Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

| | Page 1 |
|---|--------|
| ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD JANUARY 23, 2019 | |
| IN THE MATTER OF:)) R18-32 | |
| AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL) (Rulemaking - Wate: USE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS) FOR CHLORIDES) | r) |
| REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS held in the above entitled cause before Hearing Officer Martine Klein, 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 23rd day of January, 2019, commencing at the hour of 10:06 a.m. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 1 | | | |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | | Page | 2 |
| 1 | APPEARANCES | | |
| 2 | MR. MARTINE KLEIN, Chairman | | |
| 3 | MS. CARRIE ZALEWSKI, Board Member MS. CYNTHIA SANTOS, Board Member | | |
| 4 | MS. TETYANA RABCZAK, Attorney Advisor MS. KATIE PAPADIMITRIU, Board Member | | |
| 5 | MS. ALISA LIU, Technical Unit MR. ANAND RAO, Technical Unit | | |
| 6 | MR. TIMOTHY FOX, Attorney Advisor MS. U-JUNG CHOE, Board Member | | |
| | MS. BRENDA CARTER, Board Member | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | ALSO PRESENT: | | |
| 9 | MR. JAMES HUFF MR. ROGER KLOCEK | | |
| 10 | MR. DAVID SOUCEK MR. ALBERT ETTINGER | | |
| 11 | MS. STACY MEYERS | | |
| 12 | MS. LAURA BARGHUSEN MS. VIRGINIA YANG | | |
| 13 | MS. STEFANIE DIERS MR. BRIAN KOCH | | |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT TWAIT MS. MELISSA BROWN | | |
| 15 | MR. DANIEL PAULY | | |
| 15 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | Pa |
|----|--|
| 1 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Good |
| 2 | morning, everyone. We're on the record. My name |
| 3 | is Martine Klein. I am the hearing officer for |
| 4 | this rulemaking entitled Amendments to General Use |
| 5 | Water Quality Standards for Chloride. |
| 6 | Also present from the Board are |
| 7 | Board members Carrie Zalewski and Cynthia Santos |
| 8 | will be with us shortly. To my left is Anand Rao |
| 9 | and Alisa Liu from the Board's Technical Unit and |
| 10 | Tim Fox over to my right is with us who is the |
| 11 | attorney advisor for Cynthia Board member |
| 12 | Cynthia Santos. We also have Daniel Pauly here in |
| 13 | the audience who is an attorney advisor for Member |
| 14 | Choe. |
| 15 | On May 21st, 2018, Huff & Huff, |
| 16 | Inc. filed a rulemaking proposal to amend Section |
| 17 | 302.208(g) of the Board's water pollution |
| 18 | regulations and add a new Section 302.214. The |
| 19 | proposed amendments concern the Board's general |
| 20 | use water quality standards for chloride. |
| 21 | On June 21st, 2018, the Board |
| 22 | accepted Huff & Huff's proposal for public comment |
| 23 | without sending it to first notice. On the same |
| 24 | day, the Board requested an Economic Impact Study |
| | |

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

Page 3

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 4 1 from the Department of Commerce and Economic 2 Opportunity by letter. The Board has not received 3 a response from the DCEO. 4 I scheduled the first hearing in 5 this proceeding for today January 23rd, 2019. The second hearing is scheduled for March 6th, 2019. 6 7 Notice of the hearings were published in the 8 Chicago Tribune on November 14th, 2018. The 9 hearings are to address the merits and economic 10 impacts of the proposal. 11 Today, we begin with the first 12 hearing that, if necessary, will continue tomorrow 13 at 10:00 a.m. By hearing officer order, I directed interested persons to file their 14 15 pre-filed testimony for this hearing by January 16 2nd, 2019. The hearing officer order also set 17 January 16th as the deadline for pre-filing 18 questions. The Board timely received pre-filed 19 testimony with attachments from James E. Huff, 20 Roger Klocek and David Soucek on behalf of the 21 rulemaking proposal; Laura Barghusen, on behalf of 22 Openlands; and Cindy Skrukrud on behalf of the 23 Sierra Club. 24 Pre-filed questions were timely

| | Page 5 |
|----|--|
| 1 | submitted by Huff & Huff; Illinois Environmental |
| 2 | Protection Agency, whom I'll refer to as the IEPA; |
| 3 | the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, whom |
| 4 | I'll refer to as IDNR; Openlands; the Sierra Club |
| 5 | and the Board. I will also note that the Board |
| 6 | received written public comments from the DuPage |
| 7 | River and Salt Creek Workgroup, Trotter & |
| 8 | Associates, Inc. and IDNR. |
| 9 | Today's hearing is governed by |
| 10 | the Board's procedural rules. Under Section |
| 11 | 102.424(f), all testimony and questions filed |
| 12 | prior to this hearing are entered into the record |
| 13 | as if read. In addition, all information that is |
| 14 | relevant and not repetitive or privileged will be |
| 15 | admitted into the record. Please bear in mind |
| 16 | that any question posed today by the Board or |
| 17 | staff are intended solely to help develop a clear |
| 18 | and complete record for the Board's decision and |
| 19 | do not reflect any prejudgment or conclusions on |
| 20 | any testimony, comment or other questions. |
| 21 | Today's hearing will be |
| 22 | dedicated to the pre-filed testimony and |
| 23 | questioning. All witnesses will be asked to swear |
| 24 | in. If after the five witnesses have had their |
| | |

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

5

| | Page 6 |
|----|--|
| 1 | opportunity to testify and answer questions and |
| 2 | time permits, I will allow any other person |
| 3 | wishing to provide public comment to speak. We |
| 4 | have placed a sign-up sheet in the front of the |
| 5 | hearing room in Chicago and I understand in |
| 6 | Springfield. Please sign your name if you wish to |
| 7 | provide oral comment. I will also remind members |
| 8 | of the public that the Board accepts written |
| 9 | public comments on its website and are given equal |
| 10 | weight to spoken, public comment at hearing and |
| 11 | they can be submitted at any time until the |
| 12 | deadline is set or after the deadline that is |
| 13 | set. |
| 14 | The Board received a filing from |
| 15 | Huff & Huff at the end of the day yesterday titled |
| 16 | Document Production Requested and Pre-Filed |
| 17 | Questions with seven attachments. Because this |
| 18 | hearing is held via video conference, the Board's |
| 19 | rules require that any document to be offered |
| 20 | today as a hearing exhibit that was not included |
| 21 | with pre-filed testimony must have been filed 24 |
| 22 | hours before the hearing. These documents were |
| 23 | filed after the deadline so they will not be |
| 24 | admitted into the record during this hearing. |

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | Huff & Huff may resubmit those filings as comments |
| 2 | after today's hearings or include them as |
| 3 | attachments to pre-filed testimony for the second |
| 4 | hearing. Otherwise, no additional filings were |
| 5 | received by the 24-hour deadlines. |
| 6 | We will begin today's hearing |
| 7 | with Huff & Huff's testimony starting with the |
| 8 | proponent's witnesses and then we can continue |
| 9 | with Ms. Barghusen, followed by Dr. Skrukrud, |
| 10 | which follows the order in which their testimony |
| 11 | was filed. I will remind you all that your |
| 12 | testimony is entered into the record as if it was |
| 13 | read. |
| 14 | So you all so I remind you |
| 15 | that your you may give a brief opening |
| 16 | statement, if you wish, and then we can proceed |
| 17 | with questions. I ask all other participants when |
| 18 | you speak to please state your name, spell your |
| 19 | name for the court reporter and state who you |
| 20 | represent. Also, please try to speak slowly, |
| 21 | clearly and loudly for our court reporter. The |
| 22 | Board will ask its questions first. Then |
| 23 | questions will be asked in the order that they |
| 24 | were received starting with IEPA, IDNR, Sierra |
| | |

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

Page 7

Page 8 1 Club and Openlands. 2 Then the Board -- if any person 3 has any follow-up question to a question asked, 4 please raise your hand and I will call on you and 5 then you may identify yourself and then you may 6 ask your question. 7 Are there any questions before 8 we proceed? Mr. Huff, I see two of you here. Is 9 Roger Klocek coming today? And is David Soucek 10 In Springfield? Great. here? 11 MS. ZALEWSKI: Before we begin, I'm 12 wondering should we mute Springfield because 13 there's a lot of background noise? Is that --14 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: No. Because one of the --15 16 MS. ZALEWSKI: Can we turn it back 17 on when they -- or is it just too hard to turn it 18 on and off? 19 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: So Member 20 Zalewski was asking if we should mute the 21 microphone in Springfield. Because I think one of 22 the witnesses is in Springfield, I think we should 23 leave it open in the event that he wishes to 24 respond to a question.

Page 9 1 MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. All right. 2 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: So, 3 Mr. Huff, you may provide an opening statement, if 4 you wish. 5 MR. HUFF: I just want to thank the 6 Board for setting the hearing date on this. The 7 primary focus of the work that we have completed 8 was to look at cold temperature effects on the 9 toxicity of chlorides and that's really what the focus of our testimony was, the focus on the 10 winter chloride standard. 11 12 MS. ZALEWSKI: Can you hear, 13 Springfield? 14 MS. DIERS: No, we cannot. He is 15 going to have to speak up or get closer to the 16 mic. 17 MR. RAO: There is no microphone 18 here. 19 That's what --MR. FOX: 20 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: I'm going to 21 see if I can move the microphone to a central 22 location. 23 I'm going to stress that 24 everyone speak up. Mr. Klocek, if you can repeat

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 10 1 your opening statement for the folks in 2 Springfield. 3 MR. HUFF: Mr. Huff. 4 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Mr. Huff. 5 Sorry. 6 MR. HUFF: I just want to thank the 7 Board for setting the hearing. Our primary focus 8 in presenting this petition was to address whether 9 chlorides in colder temperatures are less toxic 10 and based on the research that we have completed, that's, indeed, the case. So that's our primary 11 12 focus is on the winter chloride standard. Thank 13 you. 14 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can everyone 15 in Springfield hear now? 16 MS. DIERS: Yes. Thank you. 17 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Mr. Klocek? 18 MR. KLOCEK: I have nothing further 19 to add. 20 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. 21 Mr. Soucek, do you have anything? 22 MR. SOUCEK: No. 23 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. 24 So we'll begin with the Board's questions for --

| | Page 11 |
|----|--|
| 1 | to try to make this as efficient as possible, the |
| 2 | Board will not read its preamble. The questions |
| 3 | are in the record as if read. So we will read the |
| 4 | questions without the preamble leading up to in |
| 5 | order to try to get this to a speedy ending. |
| 6 | So Question 1A. Can you we |
| 7 | will be reading the question. |
| 8 | So Question 1A. Can you provide |
| 9 | a complete list of the regulated entities you had |
| 10 | included in your outreach efforts? |
| 11 | MR. HUFF: A list of organizations |
| 12 | that we initially reached out to will be submitted |
| 13 | to the Board. |
| 14 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Question 1B. |
| 15 | Please provide a list of all regulated entities |
| 16 | that will be impacted by this proposed rulemaking. |
| 17 | MR. HUFF: In general terms, the |
| 18 | Illinois Department of Transportation, the |
| 19 | Illinois Tollway, the Skyway, the City of Chicago, |
| 20 | all county and highway departments in northeast |
| 21 | Illinois, municipalities and counties throughout |
| 22 | Illinois where there are smaller streams that |
| 23 | receive runoff, which is likely most of the |
| 24 | counties. In addition, industry, schools, |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 12 1 commercial areas, anyone with parking lots and/or 2 private roadways. Basically, anyone that uses 3 de-icing salts in Illinois. 4 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ouestion 1C. 5 Please comment and provide support for whether 6 these entities agree with your statement that the 7 "regulated community" is "striving to achieve an unachievable standard." 8 9 MR. HUFF: I think there is genuine concern about achieving a not-to-exceed 500 mg/L 10 by the regulated community and to the extent they 11 12 supported this research, it is consistent with 13 this belief. In a Technical Support Document, I 14 presented chloride data on Salt Creek, the east 15 branch of the DuPage River and the west branch of 16 the DuPage River. The DuPage River Salt Creek 17 Workgroup has worked hard on implementation of 18 BMP's in these watersheds for over the past 19 decade, yet they are far away from the 500 mg/L 20 standard despite widespread use of BMP's by the Public Works Department. 21 22 MR. RAO: Moving onto language of 23 the proposed rule. Question 2. The language of 24 the proposed rule differs from the language for

