internally that the responses given at the hearing
19	were, indeed, correct, but the agency would like
20	to expand upon them. Any source with a CAAPP
21	permit that is concerned about having ERMS
22	requirements in the permit can submit an
23	application for minor modification to the Illinois
24	EPA Bureau of Air permit section after the US EPA

	Page
1	approves the change in Illinois SIP.
2	Similarly, any applicable source
3	with a FESOP can apply to have ERMS requirements
4	removed from its permits at that same point. If
5	the agency proposal is adopted by the Board, the
6	ERMS requirements will no longer be effective at
7	the state level. However, they will technically
8	continue to be federally enforceable until the US
9	EPA approves the sunset as a revision to the
10	Illinois SIP. As stated at the hearing, it is
11	extremely unlikely that the US EPA would attempt
12	to enforce requirements under a program that the
13	State of Illinois no longer operates and that the
14	state is attempting to remove from its SIP.
15	The US EPA understands that the
16	gap of time between finalizing rulemakings at the
17	state level and approving SIP revisions at the
18	federal level is a part of the SIP revision
19	process. Additionally, once the ERMS sunset
20	provision is adopted by the Board, applicable
21	sources submitting CAAPP annual certifications can
22	explain in those certifications that the ERMS
23	requirements are no longer applicable and, thus,
24	certifying compliance with any ERMS requirements,

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

13 Ъ

June 12, 2018

1 end quote.

2 And I would just point to 3 paragraph three of that above-cited document. 4 IERG appreciates the additional information that 5 Illinois EPA has provided on this point. However, 6 Illinois EPA's further explanation leaves IERG and 7 its members who are subject to ERMS with lingering 8 concerns because the ERMS requirements will still 9 be enforceable as SIP requirements. In its 10 response, Illinois EPA states that federal 11 enforcement of the ERMS SIP or FESOP/CAAPP permits 12 is unlikely. Further, Illinois states in its 13 response that ERMS sources can explain in their 14 CAAPP's compliant certifications that, quote, the 15 ERMS requirements are no longer applicable, end 16 quote, and, quote, can certify compliance with any 17 ERMS requirements, end quote. IERG's members take their 18 19 regulatory and permit compliance obligations very 20 seriously. IERG appreciates Illinois EPA's effort 21 to provide its perspective on these issues. 22 Nevertheless, while IERG and its members strongly 23 support the ERMS sunset, we must express our 24 members' concerns about the possible

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

June 12, 2018

1 non-compliance situation that is being created by 2 the current proposal. 3 IERG believes that this can be 4 resolved by adjusting the timing of the sunset 5 provision. IERG has discussed this possibility with the Illinois EPA and has been informed that 6 7 Illinois EPA does not support adjusting the sunset 8 IERG, therefore, requests that the Board date. 9 consider the following revision to the sunset 10 provision. Section 205.115 sunset provision. The provisions of this part shall not apply on or 11 12 after April 30, 2021, or the effective date of 13 approval of this provision by the United States 14 Environmental Protection Agency as a revision to 15 the Illinois State Implementation Plan, whichever 16 occurs first, end quote. 17 This revision will continue the 18 ERMS program while allowing time for US EPA to 19 approve the ERMS sunset as a SIP revision and for 20 sources to secure revisions to their FESOP's and 21 CAAPP permits to remove ERMS requirements. IERG 22 respectfully requests that the Board consider this 23 revision to the Illinois EPA's proposal in order 24 to avoid non-compliance for IERG's members who are

June 12, 2018

Page 16 1 subject to ERMS. And that concludes my testimony. 2 I'm happy to take any questions. 3 MR. FOX: Mr. Davis, thank you for 4 providing that into the record. 5 Ms. Godiksen, I think we are set 6 to proceed with any questions about that testimony 7 that IEPA may have. 8 MS. GODIKSEN: Great. There are 9 approximately 180 Illinois sources subject to 10 ERMS. Of those, how many are members of IERG? 11 MR. DAVIS: That's a great question. 12 I don't have a definitive answer. I would suspect 13 significantly less than half. 14 MS. GODIKSEN: One half of 180? MR. DAVIS: Well, they're in the 15 16 neighborhood of 50 IERG members and while they 17 might have multiple facilities in the Chicago non-attainment area, I don't think it's likely 18 19 that they have close to 180. 20 MS. GODIKSEN: Okay. Can you get us 21 an exact number in post-hearing comments, please? 22 MR. DAVIS: I believe I can do that. 23 MS. GODIKSEN: Thank you. IERG has 24 represented to the agency on several occasions

17

	Page
1	that only two to three sources have expressed the
2	concerns reflected in IERG's pre-filed, or now
3	read into the record, testimony.
4	Can you please confirm the exact
5	number of members who have expressed those
6	concerns.
7	MR. DAVIS: I don't know that I
8	prefer to really discuss our internal,
9	deliberative processes. You know, as a membership
10	organization, I represent, you know, the interests
11	of all of my members and in any given instance I
12	really don't want to characterize our processes in
13	any given ways as taking place in any form or
14	fashion.
15	MS. GODIKSEN: Are you saying then
16	that the views that you've expressed here today
17	represent those of all of your members?
18	MR. DAVIS: Yes, I the members
19	that have voiced an opinion on this or a
20	preference or an interest in this ongoing matter,
21	bearing in mind that I'm a statewide organization
22	and that this is a rule that applies only in the
23	Chicago non-attainment area, have informed me that
24	they support the position IERG has expressed on

June 12, 2018

Page 18 1 this issue. 2 MS. GODIKSEN: So all of your 3 members or just those that have expressed concern? 4 MS. DRIVER: Mr. Hearing Officer, 5 I'm going to object. I think we've answered that 6 question. 7 MR. FOX: Ms. Godiksen? 8 MS. VETTERHOFFER: I'm sorry. This is Dana Vetterhoffer on behalf of the Illinois 9 10 We're just trying to determine if EPA. Mr. Davis' testimony that all of the IERG members 11 who are subject to ERMS is he saying they all have 12 13 expressed these same concerns to him? 14 MS. DRIVER: He's answered yes. 15 MS. VETTERHOFFER: We're just trying 16 to clarify. 17 MR. FOX: The response, 18 Ms. Vetterhoffer, I've heard is that some number 19 less than the entire membership have expressed an 20 opinion, yet all of those opinions are consistent 21 with one another in supporting IERG's position. 22 Mr. Davis, have I misstated that? 23 MR. DAVIS: No, I think that's 24 correct is -- is the way that we've come to a

,	Page 19
1	position as an organization and this is what it
2	is. Whether or not there are members I haven't
3	heard from, I can't say. I do not as my first
4	question I answered, I do not know sitting here
5	right now the entire universe of IERG member
6	facilities in the geographic footprint of the rule
7	and I cannot say with certainty whether or not I
8	heard from each and every one, but the position of
9	the organization is that as specified in our
10	filing or in my testimony.
11	MS. GODIKSEN: Has IERG consulted
12	with the other affected sources to obtain their
13	views on prolonging the ERMS program and their
14	compliance obligations for an additional three
15	years?
16	MS. DRIVER: Can I just clarify,
17	Ms. Godiksen, what you mean by other affected
18	sources? Are you talking about non-IERG members?
19	MS. GODIKSEN: Non-members, yes.
20	MR. DAVIS: No, I have not done
21	that. And, again, just to clarify our position,
22	our preference is that the rule would sunset as
23	soon as possible, that being coextensive with US
24	EPA's approval of the State Implementation Plan

June 12, 2018

Page 20 1 revision. 2 MS. GODIKSEN: That's it for our 3 questions. 4 MR. FOX: Ms. Godiksen, thanks. 5 Mr. Davis, I have a couple of questions to be 6 fair, six or seven, on the part of the Board and 7 I'll just dive right in with the first one. 8 IERG has plainly proposed that 9 the sunset take effect either on US EPA's approval 10 of the SIP revision, a date uncertain of course, or by April 30th, 2021, whichever is first. 11 Can you explain IERG's reason for recommending the 12 13 date of April 30th, 2021, which is, after all, a 14 three-year extension of what IEPA had proposed? 15 MR. DAVIS: Yeah, absolutely. You 16 know, obviously as I expressed, our preference is 17 that US EPA would take action before that and 18 that, in fact, the sunset would be effective 19 significantly before, but we thought it was 20 important to put some dates certain in there to 21 the extent that that might help drive activities. 22 Sometimes when issues stagnate 23 let's say for -- for a period of time, it's 24 helpful to have a date in place by which we can

	Page 21
1	point to and say we would really like this to take
2	place before that date and so we we didn't want
3	to just have it be unconstrained and while I don't
4	have information in front of me as far as the
5	timing for SIP approvals, I do believe,
6	antidotically, that they can sometimes take a
7	significant amount of time and so we thought it
8	was it was helpful to put some kind of end to
9	that or expectations for an end to that.
10	MR. FOX: You've referred to the
11	April 30th, 2021, deadline as something of an
12	incentive, I think that's a fair characterization.
13	Any reason why you didn't
14	provide a quicker incentive, say, April 30th of
15	2019.
16	MR. DAVIS: You know, to be frank, I
17	don't think I'm necessarily wedded to 2021. I
18	just feel that, you know, I we, in fact,
19	thought about 2019 as a date, but it didn't really
20	take a lot of discussion to to come to the
21	point where we realized that if we find ourselves
22	on April 30th, 2019, and the feds haven't taken
23	action that then we come back to the Board to get
24	them to move that date yet again and so we felt

	Page 22
1	that if if assuming that it takes a few more
2	months for the Board to finalize this proceeding
3	and, perhaps, a few months for the Illinois EPA to
4	get a SIP submittal package to US EPA, it was not
5	significantly outside the realm of possibility
6	that we would find ourselves in April of 2019
7	coming back to the Board asking to change that
8	date because the feds may not have taken the
9	action on it.
10	MR. FOX: Very good. Mr. Davis, you
11	referred to, again I'm going to speak very
12	generally about some recordkeeping and reporting
13	requirements. Those would if the Board adopted
14	a sunset date of April 30th, 2021, all of those
15	various requirements would continue, in effect,
16	without any change for the duration of that time,
17	would you agree with that assessment?
18	MR. DAVIS: If US EPA did not take
19	action before then, that is correct.
20	MR. FOX: All right. And that
21	that didn't affect your judgment about the
22	three-year proposal?
23	MR. DAVIS: No. Again, I think we'd
24	like it to be sooner than that. But, you know,

	Page 23
1	when talking to the members about the benefit of
2	sunsetting the program versus the the
3	non-compliance situation of having a federally
4	applicable rule that they're that they can't
5	comply with, I think the consensus was rather that
6	they would they would be willing to continue
7	that and have the certainty that comes with, you
8	know, the state and federal programs being both
9	terminated at the same time or the requirements of
10	both of those programs.
11	MR. FOX: I have a further question
12	about that April 30th, 2021, deadline. Is there
13	in IERG's mind some risk that April 30th, 2021,
14	could arrive without US EPA approval of the SIP
15	revision and result in exactly the circumstances
16	you've you've generally generally expressed
17	concerns with in your testimony?
18	MR. DAVIS: I mean, I hope not. I
19	might get in trouble here. I know there is some
19 20	might get in trouble here. I know there is some deadlines built into the statute as far as how
20	deadlines built into the statute as far as how
20 21	deadlines built into the statute as far as how long the timeframes that the process is supposed

	Page 24
1	that can push those dates back and so while,
2	theoretically, it's possible we may, in fact,
3	I'd I'd like to hope that that has enough of
4	a buffer for lack of a better word for the feds to
5	take action.
6	MR. FOX: So noted. I want to
7	change subjects a little bit, Mr. Davis.
8	In the response that IEPA filed
9	on May 17th, they suggested that the annual
10	certification certifications that ERMS sources
11	are required to submit could in the event that the
12	Board does adopt a regulation sunsetting this
13	program those sources could simply explain that
14	the sunset has occurred and, in effect, certify
15	compliance with that sunsetted requirement.
16	Is it is it IERG's position
17	that is not sufficient to address their that is
18	not sufficient to report in their annual
19	compliance certification?
20	MR. DAVIS: I mean, I think this is
21	maybe a legal conclusion, but, you know, if the
22	compliance certification is a certification that
23	you're complying with the terms and conditions of
24	the permit, then I think it depends on what is in

,	Page 25
1	your permit as you're making that certification.
2	But to the bigger issue I think
3	is as we discuss this issue both internally and
4	with the agency, I think we find ourselves
5	conflating two distinct issues that are similar,
6	but significantly different and that is compliance
7	and enforcement.
8	So just because the likelihood
9	of enforcement may be small, it doesn't
10	necessarily mean that there is not some
11	non-compliance and the members that have raised
12	concerns have raised concerns with the
13	non-compliance issues and I think that is an
14	important distinction that we need to be mindful
15	of. I think that's
16	MR. FOX: Great. I'm going to
17	change subjects again a bit, Mr. Davis. If if
18	you know the answer to this, do you know to the
19	extent that your IERG members request a minor
20	modification of a FESOP or a CAAPP permit from
21	IEPA the amount of time it takes from the date of
22	application to receive a determination on that?
23	Do you have in mind a typical or common amount of
24	time it takes for that to be reviewed?

26

	Page
1	MR. DAVIS: I'm going to confer with
2	my counsel really quickly here. No, I don't have
3	an answer for you handy. I really don't know how
4	long it takes for for that approval to take
5	place.
6	MR. FOX: That's that's that's
7	fine, Mr. Davis, if that's not an answer you have
8	at your fingertips. I want to, again, change of
9	subject ask kind of a hypothetical.
10	Has has IERG on behalf of its
11	members explored with IEPA whether it would be
12	possible to apply for a permit modification while
13	a SIP revision was pending at US EPA?
14	MR. DAVIS: We had some discussions.
15	I don't know that we have necessarily reached a
16	conclusion, but, again, even if even if we were
17	able to address the question of certifying
18	compliance with the permit, the SIP as I
19	understand it until it's revised by the US EPA, it
20	is itself, you know, effective and legally binding
21	as as with the weight of federal law and so,
22	you know, there are a few different few
23	different aspects of this program that that
24	create the possibility for non-compliance. It's

June 12, 2018

Page 27 1 not just the permit. They still have to comply or 2 be in compliance with an applicable federal 3 regulatory requirement. 4 MR. FOX: Mr. Davis, I had one last 5 question. 6 You had cited in your oral 7 testimony today an Illinois EPA statement that -that federal enforcement of the ERMS as an element 8 9 of the SIP was unlikely, is that statement by IEPA 10 something IERG agrees with, disagrees with or has a different position on? 11 12 MR. DAVIS: You know, I don't think 13 I have any basis to disagree, but, again, it's maybe an oversimplification, but it's kind of 14 analogous to jaywalking, right. You -- you have 15 jaywalkers and they may never get ticketed for 16 17 jaywalking, but it doesn't mean that they're not 18 breaking the law when they're jaywalking and that 19 the IERG members who are concerned with complying 20 with federal law do so not necessarily with the 21 mind towards what's the likelihood of I'm going to 22 get caught or getting enforced against, it's just 23 we don't do it and we do not want to be put in a 24 position where our choice is basically if you want

June 12, 2018

Page 28 1 to continue to operate you have to do so in violation of federal law and that's really, I 2 3 think, the crux of the issue for us. 4 MR. FOX: So noted, Mr. Davis. 5 Although, I didn't expect a jaywalking analogy. 6 That exhausts the questions that we had from the 7 Board here in Chicago. I won't overlook the 8 chairman and Member Carter who are there, but I do 9 want to see if the agency has any additional 10 questions for Mr. Davis? 11 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Actually, as the 12 agency confers quietly, Tim, I have a few 13 questions, but I can wait until after the agency 14 concludes as well. 15 MR. FOX: I won't forget you're It looks like they have already come to a 16 there. 17 conclusion about whether they have questions. 18 MS. GODIKSEN: We have no further 19 questions. 20 MR. FOX: Chairman Papadimitriu, 21 please go ahead. 22 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Mr. Davis, hello. 23 Good morning. I have two questions. 24 One, has the agency ever denied

	Page 29
1	a modification request, a permit modification
2	request, of any of your members with respect to
3	the issue we're discussing today?
4	MR. DAVIS: I don't have any
5	knowledge one way or the other.
6	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Okay.
7	MR. DAVIS: I just don't know.
8	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Okay. And my
9	second question is you've you've made a
10	distinction between enforcement and compliance.
11	It seems to me that enforcement follows compliance
12	or compliance follows there is a correlation
13	between the two. The agency has stated I believe,
14	and please correct me if I'm incorrect here, the
15	agency has said that they don't plan on enforcing
16	certain aspects of this provision because as it
17	awaits the US EPA approval.
18	If that's the case, does
19	please correct me if I've misspoken on that, are
20	the IERG members concerned about compliance from a
21	state perspective or are there other regulatory
22	bodies that that your concern of, quote,
23	unquote, non-compliance would affect.
24	MR. DAVIS: Yeah. I mean, I think

June 12, 2018

	Page 30
1	that's a great question. It kind of takes us back
2	a step. The Clean Air Act this this state rule
3	has been submitted to the US EPA originally for
4	its approval under the Clean Air Act as part of
5	the State Implementation Plan. Rules that have
6	been approved by the US EPA under the State
7	Implementation Plan then have the force of federal
8	law until the US EPA takes some action to modify
9	or rescind that State Implementation Plan.
10	So so when the state takes
11	its action, then for state law purposes that's no
12	longer an applicable requirement, but unless and
13	until US EPA takes action to change the State
14	Implementation Plan it remains a federal law
15	requirement and so those federal law requirements
16	are enforceable by other entities than just the
17	Illinois EPA and then, again, to reiterate my
18	distinction between enforcement and compliance
19	many of the IERG members are in heavily regulated
20	industries that are subject to many, many
21	different environmental and other regulatory
22	requirements and as a matter of corporate policy I
23	think it's probably good business practice to have
24	policies in place that say "We do not want our

	Page 31
1	various operations doing so in knowing
2	non-compliance with regulatory requirements"
3	without any really factoring of the likelihood of
4	enforcement or relying on the discretion of
5	whoever that enforcement authority would be to
6	assure you're not doing something you shouldn't
7	be. They they make it a proactive
8	responsibility on themselves to ensure they are in
9	compliance with all times to the extent they're
10	able to do so.
11	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Thank you.
12	MR. DAVIS: You're welcome.
13	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Mr. Fox, the
14	agency does have a couple of follow-up questions
15	if that's okay.
16	MR. FOX: Let me check, if you would
17	let me, Ms. Vetterhoffer, to see whether Chairman
18	Papadimitriu has any further questions for
19	Mr. Davis.
20	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: I'm finished.
21	Thank you.
22	MR. FOX: Very good.
23	Ms. Vetterhoffer?
24	MS. CARTER: I have one. Sorry,

. 1	
,	Page 32
1	Tim.
2	MR. FOX: I shouldn't have
3	overlooked you. Ms. Vetterhoffer, let me turn to
4	Member Carter because she has indicated she has a
5	question. Member Carter, please go ahead.
6	MS. CARTER: Do IERG members have
7	any obligation to report non-compliance to other
8	regulatory agencies?
9	MR. DAVIS: That is a great
10	question. I mean, you mean on on environmental
11	matters or just in the general sense?
12	MS. CARTER: Non-compliance
13	environmental matters to any other regulatory
14	agency.
15	MR. DAVIS: I'll confirm really
16	quickly. I think I have two answers and this is
17	maybe not a complete answer in that I don't know
18	all the potential universe of reporting
19	environments that may exist. There are still some
20	permits and some sources that do report compliance
21	status to US EPA and in kind of the more general
22	sense the Securities & Exchange Commission and
23	other, you know, regulatory authorities that
24	that deal with businesses often require that as

June 12, 2018

Page 33 1 part of their dealings, any businesses that have 2 knowing liabilities or other things of that nature 3 report those and so it's not unusual to see 4 environmental obligations reported in those 5 contexts. 6 MS. CARTER: Thank you. That 7 answers my question. 8 MR. FOX: Thank you, Member Carter. 9 Steven, can we go off the record very, very 10 quickly. 11 (Whereupon, a break was taken 12 after which the following 13 proceedings were had.) 14 MR. FOX: Ms. Vetterhoffer, I think 15 you had some follow-up questions for Ms. Davis and 16 we're in order for you to start with those. 17 MS. VETTERHOFFER: Thank you. Just 18 a couple. 19 Can you provide any specific 20 examples where US EPA or a third-party has pursued 21 an Illinois source for failure to comply with the 22 rule that's been amended at the state level and 23 pre-approved by US EPA? 24 MS. DRIVER: The -- if I can just

34

	Page
1	interject. Did you say pre-approved by US EPA?
2	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Informally
3	pre-approved by US EPA.
4	MR. DAVIS: Yeah, I don't have
5	anything handy. I'm happy to see if I can find
6	something, but I'm not aware of anything sitting
7	here right now.
8	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Okay. Can you
9	provide any specific instance when US EPA or
10	third-parties have pursued an Illinois source
11	based on non-compliance with the Emission
12	Reduction Market System rule?
13	MR. DAVIS: Again, that's something
14	I'm willing to look into, but I don't have
15	anything in front of me.
16	MS. VETTERHOFFER: This scenario
17	that IERG is saying it's concerned with where a
18	rule is adopted at the state level, it has a
19	compliance deadline in the rule and that rule has
20	to be submitted to US EPA for federal approval, in
21	Illinois that's a pretty common scenario, correct?
22	MR. DAVIS: It is a pretty common
23	scenario. I'd say more typically we see it where
24	the state requirement is more stringent than the