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 13 1 acute and chronic standards at 35 Ill. Adm. Code 2 302.208(a) Subsection's A and B. 3 2A. Please explain what is 4 meant by, and the difference between, "on the 5 average" and "arithmetic average" as used in the proposed language. Should just one of these terms 6 7 be used consistently? MR. HUFF: There is no difference 8 So, yes, they should be consistent. 9 intended. For the addition of 10 MR. RAO: 2В. 11 "more than once every three years," please discuss 12 how the departure from the language for acute and 13 chronic standards at 35 Ill. Adm. Code 302.208(a) 14 and (b) is consistent with US EPA's reasoning for 15 the 1988 US EPA Chloride Criterion. 16 MR. HUFF: My intent was to 17 acknowledge that we are having more intense storm 18 events and there will be snow events with dropping 19 temperatures and/or freezing rain that will 20 require salt applications for longer duration than 21 the typical storm event and I was trying to 22 provide an accommodation for these events. 23 MS. LIU: Good morning, Mr. Huff. 24 MR. HUFF: Good morning.

Page 14 1 MS. LIU: Thank you for coming on a 2 snowy day. Question 3. 3 Would you please explain if the 4 proposed sections 302.214(a)(ii) and (b)(ii) for the chronic summer and winter standards should 5 more closely mirror the mixing zone provisions 6 7 provided in Section 302.208(b). 8 MR. HUFF: Yes, they should. MR. RAO: Question 4. Please 9 10 explain if the proposed sections 302.214(a)(ii) and (b) (ii) for the chronic summer and winter 11 12 standards should more closely mirror the 13 attainment status provisions provided in Section 14 302.208(b). 15 Yes, they should. MR. HUFF: HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ouestion 5. 16 17 In pre-filed testimony, Mr. Huff indicated that he 18 inadvertently did not include two changes to the 19 Board's Section 302.407(q)(2) and (q)(3) and 20 Section 303.449. 21 Can you please provide draft 22 language for these proposed changes. 23 MR. HUFF: I will do that prior to 24 the next round of hearings.

15

| | Page |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Good morning. |
| 2 | Question six. The Illinois Natural History Survey |
| 3 | (INHS) Report explains the test methods in detail |
| 4 | but does not appear to cite to a specific US EPA |
| 5 | method. |
| 6 | Please indicate if the test |
| 7 | methods used in the INHS Report correspond to or |
| 8 | are derived from particular US EPA methods. |
| 9 | MR. SOUCEK: This is Dave Soucek, |
| 10 | David, S-O-U-C-E-K, from Illinois Natural History |
| 11 | Survey and I will respond to this question. |
| 12 | As stated on page 87 of the |
| 13 | pre-trial testimony of Huff & Huff and in |
| 14 | attachment two of my pre-filed testimony, static, |
| 15 | non-renewal, 96-hour acute toxicity tests were |
| 16 | conducted generally according to guidelines |
| 17 | detailed in American Society for Testing |
| 18 | Materials, abbreviated ASTM, E729-96 in 2014 and |
| 19 | ASTM E2455-06 (2014). |
| 20 | For chronic toxicity testing, |
| 21 | the amphipod tests "were generally conducted |
| 22 | according to recommendations detailed in the US |
| 23 | EPA sediment toxicity testing methods from 2000, |
| 24 | but with modifications to suit the particular |
| | |

| | Page 16 |
|----|---|
| 1 | experimental conditions of these tests, that is |
| 2 | test temperatures, shorter test duration and |
| 3 | modifications to feeding regimes as detailed in a |
| 4 | paper by Soucek, et. al, 2016. There are no US |
| 5 | EPA or ASTM methods for chronic toxicity testing |
| 6 | with mayflies or fingernail clams so we use |
| 7 | methods developed in our laboratory. |
| 8 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Did you first say |
| 9 | page 86 of your testimony? Is that what you |
| 10 | MR. SOUCEK: Eighty-seven. |
| 11 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Eighty-seven. Thank |
| 12 | you. |
| 13 | MR. RAO: Question 7. The 1988 US |
| 14 | EPA Chloride Acute Criteria is based on the |
| 15 | one-hour average concentration, and the Chronic |
| 16 | Criteria is based on the four-day average |
| 17 | concentration. |
| 18 | 7A. Please explain what the |
| 19 | "standard US EPA acute and chronic test periods" |
| 20 | are and how they are different from the time |
| 21 | periods used in the language of a criterion. |
| 22 | MR. SOUCEK: Again, I'll respond. |
| 23 | US EPA and the ASTM recommend 48 to 96-hour tests |
| 24 | for acute tests depending on the species. In most |
| | |

| | Page 17 |
|----|--|
| 1 | cases, with a notable exception of ceriodaphnia |
| 2 | dubia and other daphnids, 96-hour tests are used. |
| 3 | Chronic tests ideally begin with early life stage |
| 4 | and continue to reproduction according to the 1985 |
| 5 | guidelines, Stephan, et al, 1985. However, this |
| 6 | is not always possible, for example, the case of |
| 7 | fresh water mussels for which the ASTM manual |
| 8 | recommends a 28-day chronic toxicity test. We |
| 9 | just divide our chronic test durations into |
| 10 | attachment two of the Soucek pre-filed testimony. |
| 11 | I can read through that quote, if necessary, or if |
| 12 | you rather a briefer answer, I can end there. |
| 13 | MS. LIU: No. Please go ahead and |
| 14 | read through it. |
| 15 | MR. SOUCEK: Okay. Quote, in two |
| 16 | cases for the chronic toxicity testing, we chose |
| 17 | to conduct somewhat shortened tests. The standard |
| 18 | chronic test duration for hyalella is 42 days |
| 19 | according to US EPA in 2000 and in our laboratory |
| 20 | in a publication by Soucek and Dickson from 2015 |
| 21 | we have conducted chronic toxicity testing with |
| 22 | neocloeon, the mayfly, until emergence, which is |
| 23 | approximately 30 days. |
| 24 | However, development time for |

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | both species would be delayed at 10°C. For |
| 2 | example, Sweeney and Vannote from 1984 show that |
| 3 | neocloeon triangulifer, larval development at the |
| 4 | adult stage took 179 days at 10°C compared to 27 |
| 5 | days at 25°C. |
| 6 | In the case of this mayfly and |
| 7 | the amphipod, in evaluating the reproductive |
| 8 | endpoints these longer tests capture, would not be |
| 9 | practical at 10°C. Furthermore, recent testing in |
| 10 | our laboratory, unpublished data, indicated that |
| 11 | for the mayfly a dry mass endpoint at 14 days was |
| 12 | as sensitive to nickel and zinc toxicity as the |
| 13 | most sensitive endpoints in full-life tests that |
| 14 | incorporate emergence and preproduction. |
| 15 | Therefore, we conducted tests of |
| 16 | identical duration at both temperatures for all |
| 17 | three species, 14 days with neocloeon and 28 days |
| 18 | for hyalella and sphaerium, end quote. |
| 19 | MR. RAO: 7B. Please explain how |
| 20 | data from the 48 to 96-hour tests and the 7, 14 |
| 21 | and 21-day tests translate into standards that are |
| 22 | based on one hour and four days. |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: The standard tests of |
| 24 | 48-hour and 96-hour were used to derive the |
| | |

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

Page 18

| | Page 19 |
|----|--|
| 1 | suggested acute water quality standards, as |
| 2 | described in Section 6 of the Technical Support |
| 3 | Document. As chronic effects at 10°C were not |
| 4 | observed the test durations were extended to see |
| 5 | if the toxic effects were simply delayed. Then |
| 6 | the third round of testing where the chloride was |
| 7 | elevated for seven days, then the chloride brought |
| 8 | back to a controlled concentration to better |
| 9 | mirror what occurs in the stream. |
| 10 | These longer test results were |
| 11 | used as part of the sensitivity analysis in |
| 12 | Section 7 of the Technical Support Document |
| 13 | basically comparing these results to the proposed |
| 14 | standards which were derived using the acute |
| 15 | chronic ratio. |
| 16 | MR. RAO: Question 8. In the INHS |
| 17 | Report, for the fingernail clam, sodium chloride |
| 18 | acute and chronic data at 25°C, please elaborate |
| 19 | why the values in the tables at nominal chloride |
| 20 | (100) are denoted as "unreliable." |
| 21 | MR. SOUCEK: The question is |
| 22 | referring to preliminary data from a preliminary |
| 23 | report. The final report, including all data, is |
| 24 | included as attachment two to my pre-filed |
| | |

| | Page 20 |
|----|--|
| 1 | testimony. To answer that specific question, |
| 2 | quote, unreliable in this case refers not to the |
| 3 | nominal chloride concentration, but to the 95 |
| 4 | percent confidence limit surrounding the 96-hour |
| 5 | and 28-day LC50's. If insufficient, partial |
| 6 | mortality is observed in a test, an effect level |
| 7 | can be generated but confidence limits are too |
| 8 | wide to be reliable. |
| 9 | MR. RAO: Thank you. Question 9. |
| 10 | In the INHS report for mayfly chronic data, what |
| 11 | does "NA" and "NC" stand for? |
| 12 | MR. SOUCEK: Again, the question is |
| 13 | referring to preliminary data from a preliminary |
| 14 | report. The final report, including all data, is |
| 15 | included as attachment two under my pre-filed |
| 16 | testimony. To answer the question, NA in this |
| 17 | case means nonapplicable. There are no weight |
| 18 | data because all the organisms died in that |
| 19 | particular test. So a weight a weight |
| 20 | measurement is not applicable. NC means not |
| 21 | calculated. |
| 22 | The 10°C mayfly test in the |
| 23 | original proposal was a preliminary test. A |
| 24 | second definitive test at 10°C was included in the |
| | |