	Page 35
1	SIP that is currently in place. So compliance
2	with the state requirement often satisfies
3	whatever federal applicable requirements are also
4	in place and so in this instance it's a little
5	different because the state law would no longer
6	require obligations that the federal law would
7	continue to.
8	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Okay.
9	MR. DAVIS: But it is a common
10	occurrence that we have state regulatory
11	requirements that are submitted for federal
12	approval.
13	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Okay. How about
14	regulatory relief, in regulatory relief
15	proceedings sources ask the Board to give them
16	relief from regulations that are part of our SIP
17	and they ask for that relief immediately, your
18	claim that that puts sources in a compliance
19	conundrum, doesn't that same concern run to
20	sources asking for regulatory relief?
21	MR. DAVIS: I guess I don't have
22	enough information about the specifics as to
23	whether or not that that federal program
24	contemplates, you know, states being able to grant

	Page 36
1	regulatory relief. I'm aware of instances not in
2	the specific case, but in other cases where there
3	is an outstanding legal question as to whether or
4	not US EPA considers state-afforded regulatory
5	relief to be binding for federal all purposes. So
6	I think that is an outstanding issue that has come
7	up and it is a complicated one.
8	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Are you aware
9	that Illinois is required to submit SIP revisions
10	to the US EPA for federal approval if those
11	regulations are part of Illinois SIP?
12	MR. DAVIS: Yes, I I am aware
13	yes, we're required by the Clean Air Act to do so,
14	yes.
15	MS. VETTERHOFFER: Those are all my
16	questions right now.
17	MR. FOX: Thank you,
18	Ms. Vetterhoffer. Chairman Papadimitriu,
19	Member Carter, did you have any follow-up
20	questions for Mr. Davis?
21	MS. CARTER: I do not, Tim.
22	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: I do not, Tim.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. FOX: No, not at all.

	Page 37
1	Mr. Davis, that's exhausted the questions I had
2	and that the agency and the Board members have
3	had. So I think we can wrap up your testimony in
4	responses with a thank you for your appearance
5	this morning. We appreciate your illumination of
6	the record for us.
7	MR. DAVIS: Thank you for the
8	opportunity.
9	MR. FOX: Ms. Vetterhoffer,
10	Ms. Godiksen, you had mentioned having a witness
11	that we could swear in and if he or she is ready,
12	we can proceed to that.
13	Sir, although you're familiar to
14	us, if you would please tell us your full name and
15	prepare to be sworn in.
16	MR. ASSELMEIER: My name is David
17	Asselmeier and I go by the nickname of Buzz. I'm
18	a Manager of the Inventory and Data Support Unit
19	for the Air Quality Planning Section of the Bureau
20	of Air.
21	MR. FOX: That is a long title,
22	Mr. Asselmeier. If you'll if you're ready to
23	be sworn in, we will have the court reporter do
24	that and we can proceed.

,	Page 38
1	MR. ASSELMEIER: I'm ready.
2	WHEREUPON:
3	DAVID ASSELMEIER
4	called as a witness herein, having been first duly
5	sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:
6	MR. FOX: Mr. Asselmeier, you have,
7	of course, been sworn in. If you have some oral
8	testimony you'd like to provide to the board
9	today, please proceed with that.
10	MR. ASSELMEIER: The Illinois EPA
11	strongly opposes the Illinois Environmental
12	Regulatory Group, or IERG's, request that the
13	Board change the sunset date of the Emissions
14	Reduction Market System, or ERMS, program to the
15	earlier of 2021 or the date of the SIP submittal
16	as approved by US EPA.
17	IERG states that it and its
18	members are concerned that both because the ERMS
19	requirements will still be enforceable as SIP
20	requirements, unquote, which are federally
21	enforceable. That there is a period of time
22	between the Board adoption of a regulation and
23	federal approval, however, is not a new or novel
24	situation. It exists every time the Board amends

June 12, 2018

Page 39 1 a rule or grants regulatory relief from a rule 2 that is part of the State's Implementation Plan, 3 or SIP. 4 The agency has acknowledged that 5 the ERMS rule is technically federally enforceable 6 until US EPA approves the sunset into the SIP. 7 IERG's concern over the scenario, however, is 8 purely theoretical and has no practical basis. То 9 the agency's knowledge, neither US EPA nor 10 third-parties have ever pursued an Illinois source for failure to comply with the rule that had been 11 12 amended at the state level and pre-approved by the 13 US EPA. Further, to the agency's knowledge, 14 neither US EPA, nor third-parties, have ever 15 pursued an Illinois source based upon 16 non-compliance with ERMS. 17 Sources that remain concerned 18 with the SIP gap are met without options. From 19 permitting -- from a permitting perspective, as 20 the agency explained in post-hearing comments, 21 sources can submit applications for minor permit 22 modifications if you're a CAAPP source once the 23 rule is sunset, the benefit which confers 24 immediately upon application.

	Page
1	Further, if a source is
2	concerned with the possibility of non-compliance
3	with the SIP, it can continue to comply with the
4	ERMS rule until the SIP is approved. Sources
5	cannot obtain ATU's, but they certainly can emit
6	below their allowance allocations and submit to
7	the agency seasonal reports.
8	Adopting IERG's suggested
9	language is problematic. First, pushing the
10	effective date of the sunset to 2021 would
11	needlessly force approximately 180 Illinois
12	sources to continue to comply with the ERMS
13	program a program that no longer yields any
14	environmental benefit, and they would have to do
15	this for an additional three years and they would
16	also force the Illinois EPA to continue
17	implementing the program for that additional time
18	as well.
19	Second, it fails to establish a
20	date certain for the sunset of the ERMS program
21	leaving sources and the agency with uncertain
22	obligations. There is no guarantee as to when US
23	EPA will approve the sunset into Illinois' SIP.
24	Next, IERG's proposal would make the effectiveness

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

e 40

June 12, 2018

	Page 4
1	of Illinois regulations contingent on something
2	the agency and Board have no control over, that is
3	approval from US EPA. US EPA would determine
4	whether and when the ERMS program is sunset
5	undermining the Board's authority.
6	Fourth, IERG's language is based
7	upon speculation that the SIP will be approved by
8	the beginning of the ozone season in 2021. Should
9	it not be approved by that date, IERG's claimed
10	concern remains unaddressed as the rule will
11	sunset before the SIP is approved.
12	Furthermore, extending the
13	sunset in the manner IERG suggests with the
14	uncertainty over the timing of US EPA's approval
15	and the related sunset of the program is contrary
16	to the agency's efforts and the administration's
17	directive to streamline unnecessary regulations.
18	On a broader scale, if the Board
19	finds that the rule cannot sunset until the SIP is
20	approved, this would impact not only the Board's
21	ability to set compliance dates as it has since
22	its inception, but also the agency's ability to
23	meet federal obligations which may include
24	specified compliance deadlines. You can also

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292 Page 41

June 12, 2018

	Page 42
1	<pre>implicate implicate and delay source's request</pre>
2	for regulatory relief from SIP-approved
3	regulations which are, likewise, subject to
4	federal approval.
5	This SIP approval process and
6	the related gap of time between the Board's
7	adoption of regulations and federal approvals has
8	been in place for decades. IERG's concerns are
9	misplaced and they have no nexus to tangible
10	issues that have been incurred in Illinois because
11	of this process. Implementing IERG's suggestions
12	could have unattended implications for the Board,
13	the agency and sources, not only in this
14	rulemaking, but in future actions. The Board
15	should, therefore, reject IERG's request and adopt
16	a sunset date of April 30, 2018, as proposed by
17	the Illinois EPA. And that's all I have there.
18	MR. FOX: Thank you for your
19	testimony, Mr. Asselmeier. If you're ready to
20	proceed with questions, I suspect we can begin
21	with Ms. Driver on behalf of IERG if she, in fact,
22	has any.
23	MS. DRIVER: I do. Thank you. I
24	understand, Mr. Asselmeier, you may not be able to

	Page
1	answer these right away.
2	MR. ASSELMEIER: I'm more the
3	technical side person. So, yes.
4	MS. DRIVER: I'm just going to put
5	them out there and the agency can decide how they
6	want to respond.
7	I think I heard you say, correct
8	me if I'm wrong, that in this interim period ERMS
9	sources could still comply with the ERMS program
10	and I think I understood you to say that we could
11	do so by emitting below our allocation. Could you
12	explain that?
13	MR. ASSELMEIER: I'll try to be
14	quick here with the ERMS explanation of the
15	allotment and how that works. Every year a source
16	gets an allotment of a certain number of ATU's and
17	that differs between different sources. That is
18	based upon the historical baseline of emissions.
19	If the source has emissions that state under that
20	allotment they are not required to trade, not
21	required to buy ATU's, do anything, they're fine.
22	They're in compliance with the ERMS rule. If
23	their emissions are above their allotment or the
24	number of ATU's they hold, they can certainly buy

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

43

Page 44 1 ATU's with the rule to cover those additional 2 emissions. 3 That, in itself, is not a 4 violation that is part of the functioning of the 5 ERMS provision. Even not having enough at the end of the year is not a compliance issue. 6 There is a 7 mechanism that the rule states. So by Ms. Driver 8 saying that if a source emits less than their 9 annual allotment, they are in compliance, they have no issues, nothing needs to be done for 10 obtaining the additional ATU's, everything is 11 12 fine. Does that explain too much? 13 MS. DRIVER: No. No. Thank you. My follow-up question to that is if they have not 14 15 been given an allotment by the agency for 2018, 16 they don't have anything to work from for 2018? 17 MR. ASSELMEIER: Not completely 18 correct. Their permit does say what their 19 allotment is per year, which, to me, just the 20 physical process of saying push the button to give the actual ATU's is maybe a technicality where the 21 22 permit that is in force still allows them to have 23 those ATU's. So it may be more of a legal 24 question as to the technicality of that, but

	Page 45
1	they're guaranteed those by the permit.
2	MS. DRIVER: Even though the agency
3	hasn't actually issued them?
4	MR. ASSELMEIER: Correct. Yes.
5	MS. DRIVER: Interesting. If I can
6	have just a moment, Mr. Hearing Officer.
7	MR. FOX: Please go ahead,
8	Ms. Driver.
9	MS. DRIVER: Thank you for those few
10	minutes.
11	MR. FOX: Not at all, Ms. Driver.
12	If you have anything you'd like to proceed with,
13	go ahead.
14	MS. DRIVER: Thank you. Just a
15	couple of things. Mr. Asselmeier, kind of
16	continuing with this concept about the ERMS
17	program kind of operating itself for lack of a
18	better description of it, we talked about a
19	situation where sources would be emitting less
20	than their ATU allotment and in your understanding
21	of why that's okay.
22	If sources find themselves now
23	in the ERMS ozone season, which we are right now,
24	and understanding now that they don't have an ATU