| | Page 21 |
|----|--|
| 1 | final report in my pre-filed testimony and Table |
| 2 | 11 from that report, not calculated, is spelled |
| 3 | out with an explanation that no trend in weight |
| 4 | was observed. |
| 5 | MR. RAO: Question 10. In the INHS |
| 6 | Report, no chronic data was provided for amphipods |
| 7 | at 10°C. The INHS Report for amphipods notes, "We |
| 8 | will attempt to use older organisms derivative 14 |
| 9 | day to start a test to allow young amphipods to |
| 10 | grow stronger prior to acclimation to cold |
| 11 | temperature and testing." |
| 12 | Please clarify if data was |
| 13 | obtained using older organisms. If so, provide an |
| 14 | update. |
| 15 | MR. SOUCEK: Again, the question is |
| 16 | referring to the preliminary data from the |
| 17 | preliminary report. The final report, including |
| 18 | all the data, is included in my pre-filed |
| 19 | testimony. The amphipod chronic toxicity test at |
| 20 | 10°C are included in Table 13. As stated on page |
| 21 | 89 of the pre-filed testimony, "organisms were |
| 22 | adults at the beginning of the test with one |
| 23 | individual added to each test chamber. Adults |
| 24 | were used because repeated attempts to use seven |
| | |

| | Page 22 |
|----|--|
| 1 | to nine-day old organisms resulted in control |
| 2 | failures at 10°C. It was surmised that adults, |
| 3 | which are more robust than juveniles, might be the |
| 4 | life stage that overwinters in this species." |
| 5 | MR. RAO: Moving onto question 11. |
| 6 | In the November 13, 2017, New England Bioassay |
| 7 | Report, Tables 12 and 13, the values in the column |
| 8 | for the Survival LC50 are almost consistently |
| 9 | greater than the values in the column Survival |
| 10 | NOEC. |
| 11 | Please explain why the NOEC |
| 12 | concentration is greater than the LC50 |
| 13 | concentration. |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: The LC50 is an estimation |
| 15 | based on the dataset where 50 percent of the |
| 16 | organisms will die. The NOEC highest |
| 17 | concentration with no statistical effect is run on |
| 18 | both survival and reproduction on the |
| 19 | ceriodaphnia. If there is some mortality at lower |
| 20 | concentrations, this brings down the LC50 |
| 21 | estimation to a point lower than the NOEC for |
| 22 | survival. |
| 23 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Question 12. Under |
| 24 | hardness of test waters, looking at A, please |
| | |

Page 23 1 confirm the hardness of the test waters in the NEB 2 and INHS tests. 3 MR. SOUCEK: For the INHS tests, 4 measure hardness values for all tests are reported 5 on page 91 for the acute test and the chronic 6 tests and page 92 for the post-exposure. The 7 measure hardness values of 97 to 100 mg/L as 8 calcium carbonate placed in test waters in the 9 moderately hard category according to US EPA 10 methods. MS. ZALEWSKI: B. Please elaborate 11 12 on the hardness scale and where the test waters 13 fall in terms of moderately hard water. 14 MR. SOUCEK: I'm sorry. I jumped 15 the gun and answered that already. 16 MS. ZALEWSKI: You did. Sorrv. 17 Number 13. Sulphate concentration of test waters. Please confirm the sulfate concentration of the 18 19 test waters in the NEB and the INHS tests. 20 MR. SOUCEK: For the INHS test, using the recipe detail in Table 1 of my pre-filed 21 22 testimony results in a nominal sulfate 23 concentration of 58.5 mg/L. We did not measure 24 sulfate concentrations analytically in the test

| | Page 24 |
|----|--|
| 1 | waters but measured chloride concentrations which |
| 2 | were typically close to 100 percent of nominal |
| 3 | concentrations as were measured hardness levels. |
| 4 | So it is safe to assume that sulfate |
| 5 | concentrations were similar to nominal as well. |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: Same answer on the NEB as |
| 7 | well. |
| 8 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. Can you |
| 9 | explain the safe to assume. You said it was not |
| 10 | tested, is that accurate? |
| 11 | MR. SOUCEK: We didn't measure |
| 12 | sulfate analytically, but when we measured |
| 13 | chloride and hardness and we had a recipe that we |
| 14 | used for all these tests, we make the water in the |
| 15 | lab, it's deionized water and adding salt back to |
| 16 | it and the recipe has a measured nominal sulfate |
| 17 | concentration and because chloride and hardness |
| 18 | were essentially 100 percent measured chloride |
| 19 | and hardness were essentially 100 percent of the |
| 20 | measured concentrations, we can safely assume that |
| 21 | sulfate is also at 58 or thereabouts, plus or |
| 22 | minus a mg/L. |
| 23 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Thank you for the |
| 24 | clarification. |
| | |

Page 25 1 MR. ETTINGER: Excuse me. 2 Mr. Klein? I don't know how you want to do this. 3 In some hearings in the past, we've had people ask 4 questions during other questions to form a more 5 complete --6 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yeah, if you 7 have additional questions, just raise your hand. MR. ETTINGER: I've been sort of 8 9 waiting because some of them are going to overlap 10 with other questions, but can I go back then briefly to Question 11? 11 12 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sure. 13 MR. ETTINGER: I'm a little 14 confused. 15 Shouldn't the no observable 16 effects concentration always be lower than the 17 LC50? 18 MR. HUFF: Yeah. 19 MS. ZALEWSKI: Can you hear, 20 Springfield? MS. DIERS: We can hear. 21 22 MR. HUFF: Not -- not in the case 23 where there was some death at smaller 24 concentrations.

Page 26 1 MR. ETTINGER: Well, isn't that an observable effect? 2 3 MR. HUFF: But statistically it 4 wasn't valid and statistics don't apply in the case of the NOEC. 5 6 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. So death of 7 some of the organizations would not be an 8 observable effect if it was not statistically 9 valid, is that --10 MR. HUFF: I'll have to get back to 11 you on that. 12 MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. 13 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Moving onto 14 Board Question 14. 15 The Board asked for copies of 19 documents that were referenced in the initial 16 17 filing and pre-filed testimony of Huff & Huff. 18 Can you provide them for the record? 19 MR. HUFF: Yes, we will. 20 Okay. Moving onto MS. ZALEWSKI: 21 15. Under 1988 US EPA Chloride Criteria and 22 Stephan 2009 updates, just moving onto subparts, 23 Subpart A. 24 Have you -- are you aware of any

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 27 1 US EPA -- any work rather US EPA may be currently doing to reassess the 1988 Chloride Criteria or to 2 3 propose new chloride criteria. 4 MR. HUFF: I am not aware of any. 5 MS. ZALEWSKI: B. Have you tried 6 contacting Charles E. Stephan or someone else in 7 his lab at US EPA about exploring the temperature 8 variable in chloride toxicity with you? 9 MR. HUFF: Charles Stephan retired 10 quite a few years ago. He is no longer there. 11 MS. ZALEWSKI: Have you tried to 12 contact anyone else? 13 MR. HUFF: I have not. MS. ZALEWSKI: C. When Iowa DNR 14 15 worked with US EPA in hiring ENVIRON 2009 to 16 conduct the additional toxicity tests, do you know 17 how the work was funded? 18 If so, do you think a similar 19 source of funding would be available for toxicity 20 tests focused on the temperature variable? 21 The chloride project MR. HUFF: 22 Dr. Soucek did for the Iowa standard was funded 23 through Region 5 US EPA funds, but they were 24 directly to the Great Lakes Environmental Center

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | and INHS was a subcontractor to Great Lakes |
| 2 | Environmental Center. When Region 5 had funded |
| 3 | Dr. Soucek on chloride toxicity, I approached |
| 4 | Candice Bauer of Region 5. That was the primary |
| 5 | reason I reached out to her initially. |
| 6 | Cold temperature chloride |
| 7 | toxicity is clearly an issue in nearly all |
| 8 | northern states, not just Illinois. So in a |
| 9 | perfect world, federal dollars should be applied. |
| 10 | With the manpower efforts Illinois is spending on |
| 11 | watershed variances, that, in my opinion, will |
| 12 | continue until the cold temperature toxicity of |
| 13 | chloride is factored into the regulations. I saw |
| 14 | taking on this work as an important contribution. |
| 15 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. |
| 16 | 16. Under Iowa water quality standards for |
| 17 | chloride, looking at Subpart A. |
| 18 | Given this statement from Iowa |
| 19 | DNR about the similarities between the landscape |
| 20 | and waterbodies of Iowa and Illinois along with |
| 21 | the fact that the Iowa chloride water quality |
| 22 | standard was approved by US EPA, please comment on |
| 23 | developing a chloride water quality standard |
| 24 | similar in structure to Iowa's. |
| | |

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

Page 28

| | Page 29 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Our focus was on the |
| 2 | effect of colder temperatures on chloride |
| 3 | toxicity. We utilized the Iowa method as it |
| 4 | provided a straightforward approach that could be |
| 5 | easily modified to add in our new data. Hardness, |
| 6 | and to a lesser extent sulfate, are important |
| 7 | factors. More refined standards will result in |
| 8 | incorporation of these two parameters. So I would |
| 9 | say yes to the |
| 10 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Can you repeat the |
| 11 | last phrase? There was a cough. I couldn't hear |
| 12 | you. |
| 13 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I believe a similar |
| 14 | approach to what Iowa has done could be factored |
| 15 | into the colder temperature approach. |
| 16 | MS. ZALEWSKI: You may have |
| 17 | addressed this go ahead. |
| 18 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. |
| 19 | Mr. Ettinger, do you have a follow-up? |
| 20 | MR. ETTINGER: But part of your |
| 21 | proposal does cover a statewide standard that's a |
| 22 | 365 covers 365 days a year, is that not |
| 23 | correct? |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: I'm sorry. Could you |
| | |

Page 30 1 repeat that question? 2 MR. ETTINGER: You've said 3 repeatedly that you focused on cold weather 4 standards, however, your petition includes a 5 proposal for 365 days a year. Yes, I used the 1988 EPA 6 MR. HUFF: 7 chloride water quality criteria to be reflective of the summer standard. 8 9 MR. ETTINGER: And why did you use the 1988 EPA standard as opposed to the more 10 recently approved Iowa standard for the summer? 11 12 My understanding was that MR. HUFF: 13 US EPA Region 5 no longer believes the Iowa standard is an approvable approach. 14 MR. ETTINGER: And why is that? 15 MR. HUFF: I don't know. 16 17 MS. ZALEWSKI: I'm going to ask 16B. 18 You may have answered, but just in case you 19 didn't. 20 Please comment on whether 21 chloride issues in Illinois could be addressed by 22 a standard similar to Iowa's that included 23 provisions for site specific hardness and sulfate 24 concentration with the addition of a temperature

1 component. 2 MR. HUFF: If I understood the 3 question correctly, could we have a standard that 4 allowed for site specific data input on hardness 5 and chlorides as an Illinois standard? Yes, I believe that would be appropriate. 6 7 MS. LIU: Ouestion 17. Under the 8 topic of water quality characteristics affecting 9 chloride toxicity for temperature, the Technical 10 Support Document in Appendix A contains a literature survey on the toxicity of chlorides 11 12 with a focus on temperature effects. 13 17A. Was the literature survey 14 able to identify the majority of the temperatures 15 used in the studies that US EPA and Iowa DNR 16 compiled in the Stephan 2009c updated list? 17 MR. HUFF: We -- we conducted a 18 broad search on chloride toxicity with an emphasis 19 on any articles that had a temperature effect 20 beyond the standard tests that were run on those. 21 I believe most of the 2009 references were 22 included in that and their default temperatures to 23 a large extent would be in the 23 to 25°C. 24 MS. LIU: Question B. Would you

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

Page 31

| , | Page 32 |
|----|--|
| 1 | please comment on creating a new table based on |
| 2 | the table in Stephan 2009c and including a column |
| 3 | for temperature values from all the referenced |
| 4 | studies available. |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: As we amend Table 1, we |
| 6 | will do that and put temperatures in there. |
| 7 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Question 18. Still |
| 8 | under temperature. |
| 9 | The proposal would replace the |
| 10 | current single value chloride water quality |
| 11 | standard with acute and chronic values split into |
| 12 | two seasons. |
| 13 | Subpart A. Has US EPA approved |
| 14 | water quality standards in the past based on |
| 15 | temperature rather than season? |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: The Illinois EPA in its |
| 17 | pre-filed questions to me, Question 14, |
| 18 | highlighted the ammonia water quality standards |
| 19 | that are temperature-based. So I believe the |
| 20 | answer to your question is yes. I confused |
| 21 | effluent limits to water quality standards when |
| 22 | making the statement that US EPA has always pushed |
| 23 | for seasonal limits. |
| 24 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Subpart B. If new |
| | |

| | Page 33 |
|----|--|
| 1 | studies could be performed to evaluate other |
| 2 | temperatures besides 10°C, would it be possible to |
| 3 | provide chloride water quality standards based on |
| 4 | temperature rather than season to account for |
| 5 | variability and temperatures throughout the year |
| 6 | and throughout the State of Illinois? |
| 7 | MR. HUFF: Yes, that would be a good |
| 8 | approach in moving forward. However, I would |
| 9 | recommend not delaying a winter standard until |
| 10 | that research is done. |
| 11 | MR. RAO: Moving onto hardness and |
| 12 | sulfate. Question 19. |
| 13 | Mr. Klocek's pre-filed testimony |
| 14 | stated "Iowa adopted new chloride standards in |
| 15 | 2009 with Pennsylvania, Missouri and Wisconsin |
| 16 | currently in the process of adopting similar |
| 17 | standards as Iowa. Indiana adopted new chloride |
| 18 | standards in 2012. |
| 19 | 19A. Please provide citations |
| 20 | to and summaries of the new chloride standards |
| 21 | adopted or proposed for Pennsylvania, Missouri, |
| 22 | Wisconsin and Indiana. |
| 23 | MR. KLOCEK: Indiana effective May |
| 24 | 20th, 2015, had chloride limits set dependent on |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 34 1 sulfate and hardness tables. This is referenced in Illinois -- Indiana Administrative Code Article 2 It was online accessed on 1/19/19 at -- do I 3 2. 4 need to read the --5 MR. RAO: If you have something you 6 can submit in writing, that will be acceptable. 7 MR. HUFF: We'll submit those. 8 MR. KLOCEK: Yeah. 9 MR. ETTINGER: I'm sorry. 10 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Go ahead. 11 MR. ETTINGER: Again, I'm -- you say 12 Indiana changed its standard in 2015? 13 MR. KLOCEK: No, it became 14 effective. I don't know when they changed it. 15 Do you know if it was MR. ETTINGER: 16 approved by US EPA? 17 MR. KLOCEK: I believe so because it's the EPA website that documents that Indiana 18 19 standard. 20 MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. 21 MR. RAO: And you would be 22 submitting information for the other states also? 23 MR. KLOCEK: Yes. Should I go on with the summaries for the other states or --24

ſ

| | Page 35 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MS. LIU: Sure. |
| 2 | MR. RAO: Sure. |
| 3 | MR. KLOCEK: Okay. Pennsylvania |
| 4 | adopted 230 milligram chloride water standard for |
| 5 | potable water supplies only and are silent |
| 6 | regarding chloride and aquatic species. The |
| 7 | previous 2010 proposed adopting the Iowa standard |
| 8 | which accounts for hardness and sulfates that was |
| 9 | withdrawn. A Stroud report issued in 2012 listed |
| 10 | weaknesses in the Pennsylvania proposal that |
| 11 | included using only sodium chloride toxicity |
| 12 | studies and not including calcium, magnesium or |
| 13 | potassium chloride toxicity results. |
| 14 | Also, the Stroud report said |
| 15 | that mussel toxicity data was lacking along with |
| 16 | planned toxicity data, although the report |
| 17 | admitted that plant data endpoints are lacking in |
| 18 | the literature. Other procedural weaknesses in |
| 19 | calculations were pointed out in the Pennsylvania |
| 20 | proposal. That was from summary and comments by |
| 21 | Clean Water Action to the Environmental Quality |
| 22 | Board online access 1/19/2019 at a State of |
| 23 | Pennsylvania online address. |
| 24 | Missouri the online address |
| | |

36

| | Page |
|----|---|
| 1 | will be supplied electronically. Missouri |
| 2 | proposed chloride criteria was to copy the Iowa |
| 3 | 2009 standard without comment. Missouri did not |
| 4 | detail how this standard would be applied |
| 5 | statewide or how they would develop sulfate or |
| 6 | hardness databases for different regions of the |
| 7 | state. Missouri also did not provide any |
| 8 | discussion of including more recent toxicity |
| 9 | testing data into their proposal. This was online |
| 10 | accessed 1/19/2019. |
| 11 | Water quality standards for |
| 12 | chloride in Wisconsin are set based on aquatic |
| 13 | life toxicity. The water criteria for chloride in |
| 14 | Wisconsin is presently 395 mg/L chronic and 757 |
| 15 | mg/L acute. Again, a Wisconsin DNR website. And |
| 16 | that concludes that. |
| 17 | MR. ETTINGER: You said Missouri did |
| 18 | not say how it was going to it did not say that |
| 19 | it was how it was going to consider more recent |
| 20 | toxicity data |
| 21 | MR. HUFF: Yeah. |
| 22 | MR. ETTINGER: is that a |
| 23 | statement by you or are you quoting something? |
| 24 | I'm sorry. |
| | |

| | Page 37 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. KLOCEK: They were denied |
| 2 | because they basically copied the Iowa standard |
| 3 | without saying how they were going to develop |
| 4 | their own databases for hardness which they didn't |
| 5 | elaborate on it or how they were going to include |
| 6 | more recent toxicity data. |
| 7 | MR. ETTINGER: And I missed |
| 8 | something. Denied by who? |
| 9 | MR. KLOCEK: US EPA. |
| 10 | MR. ETTINGER: So US EPA turned down |
| 11 | the Missouri standard based on the Iowa standard |
| 12 | because it does not take into account more recent |
| 13 | toxicity data? |
| 14 | MR. KLOCEK: Right. |
| 15 | MR. RAO: Moving onto 19B. Can you |
| 16 | please comment on whether any of these standards |
| 17 | will be mirrored or tailored for protecting |
| 18 | Illinois waterways? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: I think I would recommend |
| 20 | that temperature be incorporated into any chloride |
| 21 | water quality standard for Illinois, which has not |
| 22 | been done in those other states to this point. As |
| 23 | I indicated previously, the impact of sulfate and |
| 24 | hardness at colder temperatures has not yet been |

January 30, 2019

Page 38 1 fully established. 2 Question 20. The table in MS. LIU: 3 Stephan 2009C, Summary of Data Concerning the 4 Acute Toxicity of Sodium Chloride to Aquatic 5 Animals, includes the hardness and sulfate concentration of the test waters in each of the 6 7 studies. 8 Would you please -- 20A. Please 9 comment on adding to the creation of the table described above based on the table in Stephan 10 2009c, the hardness and sulfate concentration from 11 12 the study performed by Illinois Natural History 13 Survey and New England Bioassay. 14 MR. HUFF: We'll put those in table 15 format. I think we indicated earlier the INHS hardness was 97 mg/L and the New England Bioassay 16 17 hardness was 84 mg/L. Sulfate concentration in 18 the INHS study was 58.5 mg/L. And I misspoke 19 earlier on NEB. It was actually 65 mg/L in their 20 study, also calculated similar to how INHS did 21 theirs. 22 MS. LIU: 20B. Would you please 23 comment on adding to this table the acute value of 24 LC50 results from the studies performed by the

January 30, 2019

Page 39 1 Illinois Natural History Survey and New England 2 Bioassay for each test temperature. 3 Please comment on including both the acute value and the normalized acute values 4 5 using the equation developed by Stephan 2009c at 6 1. 7 MR. HUFF: We will provide that information to the Board. Once those values are 8 normalized -- those normalized values will be 9 10 approximately 100 percent higher. And that, with the hardness of 300 mg/L, is the normalized value. 11 12 MR. RAO: Moving onto Question 21. 21A. 13 Does Illinois have sufficient 14 15 ambient water monitoring data to determine 16 statewide background values for hardness and 17 sulfate? 18 MR. HUFF: That question is, 19 perhaps, better asked for the Agency, but I 20 believe the answer is, yes, hardness is utilized 21 currently for establishing water quality standards 22 for metals and for sulfates. I have requested and 23 received yesterday from the Illinois EPA their 24 hardness data for the statewide network.

| | Page 40 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. RAO: So will you be providing |
| 2 | information of hardness and sulfate concentration |
| 3 | of waters throughout the state along with comments |
| 4 | on how they vary? That's in 21B. |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: The IEPA has access to |
| 6 | that data in a computerized format. I'm not sure |
| 7 | how they sort by regions of the state, but I |
| 8 | assume that can be done. So, yeah, I'll follow |
| 9 | back up with the Agency and see if they can point |
| 10 | me to how I sort that by the watershed. That will |
| 11 | probably be the best way to do that. |
| 12 | MR. RAO: 21C. Please elaborate on |
| 13 | the hardness scale and where the test waters used |
| 14 | in the studies by INHS and NEB fall in relation to |
| 15 | hardness in waters throughout Illinois. |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: Using hardness and |
| 17 | sulfate data that I received from the Agency |
| 18 | yesterday prepared from 2000 to 2016, the mean |
| 19 | hardness across the state is 286.8 mg/L and the |
| 20 | mean sulfate is 86.8 mg/L. So those are both |
| 21 | higher than the research that we conducted at 10 |
| 22 | and 25°C. |
| 23 | MR. RAO: 21D. Are hardness and |
| 24 | sulfate concentrations typically monitored in |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 41 1 streams where water quality compliance is assessed such that site-specific values can be determined? 2 3 MR. HUFF: Yes, that's my 4 understanding. If that's not monitored there, the 5 Agency uses a closest stream gauge in the same 6 watershed is my understanding. 7 MR. RAO: 21E. Please describe how 8 Illinois waterways are tested for hardness and 9 sulfate, if it is typically done with other 10 ongoing water quality monitoring, and how much it 11 costs. 12 MR. HUFF: So, again, I think this 13 question is better asked of the Agency, but my 14 understanding is that the routine network 15 monitoring is done six times a year at each 16 location. I suspect there is a bias towards nicer 17 weather. Days like today I expect the sampler 18 would not be out there sampling. I believe most 19 of these are routinely tested for as part of that 20 network. Commercial laboratory costs are 21 approximately \$20 for a hardness sample and \$25 22 for sulfate. 23 This is in Springfield. MS. DIERS: 24 This is Stefanie Diers, S-T-E-F-A-N-I-E,