	Page 46
1	allotment and let's say their emissions are above
2	their allotment for a year, typically they could
3	go out and purchase ATU's on the market?
4	MR. ASSELMEIER: Correct.
5	MS. DRIVER: Right. If a source
6	found themselves themselves in that situation
7	this season, how would the kind of
8	self-implementation of the program handle that
9	kind of situation where somebody is having to go
10	out and purchase to cover their emissions?
11	MR. ASSELMEIER: That is where our
12	interpretation on why we had our sunset date is we
13	would not be even worrying about a situation like
14	that or even a case where your emissions are under
15	the allotment, that we were not requiring sources
16	to true up at the end of this current ozone season
17	based upon the sunset date we had picked.
18	MS. DRIVER: So your position would
19	be then that sources wouldn't have to go out on
20	the market to cover?
21	MR. ASSELMEIER: If the rule is
22	sunset by the appropriate date, yes, correct.
23	MS. DRIVER: I think my final area
24	for today on what you testified to,

	Page 47
1	Mr. Asselmeier, has to do with the situation you
2	talked about with submitting modifications to
3	permits and you talked about those being effective
4	immediately upon application, did I get that
5	right?
6	MR. ASSELMEIER: That is what I
7	read.
8	MS. DRIVER: Okay.
9	MR. ASSELMEIER: That is it
10	depends on what the question is. That is
11	something I might not be able to answer.
12	MS. DRIVER: Sure. Sure. I guess
13	one thing I would just refer back to the agency's
14	May 17th filing after the hearing and I can show
15	that to you if that would be helpful. I'll show
16	you the agency's version. Here we go.
17	Mr. Hearing Officer, I'm looking
18	at the agency's response to the Illinois Pollution
19	Control Board and Illinois Environmental
20	Regulatory Group's questions regarding the sunset.
21	This was filed by the agency on May 17th.
22	MR. FOX: Very good. I was just
23	about to ask you that, Ms. Driver.
24	MS. DRIVER: If you look at starting

	Page 48
1	on page one, question three is where this begins,
2	but the meat of what I'm looking at is on page
3	two. At the very top of that page, I'll just read
4	this to make the record clear. This is the
5	agency's response. "Any source with a CAAPP
6	permit that is concerned about having ERMS
7	requirements in that permit can submit an
8	application for minor modification to the Illinois
9	EPA Bureau of Air permit section after the US EPA
10	approves the change in Illinois SIP."
11	So my question, Mr. Asselmeier,
12	is I'm sensing maybe a little lack of clarity in
13	what you stated today versus what's in the record
14	here and if the agency would like to clarify that
15	on the record, we'd certainly be interested in
16	hearing the clarification about the timing.
17	MR. ASSELMEIER: We can address that
18	in post-hearing. That's nothing I can answer
19	right now.
20	MS. DRIVER: Sure. Thank you,
21	Mr. Fox.
22	MR. FOX: Absolutely, Ms. Driver. I
23	don't mean to overlook you, Madam Chair Member
24	Carter, but I want to launch right off the

June 12, 2018

1 question that Ms. Driver just asked. 2 Mr. Asselmeier, I don't think I've heard the 3 answer to this specific question, but please 4 correct me if I'm wrong. 5 Is there any procedure through 6 which an ERMS source could apply for a permit 7 modification after hypothetically the Board adopts 8 a sunset date, but while the SIP revision is being 9 considered by US EPA? And I guess what I'm 10 driving at, is there anything a source could do to address the issue that IERG had raised by having 11 12 an application for a permit modification pending? 13 MR. ASSELMEIER: That, again, is one 14 I cannot answer myself. 15 MR. FOX: Very good. If we could 16 have the agency address that in post-hearing 17 comments --18 MR. ASSELMEIER: Right. MR. FOX: -- the deadline for which 19 20 we'll discuss in just a few minutes, I'd 21 appreciate it. I do have one question about minor 22 modifications generally and I realize that each 23 applicant and each permit are different, but in 24 your mind, is there an amount of time that it is

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

Page 49

	Page 50
1	typical for the agency to review and decide on an
2	application for a minor permit modification?
3	MR. ASSELMEIER: Me, specifically,
4	since I am not in the permit section, I do not
5	know. I am aware of certain deadlines for like an
6	administrative amendment. I don't know what that
7	is. So I do not know if the same schedules apply
8	to different types of modifications to permits,
9	but that is something we can look into.
10	MR. FOX: And I appreciate if you
11	could reflect that in post-hearing comments. I
12	have one other related question.
13	Has the agency considered any
14	specific sort of plan or strategy that would
15	identify sources with an ERMS condition in their
16	permits to notify them with the hope of perhaps
17	expediting the permit modification proceeding
18	procedure?
19	MR. ASSELMEIER: We have not done
20	one to my knowledge at this time, but since with
21	me running the ERMS database I do have the contact
22	names and addresses all readily available so that
23	would help.
24	MR. FOX: You had referred,

June 12, 2018

	Page 51
1	Mr. Asselmeier, to a pre-approval on the part of
2	US EPA that they have, I understand based on the
3	record so far submitted to the Board, at least
4	examined preliminarily the proposal that the
5	agency made to the Board.
6	Do you have any anything in
7	writing, any determination or any written response
8	that the agency could submit into the record that
9	reflects the US EPA's position on the proposal
10	that is before the Board?
11	MR. ASSELMEIER: I do not know
12	specifically, but I will check with my manager,
13	David Bloomberg, to see if he did receive anything
14	from US EPA. We'll take a look and, if so, we'll
15	present it.
16	MR. FOX: I appreciate your
17	willingness to do that, Mr. Asselmeier.
18	Chairman Papadimitriu,
19	Member Carter, do you have any questions for the
20	agency at this point?
21	MS. PAPADIMITRIU: No, Tim.
22	MR. FOX: Very good. Ms. Driver, we
23	can check quickly with you and see if you have any
24	additional follow-up questions?

52

	Page
1	MS. DRIVER: We're good. Thank you.
2	MR. FOX: Very good. I think we
3	have exhausted the testimony, the oral testimony,
4	that we have had here today. I think we can
5	quickly address the issue of public comments.
6	We have one person who has
7	joined us here today. Did you wish to offer
8	comment to the Board today? She is plainly
9	indicating that she does not and our sign-in sheet
10	for comments here in Chicago is blank. Is there
11	anyone in Springfield, in our Springfield
12	location, that wishes to offer public comment to
13	the Board on this proposal? I'm not seeing or
14	hearing any response, so we will proceed very
15	quickly with the issue of the Economic Impact
16	Study. Forgive me while I read from my script.
17	Section 27(b) of the
18	Environmental Protection Act provides that the
19	Board must request that the Department of Commerce
20	and Economic Opportunity conduct an Economic
21	Impact Study of proposed rules before the Board
22	adopts them. The Board then must make either the
23	study or the department's explanation for not
24	conducting one available to the public at least 20

June 12, 2018

	Page 53
1	days before a public hearing. In a letter dated
2	March 22nd, 2018, the Board's chairman, Katie
3	Papadimitriu, requested that DCEO conduct such a
4	study and the Board specifically requested a
5	response no later than May 7th of 2018.
6	The Board has received no
7	response from DCEO to this request. Is there
8	anyone who wishes to testify regarding the Board's
9	request for a study or DCEO's response? Neither
10	seeing nor hearing any, again, is there anyone who
11	wishes to offer any sworn testimony or a comment
12	today? Neither seeing nor hearing any person who
13	does, we can go off the record for a moment and we
14	can discuss the issue of post-hearing comment and
15	other procedural issues.
16	(Whereupon, a break was taken
17	after which the following
18	proceedings were had.)
19	MR. FOX: We have gone off the
20	record very briefly to discuss some procedural
21	issues and I want to report that copies of the
22	transcript of the second hearing are expected to
23	be available to the Board by Thursday, June 14th.
24	Once it's filed with the Board, of course, we will

June 12, 2018

Page 54 1 place the transcript promptly on the Board's 2 website under this Docket No. R18-22. 3 Before it takes action on the 4 agency's proposal, the Board will hold open a 5 post-hearing comment period ending on Tuesday, July 3rd of 2018. Those post-hearing comments, of 6 7 course, must be filed electronically with the 8 Board and, like the transcript, will be placed 9 right away on the Board's website under this 10 docket number. 11 Are there any other matters on 12 the record that the participants wish to address 13 this morning? That concludes our second and final 14 hearing with particular thanks to the witnesses 15 and their help in developing our record. We 16 appreciate your time and your information. We are 17 adjourned. Thank you, all, very much. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

	Page 55
1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS.
3	COUNTY OF COOK)
4	
5	I, Steven Brickey, Certified Shorthand
6	Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in
7	shorthand the proceedings had at the trial
8	aforesaid, and that the foregoing is a true,
9	complete and correct transcript of the proceedings
10	of said trial as appears from my stenographic
11	notes so taken and transcribed under my personal
12	direction.
13	Witness my official signature in and for
14	Cook County, Illinois, on this day of
15	, A.D., 2018.
16	
17	
18	NOTC4.
19	E Pana
20	Step Bil
21	STEVEN BRICKEY, CSR 8 West Monroe Street
22	Suite 2007 Chicago, Illinois 60603
23	Phone: (312) 419-9292 CSR No. 084-004675
24	