January 30, 2019

Page 42 1 D-I-E-R-S. I know you've asked some questions here in 21 of Mr. Huff. 2 3 The Agency will respond in 4 pre-filed testimony at the next hearing to clear 5 some of the things he said up so you get accurate 6 information on what the Agency does. 7 MR. RAO: We'd appreciate that. 8 Thank you. 9 MS. DIERS: Thank you. 10 MR. RAO: Moving onto 21F. For permitted dischargers with water quality based 11 12 effluent limits, how much would it cost to include 13 effluent and in-stream sampling for hardness and 14 sulfate? 15 Again, this is, perhaps, MR. HUFF: 16 a better question for the Agency. My 17 understanding is that for point source dischargers 18 such as Publicly Owned Treatment Works and 19 industrial, they would likely have composite 20 samplers already on their effluent discharge. So 21 the incremental cost would strictly be the 22 laboratory costs that I just quoted in their 23 cases. 24 For the communities, the

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 43 |
|----|--|
| 1 | municipal storm sewer communities or MS 4 |
| 2 | communities, there will be many outfalls with snow |
| 3 | melt runoff and no automatic samplers. This would |
| 4 | likely require grab samples during snow melt |
| 5 | periods from representative outfalls. Some may be |
| 6 | doing this already under their MS 4 permit. So |
| 7 | the incremental cost would, again, in those cases |
| 8 | be just the lab cost. |
| 9 | For the stream sampling, it's my |
| 10 | understanding the Agency would like to have |
| 11 | collected on the order of 50 samples over a |
| 12 | two-year period for the stream to establish |
| 13 | hardness and sulfate. So there would be a labor |
| 14 | charge and a lab charge for 50 samples which would |
| 15 | amount to approximately \$5,000 per location. |
| 16 | MR. RAO: Thank you. |
| 17 | MS. LIU: Question 22. Under |
| 18 | derivation of water quality criteria dependent on |
| 19 | water quality characteristics 22A asks, are you |
| 20 | aware of why the current general use chloride |
| 21 | water quality standard is under 35 Ill. Adm. Code |
| 22 | 302.208(g) for single-value standards instead of |
| 23 | 302.208(e) numeric water quality standards for the |
| 24 | protection of aquatic organisms? |
| | |

| | Page 44 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: The single value is |
| 2 | reflective of the time period when this standard |
| 3 | was originally adopted in 1972 in the Board |
| 4 | proceedings in R70-8 where single water quality |
| 5 | values were established for a variety of metal and |
| 6 | cyanide chlorides. The chloride standard of 500 |
| 7 | mg/L was based on testimony of Professor Lackey. |
| 8 | Part 302.208(e) was adopted later and focused on |
| 9 | the metals with hardness of the receiving stream |
| 10 | added as a factor. |
| 11 | MS. LIU: 22B. Is there any reason |
| 12 | revised chloride water quality standards couldn't |
| 13 | take on an equation form and be located under |
| 14 | 302.208(e)? |
| 15 | MR. HUFF: At this point in time, I |
| 16 | do not believe sufficient temperature data has |
| 17 | been generated for chloride toxicity. The recent |
| 18 | published article by Jackson and Funk, which was |
| 19 | included in Mr. Klocek's pre-filed testimony, is |
| 20 | an excellent start for mayflies, but it does not |
| 21 | establish the same relationship between toxicity |
| 22 | and temperature for other organisms. |
| 23 | Similarly, the effect of |
| 24 | hardness and sulfate have not been evaluated for |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 45 1 aquatic species at colder temperatures to my 2 knowledge. 3 MS. LIU: Ouestion 23. The Board's rules contain specific procedures under deriving 4 5 acute aquatic toxicity criterion dependent on 6 water chemistry. Section 302.618. 7 23A. Is it possible to develop 8 a water quality standard equation for chloride 9 similar to the equation used for the Iowa standard 10 that incorporates site-specific hardness and sulfate as well as temperature? 11 12 MR. HUFF: As noted in the previous response, I do not believe we have sufficient data 13 14 at this time to develop such an equation, but 15 clearly that should be a direction that Illinois 16 should proceed with in the future. 17 MS. LIU: 23B. If it is possible to 18 do a multiple regression analysis on hardness and 19 sulfate, could one be done for temperature to 20 develop a slope that can be used to derive an 21 equation-based standard that is dependent on 22 hardness, sulfate and temperature? 23 Again, additional MR. HUFF: 24 temperature data would need to be collected and

January 30, 2019

Page 46 1 the relationship with sulfate and hardness would 2 have to be confirmed with both temperatures. 3 MS. LIU: Question 24. And you 4 touched on this earlier, but I'd like you to 5 mention it again. The Jackson and Funk 2019 report 6 7 cited by Mr. Klocek uses linear regression to 8 describe the relationship between temperature and 9 acute chloride toxicity for four genera of 10 mayflies across a range of temperatures. Could any of this data be used 11 12 to develop a mathematical relationship for an 13 equation based on an equation-based standard that 14 is dependent on hardness, sulfate and temperature? 15 MR. HUFF: Jackson and Funk 16 evaluated the acute toxicity of four species of 17 mayflies at various temperatures. The 18 mathematical model for the four species evaluated 19 could be developed, but would it apply to other 20 aquatic species? Jackson and Funk did not vary 21 the hardness or sulfate. So to develop a 22 relationship, one would have to assume the same 23 correlation developed at colder temperatures. 24 MS. LIU: Under statewide

January 30, 2019

Page 47 1 applicability of general use water quality 2 standards. Question 25. 3 The Technical Support Document 4 states that the derivation of the proposed 5 chloride water quality standards followed the US EPA protocol from 1985. For the site-specific 6 7 rule for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal that 8 was adopted in R08-9, CITGO used a different US EPA method. 9 10 Will you please explain why a method different from the one used for the CSSC, 11 12 the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, 13 site-specific rulemaking is used for this 14 rulemaking for General Use Waters rulemaking. 15 MR. HUFF: In the Chicago Sanitary 16 and Ship Canal site-specific, the species not 17 present in the winter months in the CSSC were 18 removed from the list of species. Recognizing the 19 extent of species likely present somewhere in 20 Illinois, no species were removed from the list of 21 this proceeding. 22 MR. RAO: Question 26. To select a 23 temperature at which to conduct laboratory tests 24 on aquatic life that is representative of a winter

January 30, 2019

Page 48 1 temperature in Illinois, Huff & Huff used the 75th 2 percentile of all Illinois stream temperature 3 data. 26(a). Based on information in 4 5 the table, can you identify the locations where 6 the readings were obtained? 7 MR. HUFF: The Agency has a listing of the location codes that could be used for that 8 9 The data includes the entire database. purpose. 10 So I presume it's representative of the entire 11 state. 12 MR. RAO: 26B. So do these 13 locations cover the State of Illinois from north 14 to south? 15 That is my understanding MR. HUFF: 16 of the watershed network, yes. 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 26C. Please 18 explain how the 75th percentile is considered 19 representative of all of Illinois during the 20 months of December through April. 21 MR. HUFF: The intent for the period 22 specified was to incorporate the snowfall period 23 in Illinois. When snowfall occurs, the runoff 24 with the de-icing salts in streams will be at

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 49 |
|----|--|
| 1 | temperatures less than 10°C in the vast majority |
| 2 | of events, if not all events. However, changing |
| 3 | the proposed winter standard to when actual stream |
| 4 | temperatures are less than or equal to 10°C would |
| 5 | eliminate many of the concerns raised in a variety |
| 6 | of pre-filed questions. |
| 7 | MR. RAO: 26D. |
| 8 | MS. LIU: Would you be proposing |
| 9 | language along those lines to revise your current |
| 10 | proposal? |
| 11 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I would. |
| 12 | MR. RAO: 26D. Please describe how |
| 13 | much the ambient water temperature varies from |
| 14 | northern Illinois to southern Illinois from month |
| 15 | to month during the months of December to March. |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: Clearly, on average, it |
| 17 | is colder in the northern part of the state on |
| 18 | average. Again, the intent of the proposal was to |
| 19 | capture the snowfall season. Removing the months |
| 20 | from the proposal and going to a water quality |
| 21 | standard when the stream temperature is less than |
| 22 | or equal to 10°C would eliminate, I believe, the |
| 23 | concern over warmer temperatures in the southern |
| 24 | portion of the state and the warmer water on |
| | |

50

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | average in March and April. |
| 2 | MR. RAO: 26E. Given this range in |
| 3 | temperature, would a standard based on tests at |
| 4 | 10°C still be considered representative of |
| 5 | southern Illinois waterbodies? |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: I believe it would be |
| 7 | representative of southern stream temperatures |
| 8 | when snow melt occurs, which was the intent. |
| 9 | Dischargers would still have to meet the |
| 10 | non-winter proposed standard, and but for de-icing |
| 11 | practices, I see no reason these dischargers would |
| 12 | discharge at higher chloride concentrations during |
| 13 | the winter months. |
| 14 | MS. ZALEWSKI: 27A. Other than |
| 15 | streams in the Greater Chicago Area, please list |
| 16 | the rivers or streams that could be classified as |
| 17 | "urban streams" in Illinois. |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: The Agency publishes |
| 19 | every two years a list of impaired streams and the |
| 20 | causes of impairment. Many cities in Illinois |
| 21 | have smaller streams that receive stormwater |
| 22 | runoff and all of these streams readily exceed 500 |
| 23 | mg/L during snow melt periods following salt |
| 24 | application. In addition, I believe the impaired |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 51 |
|----|--|
| 1 | list is biased as the stream sampling tends to |
| 2 | occur during non-storm events. An example of this |
| 3 | bias can be seen by noting the Salt Creek in |
| 4 | DuPage and Cook Counties is absent from the list, |
| 5 | yet continuos monitors by the DuPage River Salt |
| 6 | Creek Workgroup and then that data was included in |
| 7 | the Technical Support Document clearly shows the |
| 8 | chloride exceedances. A list of impaired |
| 9 | waterways will be forwarded electronically to the |
| 10 | Board. |
| 11 | MS. ZALEWSKI: B I think you might |
| 12 | have answered, but I'll read it just in case. |
| 13 | Are you aware of chloride |
| 14 | monitoring data for other urban streams within |
| 15 | Illinois that are General Use Waters that |
| 16 | demonstrate concentrations above 500 mg/L $$ |
| 17 | during certain times of the year? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: The list the 303(d) |
| 19 | list which I'll provide the Board there are |
| 20 | currently 47 stream segments on 31 streams that |
| 21 | are listed as impaired for chlorides. |
| 22 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. |
| 23 | MR. ETTINGER: Excuse me again. Was |
| 24 | that list submitted as part of the documents that |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 52 1 didn't come in within 24 hours? 2 MR. HUFF: Yes, sir. 3 MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. 4 MS. ZALEWSKI: С. Do you know of 5 chloride monitoring data for urban streams in other states with winter climate conditions 6 7 similar to Illinois? 8 MR. HUFF: Corsi, et al. published an article entitled "River chloride trends in 9 snow-affected urban watersheds increasing 10 concentrations outpace urban growth rate and are 11 12 common among all seasons" in late 2014. A copy of 13 that will be submitted as well to the Board. 14 MS. ZALEWSKI: And that article 15 discusses other states besides Illinois? MR. HUFF: Yes. 16 17 MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. 28. The 18 Statement of Reasons states, "Both the Illinois 19 EPA and US EPA were approached about the 20 possibility of conducting colder temperature 21 toxicity testing without success." 22 Would you please comment on Α. 23 estimating the costs and time to conduct 24 additional studies at a range of temperatures.