Page 56

				rage 50
A	42:7	1:4	42:7	authority 31:5 41:5
A.D 55:15	adopts 49:7 52:22	amends 38:24	approve 10:2 11:8	available 5:22
a.m 1:10	advocate 8:12	amount 9:9 21:7	15:19 40:23	50:22 52:24 53:23
ability 41:21,22	affect 22:21 29:23	25:21,23 49:24	approved 10:9 30:6	avoid 4:9 15:24
able 7:17 26:17	aforesaid 55:8	analogous 27:15	38:16 40:4 41:7,9	awaits 29:17
31:10 35:24 42:24	agencies 32:8	analogy 28:5	41:11,20	aware 34:6 36:1,8
47:11	agency 6:4 9:5 11:7	ANNET 2:7	approves 13:1,9	36:12 50:5
above-cited 14:3	12:11,17,19 13:5	annual 10:22 13:21	39:6 48:10	
absolutely 12:6	15:14 16:24 25:4	24:9,18 44:9	approving 13:17	B
20:15 48:22	28:9,12,13,24	answer 6:8 16:12	approximately 5:4	Bachelor 8:23
accept 5:19 7:17	29:13,15 31:14	25:18 26:3,7	16:9 40:11	back 21:23 22:7
acknowledged	32:14 37:2 39:4	32:17 43:1 47:11	April 4:17 15:12	24:1 30:1 47:13
10:15 39:4	39:20 40:7,21	48:18 49:3,14	20:11,13 21:11,14	background 4:11
Act 10:18 30:2,4	41:2 42:13 43:5	answered 18:5,14	21:22 22:6,14	based 5:23 34:11
36:13 52:18	44:15 45:2 47:21	19:4	23:12,13 42:16	39:15 41:6 43:18
action 20:17 21:23	48:14 49:16 50:1	answers 32:16 33:7	area 16:18 17:23	46:17 51:2
22:9,19 24:5 30:8	50:13 51:5,8,20	antidotically 21:6	46:23	baseline 43:18
30:11,13 54:3	agency's 39:9,13	appearance 37:4	array 8:19	basically 27:24
actions 42:14	41:16,22 47:13,16	appears 55:10	arrive 23:14	basis 27:13 39:8
activities 20:21	47:18 48:5 54:4	applicable 9:9 12:9	asked 12:7,11 49:1	bear 3:21
actual 44:21	agree 22:17	12:13 13:2,20,23	asking 22:7 35:20	bearing 17:21
addition 3:15	agrees 27:10	14:15 23:4 27:2	aspects 26:23 29:16	beginning 41:8
addition 3.15 additional 4:8 14:4	ahead 7:8,20 12:3	30:12 35:3	Asselmeier 2:7 6:5	begins 48:1
19:14 28:9 40:15	28:21 32:5 45:7	applicant 49:23	6:21 37:16,17,22	behalf 7:8 8:12
40:17 44:1,11	45:13	application 12:23	38:1,3,6,10 42:19	18:9 26:10 42:21
51:24	Air 1:4 10:18 12:24	25:22 39:24 47:4	42:24 43:2,13	believe 6:5 16:22
Additionally 13:19	30:2,4 36:13	48:8 49:12 50:2	44:17 45:4,15	21:5 29:13
address 24:17	37:19,20 48:9	applications 39:21	46:4,11,21 47:1,6	believes 15:3
26:17 48:17 49:11	Alec 2:8 5:8 7:11	applies 17:22	47:9 48:11,17	benefit 9:19 11:24
49:16 52:5 54:12	8:4	apply 11:17 13:3	49:2,13,18 50:3	23:1 39:23 40:14
addresses 50:22	Alisa 2:3 3:15	15:11 26:12 49:6	50:19 51:1,11,17	better 24:4 45:18
adjourn 6:16	allocation 43:11	50:7	assessment 22:17	bigger 25:2
adjourned 54:17	allocations 40:6	appreciate 7:2 37:5	assigned 3:12	binding 26:20 36:5
adjusting 15:4,7	allotment 9:8 43:15	49:21 50:10 51:16	assuming 22:1	bit 24:7 25:17
Adm 1:4 3:5	43:16,20,23 44:9	54:16	assure 31:6	blank 52:10
administration's	44:15,19 45:20	appreciates 14:4,20	attempt 6:8 13:11	Bloomberg 51:13
41:16	46:1,2,15	approach 9:16	attempting 13:14	board 1:1,8 2:2,3
administrative	allowance 40:6	appropriate 46:22	attorney 8:15	3:2,6,9,12,13,22
50:6	allowing 15:18	approval 15:13	ATU 45:20,24	4:12,14,19,19,21
admitted 3:20	allows 44:22	19:24 20:9 23:14	ATU's 9:8 10:5,10	5:2,5,14,18 6:14
adopt 24:12 42:15	amended 33:22	26:4 29:17 30:4	11:10 40:5 43:16	7:16,20 10:1
adopted 13:5,20	39:12	34:20 35:12 36:10	43:21,24 44:1,11	11:20 13:5,20
22:13 34:18	amendment 3:5	38:23 41:3,14	44:21,23 46:3	15:8,22 20:6
Adopting 40:8	50:6	42:4,5	audible 7:1	21:23 22:2,7,13
adoption 38:22	AMENDMENTS	approvals 21:5	authorities 32:23	24:12 28:7 35:15
•	l		l	

Page 57

37:2 38:8,13,22	46:14	claimed 41:9	complicating 23:23	continue 13:8
38:24 41:2,18	cases 36:2	clarification 48:16	comply 23:5 27:1	15:17 22:15 23:6
42:12,14 47:19	caught 27:22	clarify 18:16 19:16	33:21 39:11 40:3	28:1 35:7 40:3,12
49:7 51:3,5,10	cause 1:7	19:21 48:14	40:12 43:9	40:16
52:8,13,19,21,22	center 3:10	clarity 48:12	complying 24:23	continuing 45:16
53:4,6,23,24 54:4	certain 20:20 29:16	Clean 10:18 30:2,4	27:19	contrary 41:15
54:8	40:20 43:16 50:5	36:13	concept 45:16	control 1:1,8 3:2
Board's 3:11,16,18	certainly 40:5	clear 3:24 4:6 48:4	concern 10:3 11:14	11:20 41:2 47:19
5:8 41:5,20 42:6	43:24 48:15	clearly 4:7 5:20	18:3 29:22 35:19	conundrum 35:19
53:2,8 54:1,9	certainty 19:7 23:7	clerk's 5:11	39:7 41:10	Cook 55:3,14
bodies 29:22	certification 24:10	close 16:19	concerned 12:21	copies 53:21
break 33:11 53:16	24:19,22,22 25:1	Code 1:5 3:5	27:19 29:20 34:17	corporate 30:22
breaking 27:18	certifications 10:23	coextensive 19:23	38:18 39:17 40:2	correct 6:10 12:19
Brenda 2:2 3:13	13:21,22 14:14	come 4:2 18:24	48:6	18:24 22:19 29:14
Brickey 1:8 55:5,20	24:10	21:20,23 28:16	concerns 11:19	29:19 34:21 43:7
briefly 6:22 53:20	Certified 55:5	36:6	14:8,24 17:2,6	44:18 45:4 46:4
broader 41:18	certify 14:16 24:14	comes 23:7	18:13 23:17 25:12	46:22 49:4 55:9
buffer 24:4	55:6	coming 22:7	25:12 42:8	correlation 29:12
built 23:20	certifying 13:24	commencing 1:10	concluded 6:15	counsel 8:7,17 26:2
Bureau 12:24	26:17	comment 6:13 52:8	concludes 16:1	County 55:3,14
37:19 48:9	Chair 48:23	52:12 53:11,14	28:14 54:13	couple 20:5 31:14
Bureau's 8:16,18	chairman 2:2 3:11	54:5	conclusion 24:21	33:18 45:15
business 8:12 30:23	7:24 28:8,20	comments 16:21	26:16 28:17	course 4:5,14 20:10
businesses 32:24	31:17 36:18 51:18	39:20 49:17 50:11	condition 11:1	38:7 53:24 54:7
33:1	53:2	52:5,10 54:6	50:15	court 4:5 7:2 37:23
button 44:20	Champaign 8:23	Commerce 52:19	conditions 11:4	cover 44:1 46:10,20
buy 43:21,24	change 13:1 22:7	Commission 32:22	24:23	create 26:24
Buzz 2:7 37:17	22:16 24:7 25:17	common 25:23	conduct 52:20 53:3	created 15:1
	26:8 30:13 38:13	34:21,22 35:9	conducting 52:24	crux 28:3
C	48:10	community 8:13	confer 26:1	CSR 1:8 55:20,23
C 2:1	changes 12:8,12	9:24	confers 28:12 39:23	current 8:11 15:2
CAAPP 10:18,22	characterization	complete 3:24	confirm 17:4 32:15	46:16
10:24 11:1 12:20	21:12	10:11 32:17 55:9	confirmed 12:17	currently 35:1
13:21 15:21 25:20	characterize 17:12	completely 44:17	conflating 25:5	
39:22 48:5	check 31:16 51:12	compliance 10:23	consensus 23:5	D
CAAPP's 14:14	51:23	10:24 13:24 14:16	consider 15:9,22	Dana 2:8 18:9
called 1:8 7:12 38:4	Chicago 1:9 3:14	14:19 19:14 24:15	considered 49:9	Data 37:18
capacity 8:17	4:5,17 7:1 16:17	24:19,22 25:6	50:13	database 50:21
career 8:21	17:23 28:7 52:10	26:18 27:2 29:10	considers 36:4	date 10:3 15:8,12
Carter 2:2 3:14 8:1	55:22	29:11,12,20 30:18	consistent 18:20	20:10,13,24 21:2
28:8 31:24 32:4,5	choice 27:24	31:9 32:20 34:19	consulted 19:11	21:19,24 22:8,14
32:6,12 33:6,8	circumstances	35:1,18 41:21,24	contact 50:21	25:21 38:13,15
36:19,21 48:24	23:15	43:22 44:6,9	contemplates 35:24	40:10,20 41:9
51:19	cited 27:6	compliant 14:14	contexts 33:5	42:16 46:12,17,22
case 29:18 36:2	claim 35:18	complicated 36:7	contingent 41:1	49:8
		-	Ŭ	

				Page 58
dated 53:1	deposeth 7:13 38:5	44:13 45:2,5,8,9	25:7,9 27:8 29:10	19:13 24:10 27:8
dates 20:20 24:1	description 45:18	45:11,14 46:5,18	29:11 30:18 31:4	38:14,18 39:5,16
41:21	designated 5:7	46:23 47:8,12,23	31:5	40:4,12,20 41:4
David 37:16 38:3	detail 10:23	47:24 48:20,22	enforcing 29:15	43:8,9,14,22 44:5
51:13	determination	49:1 51:22 52:1	ensure 31:8	45:16,23 48:6
Davis 2:8 5:8,20	25:22 51:7	driving 49:10	entire 18:19 19:5	49:6 50:15,21
6:3,20,23 7:4,6,8	determine 18:10	due 9:19	entities 30:16	especially 6:17
7:11,14,23 8:4	41:3	duly 7:12 38:4	entitled 1:7 3:4	establish 40:19
12:2,6 16:3,11,15	develop 3:23	duration 22:16	environmental	event 24:11
16:22 17:7,18	developing 8:9		4:21 5:6 8:6,8,10	exact 16:21 17:4
18:22,23 19:20	54:15	E	8:13,15,19 9:4,19	exactly 23:15
20:5,15 21:16	deviations 10:21	E 2:1,1	11:7,21 15:14	examined 51:4
22:10,18,23 23:18	different 25:6	earlier 38:15	30:21 32:10,13	examples 33:20
24:7,20 25:17	26:22,23 27:11	Economic 52:15,20	33:4 38:11 40:14	Exchange 32:22
26:1,7,14 27:4,12	30:21 35:5 43:17	52:20	47:19 52:18	executive 5:8 8:5
28:4,10,22 29:4,7	49:23 50:8	effect 20:9 22:15	environments	exhausted 37:1
29:24 31:12,19	differs 43:17	24:14	32:19	52:3
32:9,15 33:15	direct 10:6	effective 13:6 15:12	EPA 9:5,17 10:1,4	exhausts 28:6
34:4,13,22 35:9	directed 4:24	20:18 26:20 40:10	10:4,7,14 11:5,7	exist 32:19
35:21 36:12,20	direction 55:12	47:3	11:15,19 12:24,24	exists 38:24
37:1,7	directive 41:17	effectiveness 40:24	13:9,11,15 14:5	expand 12:20
Davis' 5:15 18:11	director 5:8 8:5	efficient 9:16	14:10 15:6,7,18	expect 28:5
day 1:9 55:14	disagree 27:13	effort 14:20	18:10 20:17 22:3	expectations 21:9
days 53:1	disagrees 27:10	efforts 9:23 41:16	22:4,18 23:14	expected 53:22
DCEO 53:3,7	discretion 31:4	either 20:9 52:22	26:13,19 27:7	expediting 50:17
DCEO's 53:9	discuss 17:8 25:3	electronically 54:7	29:17 30:3,6,8,13	explain 13:22 14:13
deadline 5:3,16	49:20 53:14,20	element 27:8	30:17 32:21 33:20	20:12 24:13 43:12
21:11 23:12 34:19	discussed 15:5	emission 9:20	33:23 34:1,3,9,20	44:12
49:19	discussing 5:16	34:11	36:4,10 38:10,16	explained 39:20
deadlines 11:10	29:3	emissions 1:5 3:5	39:6,9,13,14	explanation 14:6
23:20 41:24 50:5	discussion 21:20	9:11,16 11:22	40:16,23 41:3,3	43:14 52:23
deal 32:24	discussions 26:14	38:13 43:18,19,23	42:17 48:9,9 49:9	explored 26:11
dealings 33:1	displace 6:22	44:2 46:1,10,14	51:2,14	express 14:23
decades 9:17 42:8	distinct 25:5	emit 40:5	EPA's 9:23 10:2	expressed 9:4 17:1
decide 43:5 50:1	distinction 25:14	emits 44:8	14:6,20 15:23	17:5,16,24 18:3
decision 4:1	29:10 30:18	emitting 43:11	19:24 20:9 41:14	18:13,19 20:16
definitive 16:12	dive 20:7	45:19	51:9	23:16
delay 42:1	docket 3:6 54:2,10	encourages 10:1	ERMS 9:3,6,7,14	extending 41:12
deliberative 17:9	doctorate 8:23	enforce 11:16	9:14,18,23 10:16	extension 20:14
demonstrated 9:18	document 5:6 14:3	13:12	11:2,4,8,9,14	extent 20:21 25:19
denied 28:24	doing 31:1,6	enforceable 10:17	12:10,21 13:3,6	31:9
Department 52:19	drive 20:21	13:8 14:9 30:16	13:19,22,24 14:7	extremely 13:11
department's 52:23	Driver 2:6 18:4,14	38:19,21 39:5	14:8,11,13,15,17	F
depends 24:24	19:16 33:24 42:21	enforced 27:22 enforcement 14:11	14:23 15:18,19,21	facilities 16:17 19:6
47:10	42:23 43:4 44:7	enforcement 14.11	16:1,10 18:12	Tacinities 10.1 / 19.0
	l	l	l	l

Page 59

facility 9:21	44:12	Furthermore 41:12	guaranteed 45:1	identify 50:15
facility's 9:9	fingertips 26:8	future 42:14	guess 35:21 47:12	IEPA 4:12 16:7
fact 20:18 21:18	finished 31:20		49:9	20:14 24:8 25:21
24:2 42:21	first 4:18 6:6 7:12	G		26:11 27:9
factoring 31:3	12:10 15:16 19:3	gap 12:14 13:16	<u> </u>	IEPA's 4:20
factors 23:23	20:7,11 38:4 40:9	39:18 42:6	half 16:13,14	IERG 4:22 7:9 8:6
fails 40:19	follow-up 31:14	general 8:7,17	handle 46:8	8:12 9:2,6,12,14
failure 33:21 39:11	33:15 36:19 44:14	32:11,21	handled 12:9,13	9:22 10:1 12:11
fair 20:6 21:12	51:24	generally 22:12	handy 26:3 34:5	14:4,6,20,22 15:3
familiar 37:13	following 15:9	23:16,16 49:22	happy 16:2 34:5	15:5,8,21 16:10
far 21:4 23:20 51:3	33:12 53:17	geographic 19:6	hate 6:21	16:16,23 17:24
Farm 8:16,18	follows 7:13 29:11	Geological 8:22	head 3:10 6:23	18:11 19:5,11
fashion 17:14	29:12 38:5	geology 8:24	heard 18:18 19:3,8	20:8 25:19 26:10
February 4:13	footprint 19:6	getting 27:22	43:7 49:2	27:10,19 29:20
federal 13:18 14:10	force 30:7 40:11,16	give 35:15 44:20	hearing 1:7 3:2,3	30:19 32:6 34:17
23:8 26:21 27:2,8	44:22	given 12:18 17:11	3:17 4:2,18,23 5:1	38:17 41:13 42:21
27:20 28:2 30:7	foregoing 55:8	17:13 44:15	5:3,10,13,17 6:2,6	49:11
30:14,15 34:20	forget 28:15	go 7:8,20 12:2	6:20 8:2 10:4,7,8	IERG's 9:6 12:7
35:3,6,11,23 36:5	Forgive 52:16	28:21 32:5 33:9	10:15 11:5,13	14:18 15:24 17:2
36:10 38:23 41:23	form 17:13	37:17 45:7,13	12:10,18 13:10	18:21 20:12 23:13
42:4,7	found 23:22 46:6	46:3,9,19 47:16	18:4 45:6 47:14	24:16 38:12 39:7
federally 10:16	Fourth 41:6	53:13	47:17 48:16 52:14	40:8,24 41:6,9
13:8 23:3 38:20	Fox 1:8 2:3 3:1,3	Godiksen 2:7 6:5	53:1,10,12,22	42:8,11,15
39:5	6:11 7:7,14 8:2	6:10,21 16:5,8,14	54:14	III 1:4 3:5
feds 21:22 22:8	12:2 16:3 18:7,17	16:20,23 17:15	hearings 4:14,15	Illinois 1:1,8,9,9
24:4	20:4 21:10 22:10	18:2,7 19:11,17	heavily 30:19	3:2 4:18,21 5:5
feel 21:18	22:20 23:11 24:6	19:19 20:2,4	held 1:7 4:19 12:11	8:5,8,11,14,16,22
felt 21:24	25:16 26:6 27:4	28:18 37:10	hello 28:22	9:1,4,5,17,23 10:1
FESOP 10:17 11:1	28:4,15,20 31:13	going 18:5 22:11	help 3:23 4:6 20:21	10:2,4,4,7,14 11:5
13:3 25:20	31:16,22 32:2	25:16 26:1 27:21	50:23 54:15	11:15,18,20,21
FESOP's 15:20	33:8,14 36:17,24	43:4	helpful 6:21,23	12:15,23 13:1,10
FESOP/CAAPP	37:9,21 38:6	good 3:1 7:7,23	12:5 20:24 21:8	13:13 14:5,6,10
14:11	42:18 45:7,11	22:10 28:23 30:23	47:15	14:12,20 15:6,7
filed 4:12 11:23	47:22 48:21,22	31:22 47:22 49:15	historical 43:18	15:15,23 16:9
24:8 47:21 53:24	49:15,19 50:10,24	51:22 52:1,2	hold 8:23 9:8 10:10	18:9 22:3 27:7
54:7	51:16,22 52:2	governed 3:17	43:24 54:4	30:17 33:21 34:10
filing 19:10 47:14	53:19	grant 35:24	holding 11:10	34:21 36:9,11
filings 5:10	frank 21:16	grants 39:1	hope 23:18 24:3	38:10,11 39:10,15
final 46:23 54:13	front 21:4 34:15	great 16:8,11 25:16	50:16	40:11,16 41:1
finalize 22:2	full 37:14	30:1 32:9	hour 1:10	42:10,17 47:18,19
finalizing 13:16	functioning 44:4	Group 4:22 5:6 8:6	hours 5:12	48:8,10 55:1,14
find 21:21 22:6	further 10:7 11:19	8:8,15 38:12	hypothetical 26:9	55:22
25:4 34:5 45:22	12:4 14:6,12	Group's 11:21	hypothetically 49:7	Illinois' 8:12 40:23
finds 41:19	23:11 28:18 31:18	47:20	<u> </u>	illumination 37:5
fine 26:7 43:21	39:13 40:1	guarantee 40:22	i	immediately 35:17
	l		l	