January 30, 2019

Page 53 1 MR. HUFF: Assuming the same four 2 species are sufficient as what we studied, I would 3 estimate the cost for a range of temperatures at 4 \$250,000 and require approximately 18 months to 5 complete. For reference, the research conducted for this petition required approximately \$100,000 6 7 and nearly two years to complete. With the 8 knowledge gained at the colder temperatures for 9 these organisms, the time period could be 10 shortened. For each additional species studied, I would estimate an additional \$40,000. Note, this 11 12 cost is for temperature studies only, not sulfate 13 or hardness. Glodcidia testing may be more 14 complex and, therefore, more expensive. 15 MS. ZALEWSKI: B. I'm not sure if 16 you answered, but you may have. 17 Would you please comment on 18 estimating the additional costs and time to derive 19 acute and chronic chloride water quality standards 20 if additional information were available for acute 21 toxicity across a range of temperatures? 22 MR. HUFF: Assuming the same 23 approach is utilized as utilized in this petition, 24 I would estimate three months and \$25,000. Ιf

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 54 |
|----|---|
| 1 | outreach to the Illinois EPA is included, I would |
| 2 | add six additional months and an additional |
| 3 | \$50,000. If outreach to the US EPA is to be |
| 4 | included, I would add several more years and add |
| 5 | at least an additional \$100,000 to the above |
| 6 | estimates. |
| 7 | MS. ZALEWSKI: C. Would you please |
| 8 | comment on estimating the additional costs and |
| 9 | time to derive an equation-based water quality |
| 10 | standard for chloride standard similar to Iowa's |
| 11 | that includes provisions for site-specific |
| 12 | hardness and sulfate concentration, with the |
| 13 | addition of a temperature component. |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: Again, if assuming the |
| 15 | same four species are to be utilized, a series of |
| 16 | tests at varying temperatures, hardness and |
| 17 | sulfate would be necessary. I would think 18 |
| 18 | months of research and 3 months for the equation |
| 19 | development at a cost on the order of \$500,000 |
| 20 | which includes the temperature studies that was |
| 21 | described under question 28A. |
| 22 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Are you is there a |
| 23 | way you elaborate how you came up with these |
| 24 | numbers, even later on? |
| | |

| | Page 55 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Yes, most of these were |
| 2 | just projected from the \$100,000 and the number of |
| 3 | variables that you're adding because where we had |
| 4 | only one variable, temperature, you introduce |
| 5 | hardness in there. Now, the complexity goes up by |
| 6 | the square of the number. So you're running four |
| 7 | times as many tests. You now put sulfates in |
| 8 | there. You're at 16 tests for where we were |
| 9 | running one. |
| 10 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. |
| 11 | MR. RAO: Moving onto questions on |
| 12 | TSD Table 1. Chloride Genus and Species Mean |
| 13 | Acute Values. |
| 14 | The acronyms are GMAV and SMAV. |
| 15 | Question 29. |
| 16 | Please describe how a GMAV is |
| 17 | calculated from multiple SMAV's by use of |
| 18 | geometric means. |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: The geometric mean for |
| 20 | the three species of daphnia was computed and then |
| 21 | adjusted by a factor 1.3 for 10°C based on the |
| 22 | ratio of the NOEC for the ceriodaphnia results in |
| 23 | 10 and 25°C from New England Bioassay. The use of |
| 24 | the 1.3 factor was based on best professional |
| | |

January 30, 2019

1 judgment. Question 30. The SMAV's 2 MR. RAO: 3 and GMAV's used for three of the four most 4 sensitive genera sphaerium, ceriodaphnia and 5 neocloeon, in TSD Table 1 were based on one test value each from NEB and INHS. 6 7 30A. Please comment on the 8 variability in results that may be observed in 9 toxicity testing of a particular species done in different laboratories under the same conditions. 10 11 I can provide a couple MR. SOUCEK: 12 of examples. I have seen data that I cannot cite 13 because the data is preliminary and not published 14 for seven-day sodium chloride toxicity tests for a 15 single species for five experienced laboratories 16 use the same protocol and generated 20 percent 17 effect concentration values that varied by more 18 than a factor of two. And, furthermore, for 19 another example for the mayfly and neocloeon, the 20 96-hour LC50 we generated at 25°C were about 5.5 21 fold greater than that produced with the same 22 species by Jackson and Funk 2019. Conditions were 23 not identical, but the hardness of the dilution 24 water was similar.

Page 56

| | Page 57 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. RAO: 30B. Please comment on |
| 2 | whether one study per species or genera is |
| 3 | sufficient, especially for the most sensitive |
| 4 | species when used as a basis for deriving a water |
| 5 | quality standard. |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: So we looked at four of |
| 7 | the most sensitive species when we conducted our |
| 8 | study and in all cases temperature had an effect |
| 9 | on ameliorating the toxicity at colder |
| 10 | temperatures. So I believe it is sufficient. |
| 11 | Certainly more studies would be preferable, but |
| 12 | the data was consistent across the four species we |
| 13 | evaluated. |
| 14 | MR. RAO: 30D. Please cite to some |
| 15 | established protocol, from US EPA or elsewhere, |
| 16 | where substituting the GMAV from several previous |
| 17 | tests with the GMAV from a single new test is |
| 18 | prescribed. If not, could you please elaborate |
| 19 | more on why this approach is appropriate? |
| 20 | MR. HUFF: The focus of our effort |
| 21 | was to see if chloride exhibited the same degree |
| 22 | of toxicity at colder temperatures and our |
| 23 | research clearly shows chlorides are less toxic at |
| 24 | colder temperatures. As the data we generated |

January 30, 2019

Page 58 1 were the only 10°C data available at the time, 2 substituting these results in Table 1 for the same 3 species allows us to calculate winter standards. 4 If we have the toxicity values 5 for most of the other species the same as the 25°C test, the calculated results were conservative. 6 7 The substitution we did was based on the 8 similarity of the organisms and, again, best 9 professional judgment and not out of any US EPA 10 quideline. 11 MS. LIU: Under the species in the 12 Technical Support Document Table 1, question 31, 13 in the table, some of the species ranked by GMAV appear to be out of order. 14 15 For -- can you help me 31A. 16 with the pronunciation hyalella. 17 MR. ETTINGER: Hyalella. 18 MS. LIU: Hyalella. 19 MR. ETTINGER: We have the same 20 problem. 21 Hyalella. The SMAV and MS. LIU: 22 GMAV for the #20 ranked hyalella azteca does not 23 appear to agree with the SMAV and GMAV for the #6 24 ranked hyalella azteca.

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

ſ

| | Page 59 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Should both hyalella azteca |
| 2 | along with the Burlington strain be considered |
| 3 | under one rank for the genera hyalella? |
| 4 | MR. HUFF: Do you want to answer |
| 5 | that? |
| 6 | MR. KLOCEK: We will update Table 1 |
| 7 | with corrections requested normalizing our results |
| 8 | adding in temperatures and incorporating the 10°C |
| 9 | results from Jackson and Funk. |
| 10 | MS. LIU: 31B. In the Stephan 2009a |
| 11 | list, although green sunfish and bluegill have |
| 12 | individual SMAV's, they have one GMAV since they |
| 13 | belong to the same genera. However, in Table 1, |
| 14 | they're ranked separately. Should they be ranked |
| 15 | together? |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: They should be ranked |
| 17 | together and the corrected Table 1 will reflect |
| 18 | that. |
| 19 | MS. LIU: 31C. Fingernail clam is |
| 20 | included in the table. However, it doesn't appear |
| 21 | to be from Stephan 2009a. This is the musculium |
| 22 | species. |
| 23 | Would you please elaborate why |
| 24 | it was added and the source of the values for the |
| | |

ſ

| | | Page | 60 |
|----|---|------|----|
| 1 | SMAV and GMAV. | | |
| 2 | MR. KLOCEK: Yes, we're removing | | |
| 3 | that in the corrected Table 1. | | |
| 4 | MS. LIU: 31C and it should be D. | | |
| 5 | Sorry. Rank 24 is omitted from the list. | | |
| 6 | Additionally, some of the species appear out of | | |
| 7 | order based on GMAV as shown below. Should the | | |
| 8 | ranks be renumbered? | | |
| 9 | MR. KLOCEK: Yes. We're correcting | | |
| 10 | that on Table 1. | | |
| 11 | MS. LIU: Question 32. Would you | | |
| 12 | please describe why the 48-hour and 96-hour LC50 | | |
| 13 | results, while for different durations, both | | |
| 14 | translate into a species mean acute value. | | |
| 15 | MR. HUFF: This is based on ASTM | | |
| 16 | E729 manual. Section 11.7 duration of test | | |
| 17 | Section 11.7.1 "Whenever possible, the exposure | | |
| 18 | duration should be sufficient to ensure that a | | |
| 19 | time-independent toxicity level can be determined | - | |
| 20 | or estimated mathematically. In any case, | | |
| 21 | daphnids and larvae of midges and phantom midges | | |
| 22 | should be exposed to the test material for 48 | | |
| 23 | hours. All other species should be exposed for a | t | |
| 24 | least 96 hours. | | |
| | | | |