Page 60

r				raye oo
39:24 47:4	internally 12:18	lack 24:4 45:17	51:12	minutes 45:10
impact 41:20 52:15	25:3	48:12	manner 41:13	49:20
52:21	interpretation	LADONNA 2:6	March 4:15,16	misplaced 42:9
Implementation	46·12	language 40:9 41:6	53:2	misspoken 29:19
11:8 15:15 19:24	interruption 3:8	launch 48:24	market 1:5 3:6	misstated 18:22
30:5,7,9,14 39:2	introductions 3:9	law 26:21 27:18,20	11:23 34:12 38:14	modification 11:17
		,		
implementing	Inventory 37:18	28:2 30:8,11,14	46:3,20	12:23 25:20 26:12
40:17 42:11	issue 18:1 25:2,3	30:15 35:5,6	materials 9:10	29:1,1 48:8 49:7
implicate 42:1,1	28:3 29:3 36:6	laws 8:10,20	matter 1:3 17:20	49:12 50:2,17
implications 42:12	44:6 49:11 52:5	lead 3:12	30:22	modifications
important 20:20	52:15 53:14	leaves 14:6	matters 5:16 32:11	39:22 47:2 49:22
25:14	issued 10:5 45:3	leaving 40:21	32:13 54:11	50:8
incentive 21:12,14	issues 14:21 20:22	left 3:13,15	mean 19:17 23:18	modify 30:8
inception 9:15	25:5,13 42:10	legal 8:21 24:21	24:20 25:10 27:17	moment 45:6 53:13
41:22	44:10 53:15,21	36:3 44:23	29:24 32:10,10	Monroe 55:21
include 41:23		legally 26:20	48:23	months 22:2,3
including 8:19	$\frac{J}{J}$	legislation 8:13	meat 48:2	morning 3:1 7:24
incorrect 29:14	jaywalkers 27:16	let's 20:23 46:1	mechanism 44:7	28:23 37:5 54:13
incurred 42:10	jaywalking 27:15	letter 53:1	meet 41:23	move 21:24
indicated 6:4 32:4	27:17,18 28:5	level 13:7,17,18	member 2:2,3 3:12	moving 7:2
indicating 52:9	joined 52:7	33:22 34:18 39:12	3:13 8:1 19:5	multiple 16:17
industries 8:9	Journal 4:16	liabilities 33:2	28:8 32:4,5 33:8	
30:20	judgment 22:21	likelihood 25:8	36:19 48:23 51:19	<u> </u>
Informally 34:2	July 54:6	27:21 31:3	members 3:22 8:18	N 2:1
information 3:19	June 1:9 53:23	likewise 42:3	9:6,6,12 14:7,18	name 3:3 8:4 37:14
14:4 21:4 35:22	juris 8:23	lingering 14:7	14:22 15:24 16:10	37:16
54:16		little 7:1 24:7 35:4	16:16 17:5,11,17	names 50:22
informed 15:6	<u> </u>	48:12	17:18 18:3,11	nature 33:2
17:23	Katie 2:2 3:11 53:2	Liu 2:3 3:15	19:2,18 23:1	necessarily 21:17
innovative 9:15	kind 21:8 26:9	location 52:12	25:11,19 26:11	25:10 26:15 27:20
instance 17:11	27:14 30:1 32:21	long 23:21 26:4	27:19 29:2,20	need 4:8 25:14
23:24 34:9 35:4	45:15,17 46:7,9	37:21	30:19 32:6 37:2	needlessly 40:11
instances 23:24	know 4:8 5:18 7:5	longer 9:19 13:6,13	38:18	needs 44:10
36:1	17:7,9,10 19:4	13:23 14:15 30:12	members' 14:24	negotiating 8:9
intend 5:18	20:16 21:16,18	35:5 40:13	membership 17:9	neighborhood
intended 3:23	22:24 23:8,19	look 34:14 47:24	18:19	16:16
intending 4:24	24:21 25:18,18	50:9 51:14	mentioned 37:10	neither 6:19 39:9
interest 17:20	26:3,15,20,22	looking 47:17 48:2	met 39:18	39:14 53:9,12
interested 48:15	27:12 29:7 32:17	looks 28:16	mind 3:21 17:21	never 27:16
Interesting 45:5	32:23 35:24 50:5	lot 21:20 23:24	23:13 25:23 27:21	Nevertheless 14:22
interests 8:9,18	50:6,7 51:11	101 21.20 23.24	49:24	new 38:23
17:10	knowing 31:1 33:2	M	mindful 25:14	newer 9:20
interim 43:8	knowledge 29:5	Madam 48:23	minor 12:23 25:19	nexus 42:9
	39:9,13 50:20	making 25:1		nickname 37:17
interject 34:1		manager 37:18	39:21 48:8 49:21 50:2	non-attainment
internal 17:8	L	manager 57.10	50:2	
	I	I	I	1

Page 61

16:18 17:23 once 6:9,11,15 7:4 36:22 51:18,21 plainly 20:8 52:8 prepar	red 6:16
	t 2:5 3:9
	6:13 51:15
	34:21,22
	us 8:11
	usly 8:7
	ged 3:20
	ive 31:7
	bly 30:23
	matic 40:9
	lural 3:18
	7:17 53:15
notice 4:15 opportunity 8:2 pending 26:13 21:1,21 51:20 53:20	
	lure 49:5
novel 38:23 opposes 38:11 period 20:23 38:21 policy 30:22 50:18	
	d 6:3 7:21
	37:12,24
, , , 1	42:20 45:12
52:3 12:24 14:19 24:24 position 17:24 52:14	
	eding 3:4
object 18:5 33:16 27:1 29:1 39:21 24:16 27:11,24 6:17,	18 22:2
obligation 9:7 organic 9:10 44:18,22 45:1 46:18 51:9 50:17	7
10:10 32:7 organization 17:10 48:6,7,9 49:6,12 possibility 15:5 procee	dings 1:7
	3 35:15 53:18
14:19 19:14 33:4 originally 30:3 permits 10:17,18 possible 4:7 14:24 55:7,	9
35:6 40:22 41:23 outside 22:5 10:20,22 11:3 19:23 24:2 26:12 proces	s 13:19
obtain 19:12 40:5 outstanding 36:3,6 12:8,12 13:4 post-hearing 16:21 23:21	1 42:5,11
obtaining 44:11 overlook 28:7 14:11 15:21 32:20 39:20 48:18 49:16 44:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	ses 17:9,12
	m 1:5 9:3,15
	10:18 12:15
	2 15:18 19:13
	24:13 26:23
	3 38:14 40:13
person into isis pre approvatori i sola	3,17,20 41:4
	5 43:9 45:17
offering 6:7 P 2:1,1 perspective 14:21 39:12 46:8	J +J.J +J.17
	ams 23:8,10
	· ·
	ging 19:13
	otly 54:1
preset in the preset of the pr	sal 4:1,11
prace 17.15 20.24 preference 17.20 10.2	13:5 15:2,23
	2 40:24 51:4
	52:13 54:4
35:13 45:21 47:8 31:11,18,20 36:18 placed 54:8 prepare 37:15 propos	sed 6:1 10:9

Page 62

r				Page 62
52:21	31:18 33:15 36:16	9:13 10:11 22:12	15:21	respond 43:6
Protection 9:5 11:7	36:20 37:1 42:20	Reduction 1:5 3:6	removed 13:4	-
15:14 52:18				responded 11:15 11:19
	47:20 51:19,24	11:23 34:12 38:14	repetitious 3:20	
provide 4:6 14:21	quick 3:8 4:10,11	refer 4:22 47:13	report 1:7 10:20	response 11:20,23
21:14 33:19 34:9	43:14	referenced 11:11	11:3 24:18 32:7	14:10,13 18:17
38:8	quicker 21:14	referred 21:10	32:20 33:3 53:21	24:8 47:18 48:5
provided 14:5	quickly 26:2 32:16	22:11 50:24	reported 33:4 55:6	51:7 52:14 53:5,7
provides 52:18	33:10 51:23 52:5	reflect 3:24 50:11	reporter 4:5 7:2	53:9
providing 8:2 9:19	52:15	reflected 17:2	37:23 55:6	responses 4:2,20
16:4	quietly 28:12	reflects 51:9	reporting 9:13	12:18 37:4
provision 13:20	quote 14:1,14,16,16	regarding 8:13	22:12 32:18	responsibility 31:8
15:5,10,10,13	14:17 15:16 29:22	11:22 12:10 47:20	reports 10:12 11:11	result 7:16 23:15
29:16 44:5		53:8	40:7	returning 8:14
provisions 15:11	R	Register 4:16,18	represent 17:10,17	review 50:1
public 6:13 52:5,12	R 2:1	regulated 9:24 10:5	representative 12:7	reviewed 25:24
52:24 53:1	R18-22 1:3 3:7 54:2	10:9,15 11:16	represented 8:17	revised 12:16 26:19
published 4:15	raised 3:22 25:11	30:19	16:24	revision 11:9 13:9
purchase 46:3,10	25:12 49:11	regulation 9:16	represents 8:8	13:18 15:9,14,17
purely 39:8	raises 7:21	24:12 38:22	request 25:19 29:1	15:19,23 20:1,10
purposes 30:11	Randolph 1:9	regulations 8:10,14	29:2 38:12 42:1	23:15 26:13 49:8
36:5	reached 26:15	8:20 35:16 36:11	42:15 52:19 53:7	revisions 13:17
pursued 33:20	read 17:3 47:7 48:3	41:1,17 42:3,7	53:9	15:20 36:9
34:10 39:10,15	52:16	regulatory 4:22 5:6	requested 53:3,4	right 6:19 19:5
push 24:1 44:20	readily 50:22	8:6,8,15 9:20	requests 15:8,22	20:7 22:20 27:15
pushing 40:9	ready 7:5,6 37:11	10:10 11:16,21	require 32:24 35:6	34:7 36:16 43:1
put 20:20 21:8	37:22 38:1 42:19	14:19 27:3 29:21	required 5:11	45:23 46:5 47:5
27:23 43:4	realize 49:22	30:21 31:2 32:8	10:11 11:3 24:11	48:19,24 49:18
puts 35:18	realized 21:21	32:13,23 35:10,14	36:9,13 43:20,21	54:9
puts 55.10	really 17:8,12 21:1	35:14,20 36:1,4	requirement 11:16	risk 23:13
Q	21:19 26:2,3 28:2	38:12 39:1 42:2	24:15 27:3 30:12	roles 8:11
Quality 37:19	31:3 32:15	47:20	30:15 34:24 35:2	rule 17:22 19:6,22
	realm 22:5	reiterate 12:1	requirements 9:14	23:4 30:2 33:22
18:6 19:4 23:11	reason 20:12 21:13	30:17	9:20 10:16,21	34:12,18,19,19
26:17 27:5 29:9	reasons 9:3	reject 42:15	11:2,14 12:22	39:1,1,5,11,23
30:1 32:5,10 33:7	receive 5:2,14	related 41:15 42:6	13:3,6,12,23,24	40:4 41:10,19
36:3 44:14,24	25:22 51:13	50:12	14:8,9,15,17	43:22 44:1,7
47:10 48:1,11	received 4:20 5:5	relevant 3:19 12:1	15:21 22:13,15	46:21
49:1,3,21 50:12	53:6		23:9 30:15,22	
questioned 11:13	recommending	relief 35:14,14,16	31:2 35:3,11	rulemaking 1:4 3:4
questioned 11.13 questions 3:22 4:1	20:12	35:17,20 36:1,5	,	3:7,13 9:18 10:8
4:20 5:23 6:9,16	record 3:21,24 16:4	39:1 42:2	38:19,20 48:7	12:10 42:14
7:21 11:22 12:8	17:3 33:9 37:6	relying 31:4	requiring 46:15	rulemakings 13:16
12:12 16:2,6 20:3	48:4,13,15 51:3,8	remain 39:17	rescind 30:9	rules 3:18 5:9 7:17
20:5 28:6,10,13	53:13,20 54:12,15	remains 30:14	resolved 15:4	30:5 52:21
28:17,19,23 31:14	recordkeeping	41:10	respect 29:2	run 4:10 35:19
20.17,19,23 31.14	recorukceping	remove 13:14	respectfully 15:22	running 50:21
			l	I

Page 63

S	side 43:3	24:10,13 32:20	step 30:2	sunsetted 24:15
<u>~</u> <u></u>	sign-in 52:9	35:15,18,20 39:17	Steven 1:8 7:7 33:9	sunsetting 23:2
saith 7:13 38:5	signature 55:13	39:21 40:4,12,21	55:5,20	24:12
sake 4:4	significant 21:7	42:13 43:9,17	strategy 50:14	support 14:23 15:7
sat 6:23	significantly 16:13	45:19,22 46:15,19	streamline 41:17	17:24 37:18
satisfies 35:2	20:19 22:5 25:6	50:15	Street 1:9 55:21	supported 9:14
saying 17:15 18:12	similar 25:5	speak 4:7 6:14	stringent 34:24	supporting 18:21
34:17 44:8,20	Similarly 13:2	22:11	strongly 9:2 14:22	supports 9:2,22
scale 41:18	simply 24:13	speaking 4:9	38:11	supposed 23:21
scenario 34:16,21	SIP 11:9 12:15 13:1	specific 33:19 34:9	study 52:16,21,23	Sure 47:12,12
34:23 39:7	13:10,14,17,18	36:2 49:3 50:14	53:4,9	48:20
scheduled 4:14	14:9,11 15:19	specifically 50:3	subject 9:6,7 12:3	Survey 8:22
5:12	20:10 21:5 22:4	51:12 53:4	14:7 16:1,9 18:12	suspect 16:12 42:20
schedules 50:7	23:14 26:13,18	specifics 35:22	26:9 30:20 42:3	swear 6:2 7:8 37:11
Sciences 8:24	27:9 35:1,16 36:9	specified 19:9	subjects 8:19 24:7	sworn 5:22 7:5,13
script 52:16	36:11 38:15,19	41:24	25:17	37:15,23 38:5,7
season 10:6,11	39:3,6,18 40:3,4	speculation 41:7	submit 10:12,22	53:11
12:14 41:8 45:23	40:23 41:7,11,19	Springfield 3:10,14	12:22 24:11 36:9	system 3:6 4:9
46:7,16	42:5 48:10 49:8	4:16 52:11,11	39:21 40:6 48:7	11:23 34:12 38:14
seasonal 9:10 10:12	SIP-approved 42:2	SS 55:2	51:8	
11:10 40:7	Sir 37:13	staff 3:23	submittal 12:1 22:4	<u> </u>
second 4:13 29:9	sitting 19:4 34:6	stagnate 20:22	38:15	table 3:10 6:23
40:19 53:22 54:13	situated 7:4	start 5:12 33:16	submitted 5:11	take 14:18 16:2
section 5:9 12:24	situation 15:1 23:3	starting 47:24	7:18 30:3 34:20	20:9,17 21:1,6,20
15:10 37:19 48:9	38:24 45:19 46:6	state 1:9 4:16 8:10	35:11 51:3	22:18 23:22 24:5
50:4 52:17	46:9,13 47:1	8:22 10:17 11:8	submitting 11:10	26:4 51:14
secure 15:20	six 20:6	12:15 13:7,13,14	13:21 47:2	taken 1:8 21:22
Securities 32:22	small 25:9	13:17 15:15 19:24	sufficient 24:17,18	22:8 33:11 53:16
see 6:12 28:9 31:17	solely 3:23	23:8 29:21 30:2,5	suggested 5:21 24:9	55:11
33:3 34:5,23	somebody 46:9	30:6,9,10,11,13	40:8	takes 22:1 25:21,24
51:13,23	soon 6:2 19:23	33:22 34:18,24	suggestions 42:11	26:4 30:1,8,10,13
seeing 6:19 52:13	sooner 22:24	35:2,5,10 39:12	suggests 41:13	54:3
53:10,12	sorry 18:8 31:24	43:19 55:1	Suite 55:21	talked 45:18 47:2,3
self-implementat	sort 50:14	State's 39:2	Sun 4:17	talking 19:18 23:1
46:8	source 11:17 12:20	state-afforded 36:4	sunset 10:3 11:8,22	tangible 42:9
sense 32:11,22	13:2 33:21 34:10	stated 10:3,8 11:5	12:10 13:9,19	technical 2:3 3:16
sensing 48:12	39:10,15,22 40:1	13:10 29:13 48:13	14:23 15:4,7,9,10	43:3
seriously 14:20	43:15,19 44:8	statement 27:7,9	15:19 19:22 20:9	technicality 44:21
served 8:7	46:5 48:5 49:6,10	states 11:6 14:10	20:18 22:14 24:14	44:24
set 16:5 41:21	source's 10:23 42:1	14:12 15:13 35:24	38:13 39:6,23	technically 13:7
seven 20:6	sources 10:5,9,15	38:17 44:7	40:10,20,23 41:4	39:5
sheet 52:9	10:20,22 11:9	statewide 17:21	41:11,13,15,19	tell 37:14
shorthand 55:5,7	12:9,13 13:21	status 32:21	42:16 46:12,17,22	terminated 23:9
show 47:14,15	14:13 15:20 16:9	statute 23:20	47:20 49:8	terms 24:23
shutdowns 9:21	17:1 19:12,18	stenographic 55:10	sunsets 12:15	testified 6:6 46:24
		1		

				Page 64
testify 4:24 7:15	36:21,22 51:21	uncertainty 41:14	48:24 53:21	46:2
8:3 53:8	time 4:9 12:14	unconstrained 21:3	way 18:24 29:5	years 19:15 40:15
testimony 5:1,2,7	13:16 15:18 20:23	undermining 41:5	ways 17:13	Yesterday 5:4
5:10,15,19,21,22	21:7 22:16 23:9	understand 26:19	we'll 4:22 6:15	yields 40:13
5:23 6:7 7:18,18	25:21,24 38:21,24	42:24 51:2	49:20 51:14,14	
7:19 12:4 16:1,6	40:17 42:6 49:24	understanding	we're 18:10,15 29:3	Z
17:3 18:11 19:10	50:20 54:16	45:20,24	33:16 36:13 52:1	
23:17 27:7 37:3	timeframes 23:21	understands 13:15	we've 18:5,24	0
38:8 42:19 52:3,3	times 4:17 31:9	understood 43:10	website 54:2,9	084-004675 55:23
53:11	timing 15:4 21:5	Unit 2:3 3:16 37:18	wedded 21:17	1
thank 7:3,14,23,24	41:14 48:16	United 11:6 15:13	weight 26:21	
16:3,23 31:11,21	Timothy 1:8 2:3	units 9:8	welcome 3:1 31:12	10:06 1:10
33:6,8,17 36:17	title 37:21	universe 19:5 32:18	West 1:9 55:21	100 1:9
36:23 37:4,7	today 3:9 4:3 5:20	University 8:24	whichever 15:15	102.424(g) 5:9
42:18,23 44:13	5:24 7:15 8:3	unnecessary 41:17	20:11	10th 4:19 10:6
45:9,14 48:20	17:16 27:7 29:3	unquote 29:23	wide 8:19	12:11
52:1 54:17	38:9 46:24 48:13	38:20	willing 6:8 7:15	14th 53:23
thanks 20:4 54:14	52:4,7,8 53:12	unusual 33:3	23:6 34:14	17th 4:20 11:24
theoretical 39:8	top 48:3	Urbana-Champa	willingness 51:17	24:9 47:14,21
theoretically 24:2	trade 43:20	9:1	wish 6:14 52:7	180 16:9,14,19
thing 47:13	trading 9:8		54:12	40:11
things 33:2 45:15	transcribed 55:11	V	wishes 6:13 52:12	2
think 6:15,20,22,24	transcript 4:6 10:7	various 22:15 31:1	53:8,11	$\frac{2}{2052:24}$
12:3 16:5,18 18:5	10:13,19 11:12,18	version 47:16	witness 6:4 7:12	20 <i>32</i> .24 2007 <i>55</i> :21
18:23 21:12,17	53:22 54:1,8 55:9	versus 23:2 48:13	37:10 38:4 55:13	2007 <i>3 5 5 5 1</i> 2018 <i>1 1 1 9 4 1 3 5 1</i>
22:23 23:5,22	trial 55:7,10	Vetterhoffer 2:8	witnesses 54:14	10:5,11 11:11,15
24:20,24 25:2,4	trouble 23:19	18:8,9,15,18	word 24:4	11:24 12:11,14
25:13,15 27:12	true 46:16 55:8	31:13,17,23 32:3	work 44:16	42:16 44:15,16
28:3 29:24 30:23	try 43:13	33:14,17 34:2,8	worked 8:21	53:2,5 54:6 55:15
32:16 33:14 36:6	trying 18:10,15	34:16 35:8,13	works 43:15	2019 21:15,19,22
37:3 43:7,10	Tuesday 54:5	36:8,15,18 37:9	worrying 46:13	2019 21:13,19,22
46:23 49:2 52:2,4	turn 32:3	views 17:16 19:13	wouldn't 46:19	2021 15:12 20:11
third-parties 34:10	two 4:14 6:12 9:17	violation 28:2 44:4	wrap 37:3	20:13 21:11,17
39:10,14	17:1 25:5 28:23	visible 6:24	wrapped 6:11	20:13 21:11,17 22:14 23:12,13
third-party 33:20	29:13 32:16 48:3	voiced 17:19	writing 51:7	38:15 40:10 41:8
thought 20:19 21:7	types 10:20 50:8	volatile 9:10	written 5:9,19 7:17	205 1:5 3:5
21:19	typical 25:23 50:1	volume 4:8	7:18 51:7	205 1.5 5.5 205.115 15:10
three 12:7 14:3	typically 34:23	VOM 9:10,16	wrong 43:8 49:4	205.115 15.10 20th 4:17
17:1 19:14 40:15	46:2			20m 4:17 22nd 4:13 53:2
48:1		<u> </u>	X	24 5:12
three-year 20:14	U	wait 28:13		24 5:12 24th 5:1
22:22	unaddressed 41:10	want 4:10 7:24	$\frac{\mathbf{Y}}{\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A} +$	25th 4:15
Thursday 53:23	unattended 42:12	17:12 21:2 24:6	Yeah 20:15 29:24	26th 4:17
ticketed 27:16	uncertain 20:10	26:8 27:23,24	34:4	27(b) 52:17
Tim 3:3 28:12 32:1	40:21	28:9 30:24 43:6	year 43:15 44:6,19	28 10:19
				-010.17

••••			
29 10:7			
3			
30 10:13 11:12			
15:12 42:16			
30th 20:11,13			
21:11,14,22 22:14			
23:12,13 312 55:22			
31 2 55.22 33 11:12			
34 11:18			
35 1:4 3:5			
3rd 54:6			
JIU J4.0			
4			
4:00 5:4			
419-9292 55:22			
5			
50 16:16			
6			
60603 55:22			
7			
7th 1:9 53:5			
7 th 1.9 55.5			
8			
8 1:1 55:21			