| | Page 61 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. LIU: Question 33. The values |
| 2 | from the New England Bioassay reports were |
| 3 | reported in g/L of sodium chloride. The Technical |
| 4 | Support Document converted g/L sodium chloride to |
| 5 | mg/L as chloride to arrive at the LC50 hours |
| 6 | LC50 values. |
| 7 | Would you please confirm the |
| 8 | conversion was based on the ratio of atomic mass |
| 9 | of sodium to chloride. |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Yes, it was although |
| 11 | depending on who was doing the conversion, there |
| 12 | may have been fewer significant digits than the |
| 13 | 0.60662 that you utilized. |
| 14 | MS. LIU: Question 34. The TSD |
| 15 | Table 1 also adjusted the SMAV's and GMAV's for |
| 16 | musculium, hyalella, daphnia, sphaerium, and |
| 17 | ceriodaphnia, Illinois Natural History Survey and |
| 18 | New England Bioassay. |
| 19 | 34A. Footnote one for the |
| 20 | fingernail clam notes that it was adjusted to 10°C |
| 21 | by multiplying by a ratio of 1.75 based on the |
| 22 | sphaerium results. The 1.75 ratio appears to be |
| 23 | from the INHS report, is that correct? |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: Yes, the source of the |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 62 |
|----|--|
| 1 | musculium data was from the INHS report and were |
| 2 | considered for inclusion. Musculium has been |
| 3 | removed from the revised Table 1 submitted |
| 4 | electronically on January 22nd, 2019. We'll |
| 5 | resubmit that. |
| 6 | MS. LIU: 34B. Footnote two for |
| 7 | daphnia states "Adjusted to 10°C based on |
| 8 | ceriodaphnia dubia results by multiplying times |
| 9 | 1.3." You mentioned earlier 1.3 was the best |
| 10 | professional judgment value, could you describe |
| 11 | your process of going through that. |
| 12 | MR. HUFF: If you look at the |
| 13 | results of the acute toxicity of 25°C versus 10°C, |
| 14 | that ratio difference for ceriodaphnia was on the |
| 15 | order of 1.9 or 2.0 depending on which test. The |
| 16 | 1.3 was the difference in the no observable effect |
| 17 | concentration for the ceriodaphnia 1.3. So just |
| 18 | because of the similarity of these other organisms |
| 19 | we said "Let's just apply a conservative 1.3 to |
| 20 | it." I will also offer in revised Table 1 we have |
| 21 | taken that back out and gone back to the 25°C data |
| 22 | for those other species. |
| 23 | MS. LIU: Thank you. 34C. For |
| 24 | footnote two, adjustments were made to all three |
| | |

January 30, 2019

1 daphnia species based on the results of the 2 ceriodaphnia dubia. 3 Would you please cite to some 4 established protocol from US EPA or elsewhere that 5 prescribes the adjustment of the GMAV of one 6 genera based on another genera. If not, would you 7 please further elaborate on the appropriateness of 8 your approach. Again, that was based on 9 MR. HUFF: 10 best professional judgment that we saw this temperature difference in all the species that we 11 12 tested and thought from a similarity, but, again, 13 we have taken that out in the revised statement. 14 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: So I think 15 we're at about an hour-and-a-half in. So how about we take a break, come back in 15 minutes and 16 17 then we can start with the Board Question 35. 18 (Whereupon, a break was taken 19 after which the following 20 proceedings were had.) 21 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Before we 22 start up again, I just want to note for the record 23 that we have been joined by Chairman Katie 24 Papadimitriu and Board member Brenda Carter and

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

Page 63

January 30, 2019

Page 64 Chairman Papadimitriu's attorney advisor Tanya 1 2 Rabczak and they are all located in the 3 Springfield office. So we left off at Question 35. 4 5 So, Alisa, you may go whenever you're ready. 6 MS. LIU: Under normal rising acute 7 values based on hardness and sulfate in Question 35 in the Stephan 2009 --8 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can you guys 9 10 put yourself on mute in Springfield. There we go. 11 Thank you. 12 Question 35. In Stephan MS. LIU: 13 2009a and c, the GMAV's and SMAV's were normalized 14 to hardness and sulfate. The method that he used 15 is different than the approach that I think you 16 might be thinking of using as you contemplate 17 revisions to the tables and the calculations. 18 Would you please comment on 19 revising TSD Table 1 to use the normalized acute 20 values of the species tested by the Illinois 21 Natural History Survey, New England Bioassay, 22 Jackson and Funk consistent with the way shown in 23 Stephan 2009c by first dividing the acute values 24 by the exponential term using the hardness and

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019 January 30, 2019

| | Page 65 |
|----|--|
| 1 | sulfate levels and the test waters, then normalize |
| 2 | the data to 300 mg's/L hardness and 65 mg/L $$ |
| 3 | sulfate for consistency with the existing Stephan |
| 4 | 2009 values used in the table by multiplying by |
| 5 | the exponential term. |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: Yes. We'll revise Table |
| 7 | 1 and we'll submit a separate Table 3 of just our |
| 8 | data plus Jackson and Funk that will show their |
| 9 | results in a normalized result. |
| 10 | MS. LIU: When you do it, will you |
| 11 | please make sure you're doing the normalizing the |
| 12 | way they do it in Stephan 2009 by dividing first |
| 13 | and then multiplying? |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: We'll go back and look at |
| 15 | that and try to do that, yes. |
| 16 | MS. LIU: I understand that you're |
| 17 | filing something with the Board yesterday that we |
| 18 | weren't able to utilize in the hearing today. |
| 19 | Prior to the next hearing, we |
| 20 | can develop questions based on that that will |
| 21 | describe the normalizing question maybe in a |
| 22 | little more detail. |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: That that will be |
| 24 | fine. |
| | |

| | Page 66 |
|----------|---|
| 1 | MS. LIU: In general, 35B, would you |
| 2 | please comment on how using the normalized acute |
| 3 | values might change the ranks and the calculation |
| 4 | of the final acute value and the final chronic |
| 5 | value, the CMC and the CCC presented in Table 2 of |
| 6 | the Technical Support Document. |
| 7 | MR. HUFF: I believe with the |
| 8 | normalized values we will end up with basically |
| 9 | four new species at the bottom of the rank. So |
| 10 | they will all be at the higher temperature where |
| 11 | we're setting at 10°C because at 10°C normalized |
| 12 | data will move up in the acute toxicity value |
| 13 | that's there. The result when you normalize it, |
| 14 | you will see an increase of about 50 percent in |
| 15 | the acute value on a normalized basis. |
| 16 | MS. LIU: Question 36A. Please |
| 17 | comment on recalculating the CMC and CCC presented |
| 18 | in the Technical Support Document Table 2 based on |
| 19 | normalized and non-normalized values as done in |
| 20 | Stephan 2009a and c and use of the equation |
| | |
| 21 | whereby the CMC and the CCC are then normalized by |
| 21 22 | whereby the CMC and the CCC are then normalized by dividing by the exponential term at 300 hardness |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 67 1 standard. 2 MR. HUFF: We will try to do that, 3 yes, ma'am. MS. LIU: Ouestion 36B. 4 Please comment on what statewide default values for 5 6 hardness and sulphate may be used in Illinois if 7 you were to turn the equation into a single value 8 number. The mean value from the 9 MR. HUFF: 10 data I received from the Agency yesterday in 11 hardness for Illinois streams was 286.8 mg/L and 12 the sulfate was 86.8 mg/L. Those mean values 13 would seem appropriate under that methodology. 14 MS. SANTOS: Can you please repeat 15 the sulfate? 16 MR. HUFF: 86.8 mg's/L. 17 MS. LIU: I will drop the next 18 question because you will be doing recalculations. 19 So it doesn't apply now. 20 MR. RAO: Moving onto Other Acute 21 Toxicity Testing on mayflies At Various 22 Temperatures With Linear Regression Analysis. 23 Ouestion 37. The Jackson and 24 Funk 2019 acute toxicity test examined acute

January 30, 2019

Page 68 1 responses to elevated sodium chloride 2 concentrations at 5, 7.5, 10, 12.5, 15, 20, 25°C. 3 37A. Please comment on 4 providing a table similar to Table 2 of Jackson 5 and Funk 2019 showing species, genera, temperatures, and electrical conductivity with the 6 7 96-hour LC50 acute values converted to chloride 8 concentrations. Please also comment on including 9 the normalized acute values as done in Stephan 2009 for hardness and sulfate. 10 11 MR. HUFF: We will provide data 12 separately for the Jackson and Funk and our work 13 in one and then we'll incorporate that into Table 14 1 in a normalized fashion as well. 37B. Please comment on 15 MR. RAO: 16 why the acute values from these four new genera of 17 mayflies from Jackson and Funk 2019 were not added 18 to TSD Table 1 along with the acute values 19 provided by INHS. 20 MR. HUFF: We didn't get the Jackson 21 and Funk article until long after the Technical 22 Support Document was completed. We have 23 incorporated that now into the Table 1 that we 24 will submit.

| | Page 69 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. RAO: 37C. Please comment on |
| 2 | the effect of adding the 10°C data for the |
| 3 | neocloeon genera from Jackson and Funk 2019 to the |
| 4 | INHS 2017 data would have on the calculation of |
| 5 | the SMAV and the GMAV used in TSD Table 1. |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: I don't think it will |
| 7 | have a significant effect because they're not |
| 8 | going to be one of the four most sensitive |
| 9 | organism species. |
| 10 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Before you |
| 11 | continue, Mr. Huff, can you please remove that |
| 12 | paper from the microphone to make sure it's not |
| 13 | clogging the sound. |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: Sorry. |
| 15 | MR. RAO: 37D. Please comment on |
| 16 | any effect of adding the 10°C data for all four |
| 17 | genera would have on the TSD's calculation of the |
| 18 | Final Acute Value and Criterion Maximum |
| 19 | Concentration. |
| 20 | MR. HUFF: Same answer. I don't |
| 21 | think it will have a material effect just based on |
| 22 | where it shows up in the ranking normalized. |
| 23 | MR. RAO: Moving onto TSD Table 2. |
| 24 | Recalculation values. Question 38. |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 70 1 TSD Table 2 is entitled 2 "Recalculation Values for Chicago Sanitary and 3 Ship Canal," is this title correct? 4 MR. HUFF: No. MR. RAO: If not, is the table 5 addressing values for all Illinois waters? 6 7 MR. HUFF: Yes, that was the intent. 8 MR. RAO: Okay. We're going to skip 9 I think you're going to provide the revised 39. 10 table later. Moving onto Question 40. 11 Due to the limitations of the 12 text editor, the format of the mathematical terms 13 in Table 2 doesn't seem to appear as intended. Based on the US EPA 1985 14 guidelines, please comment on whether the 15 equations in our pre-filed questions, I'm not 16 17 going to read this equation right now, below appears as intended. 18 19 MR. HUFF: The equation that 20 underlie the output in the data table was correct. 21 The mathematics that we put down to show how we 22 were doing that the second and third lines of the 23 S squared calculations were shown incorrectly and 24 that's been corrected as well on the table we'll

January 30, 2019

Page 71 1 be submitting. 2 MR. RAO: Thank you. 3 MS. LIU: Ouestion 41 under acute 4 and chronic ratio. The Technical Support Document 5 Table 2 gives an acute chronic ratio of 3.178. 6 Did you mean 3.187? 7 MR. HUFF: You can answer that. 8 MR. KLOCEK: Yes, the last two 9 digits were transposed. 10 MS. LIU: 41B. Will you comment on how this would alter the final chronic value? 11 12 MR. HUFF: With the revision noted 13 in the previous question, the calculation, the CCC 14 value will increase -- or will decrease by 0.2 15 percent before rounding. MS. LIU: Under derivation of an 16 17 alternative final chronic value, Question 42, 18 Stephan 2009a described an alternative approach to deriving the final chronic value "Justified on the 19 20 basis of the good science clause in the 1985 21 quidelines." 22 42A. Would you please comment 23 on how the four most sensitive species would be 24 different than TSD Table 1 and 2 based on the

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | GMAV's for the calculation of the final acute |
| 2 | value versus the predicted genus mean chronic |
| 3 | values for the calculation of the final chronic |
| 4 | value using the alternative method. |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: Our testing failed to |
| 6 | show chronic toxicity for the duration of the test |
| 7 | for the standard the toxicity test while some |
| 8 | chronic effects were observed when exposed to |
| 9 | elevated chlorides for up to seven weeks. We |
| 10 | elected to use the extended testing and the spike |
| 11 | testing as part of our sensitivity analysis and |
| 12 | relied on the calculated acute-chronic ratio. And |
| 13 | without chronic data at 10°C for all the species, |
| 14 | I'm not clear how I would implement that |
| 15 | alternative approach. |
| 16 | MS. LIU: I think the alternative |
| 17 | approach was more based on incorporating the |
| 18 | vertebrae and invertebrate acute-chronic ratios |
| 19 | rather than just the invertebrate chronic ratio |
| 20 | that you utilized to calculate the predicted |
| 21 | chronic values. I see where your explanation is |
| 22 | going. It's a slightly different way to do it |
| 23 | mathematically. I was wondering if you would look |
| 24 | at that procedure and try that out as well. |
| | |

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

Page 72

| | Page 73 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: I'll do my best, yes, |
| 2 | ma'am. |
| 3 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Under the |
| 4 | heading technical feasibility and economic |
| 5 | reasonableness, Question 43, as noted in the |
| 6 | Statement of Reasons, the Board is required to |
| 7 | take into account the "technical feasibility and |
| 8 | economic reasonableness of measuring or reducing |
| 9 | the particular type of pollution." |
| 10 | Would you please address the |
| 11 | technical feasibility and economic reasonableness |
| 12 | of the proposal. |
| 13 | MR. HUFF: Going from a |
| 14 | not-to-exceed winter water quality standard to a |
| 15 | four-day chronic and a higher acute winter water |
| 16 | quality standard will benefit all urban streams in |
| 17 | Illinois without impacting the aquatic communities |
| 18 | in these streams. The non-winter chronic water |
| 19 | quality standard is more restrictive than the |
| 20 | current 500 mg/L not-to-exceed standard and from |
| 21 | the stream work that the DuPage River Salt Creek |
| 22 | Workgroup has conducted as referenced in Steven |
| 23 | McCracken's written comments will benefit these |
| 24 | receiving streams. |
| | |

| | Page 74 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Given the current peak chlorides |
| 2 | and urban streams during snow melt, I do not |
| 3 | believe the current water quality standards are |
| 4 | attainable. Adopting a winter standard will allow |
| 5 | many urban streams to achieve the water quality |
| 6 | standards through the best management practices |
| 7 | currently being implemented. |
| 8 | In conclusion, I would say there |
| 9 | will be a positive economic impact on the Illinois |
| 10 | economy if a winter chloride standard is adopted. |
| 11 | I believe the proposed standards are technically |
| 12 | feasible for many urban streams, but there will |
| 13 | continue to be urban steams that will have a |
| 14 | difficult time meeting even the proposed |
| 15 | standards. |
| 16 | MR. ETTINGER: Excuse me. |
| 17 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. ETTINGER: Do you want me to go |
| 19 | with that now or should I wait because I have |
| 20 | other questions about that later? |
| 21 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: You can ask |
| 22 | the questions now. |
| 23 | MR. ETTINGER: Okay. Your |
| 24 | understanding is that the 500 mg/L now is a |
| | |

| | Page 75 |
|----|---|
| 1 | not-to-be-exceeded standard? |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: Correct. |
| 3 | MR. ETTINGER: Correct. So there is |
| 4 | no chronic standard currently in Illinois? |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: Correct. |
| 6 | MR. ETTINGER: Okay. What is a |
| 7 | permit writer supposed to do, to your |
| 8 | understanding, if there is no chronic standard or |
| 9 | the standard is missing? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Well, if if you're |
| 11 | talking about when a permit writer goes through a |
| 12 | reasonable potential to exceed a water quality |
| 13 | standard on a point source discharger as opposed |
| 14 | to let's say a municipal system with storm sewers, |
| 15 | he would go through and if there is a reasonable |
| 16 | potential with that discharge exceeding 500 mg/L $$ |
| 17 | with a not-to-exceed standard, I believe he would |
| 18 | put a daily maximum limit on that discharger to |
| 19 | assure that 500 mg/L would not be exceeded under |
| 20 | his analysis. |
| 21 | MR. ETTINGER: Okay. Specifically, |
| 22 | in a situation, though, in which there is no |
| 23 | chronic standard, is the permit writer to attempt |
| 24 | to use write a permit based on a narrative |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 76 1 standard? 2 MR. HUFF: I don't believe so. But 3 that's a question better asked of the Agency. 4 MR. ETTINGER: I'm just trying to 5 understand the predicates for your conclusion. 6 The current -- if there is no 7 numeric standard as to a particular component that 8 might be relevant to a permit, in general, is one 9 supposed to write a narrative -- you'd write a 10 limit based on a narrative standard, to your 11 knowledge? 12 MR. HUFF: Not -- I don't believe There is a numerical standard in the case of 13 so. 14 chlorides. That's what they would address is my 15 understanding. 16 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. 17 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can we continue? 18 19 MR. ETTINGER: He said what he 20 could. 21 MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. We're onto 22 number 44 under Chloride Best Management Practices 23 and Offsets. In R08-9(d) --24 MS. BROWN: I --

| | Page 77 |
|----|---|
| 1 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. Is |
| 2 | there a question in Springfield? |
| 3 | MS. BROWN: Yes. Melissa Brown on |
| 4 | behalf of the Illinois Environmental Regulatory |
| 5 | Group. |
| 6 | Mr. Huff, can you please just |
| 7 | elaborate on the technical feasibility and |
| 8 | economic reasonableness of the proposed summer |
| 9 | standard? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: I think the summer |
| 11 | standard is going to be difficult in a lot of |
| 12 | streams to achieve those numbers. So, again, I |
| 13 | just simply propose what the US EPA had published |
| 14 | as a summer standard to start a dialogue on the |
| 15 | summer numbers. |
| 16 | MS. BROWN: So then you don't think |
| 17 | it's technically feasible now currently, the |
| 18 | summer standard? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: The summer standard? I |
| 20 | think there will be streams in Illinois that will |
| 21 | find that very difficult to achieve and certainly |
| 22 | in the spring months as it's written right now |
| 23 | where you continue to have a contribution from |
| 24 | de-icing whether from retention basins or |
| | |

| | Page 78 |
|----|--|
| 1 | groundwater, there is typically a tail in the |
| 2 | spring months where the chloride drops over time. |
| 3 | MS. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. |
| 4 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Okay. 44. In |
| 5 | R08-9(d), Mr. Huff testified regarding a chloride |
| 6 | offset program with the Illinois Toll Highway |
| 7 | Authority. |
| 8 | A. Please provide further |
| 9 | elaboration on these efforts. |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: So I will submit to the |
| 11 | Board in the next submittal fairly extensive |
| 12 | information on the memorandums of agreement that |
| 13 | the tollway has entered in with two communities |
| 14 | and the full description from the tollway on their |
| 15 | program. |
| 16 | MS. ZALEWSKI: B. Were local |
| 17 | communities able to apply to the Illinois Toll |
| 18 | Highway Authority for funding to purchase new |
| 19 | equipment to reduce salt usage in their |
| 20 | communities to offset increased salt usage by the |
| 21 | tollway where the same watersheds were affected? |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: Yes, the tollways program |
| 23 | was developed and focused on offsetting new salt |
| 24 | loadings at the watershed level. Thus, all |
| | |

| | Page 79 |
|----|--|
| 1 | communities adjacent to the Elgin-O'Hare West |
| 2 | Airport Corridor have been made aware of the |
| 3 | program, though primary focus for achieving |
| 4 | offsets has occurred within the project area where |
| 5 | an entirely new facility is being constructed |
| 6 | which is east of I-290 to O'Hare and north to I-90 |
| 7 | and south to I-294. |
| 8 | MS. ZALEWSKI: C. How much funding |
| 9 | were the communities able to acquire for these |
| 10 | offset agreements, how were the amounts |
| 11 | determined, and how was it allocated among BMP |
| 12 | measures? |
| 13 | MR. HUFF: The tollway has not |
| 14 | established a monetary cap for funding communities |
| 15 | as part of the program. The focus of the tollway |
| 16 | program is to achieve an approximate 20 percent |
| 17 | chloride use reduction with its partnering |
| 18 | communities. This reduction amount was |
| 19 | established with a goal of increasing winter snow |
| 20 | and ice removal operational efficiencies within a |
| 21 | community that could be achieved while maintaining |
| 22 | safety for the motoring public. |
| 23 | MS. ZALEWSKI: D. Can you name some |
| 24 | of Illinois's communities that have these types of |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 80 1 offset agreements? 2 MR. HUFF: There are currently two 3 communities that have partnered with the tollway 4 as part of the offset program. They are Wood Dale and Bensenville and I will submit those 5 6 agreements -- additional agreements that are 7 currently in negotiations between the tollway and 8 the partnering communities. 9 MS. ZALEWSKI: Thank you. E. Were 10 the agreements or resulting BMP initiatives made part of the MS 4 permits? 11 12 MR. HUFF: The winter operations BMP's have not been specifically included in the 13 14 tollways' MS 4 permit and I'm not sure about the 15 communities. 16 MS. ZALEWSKI: F. Do you know if 17 there are similar offset agreements in other 18 states? 19 MR. HUFF: I am unaware of any 20 offset programs in the United States. 21 MS. ZALEWSKI: G. What other 22 sources of funding are communities able to use for 23 implementing chloride BMP's? 24 MR. HUFF: My understanding is that

| | Page 81 |
|----|--|
| 1 | nearly all of the BMP's implemented by communities |
| 2 | have been funded completely at the local level. |
| 3 | That rate of funding depends on the financial |
| 4 | strength of each community. |
| 5 | MS. ZALEWSKI: 45A. Please comment |
| 6 | on whether all municipalities and other entities |
| 7 | discharging to urban waterways have developed and |
| 8 | implemented BMP's to reduce de-icing salt usage. |
| 9 | MR. HUFF: BMP's have been |
| 10 | implemented at different rates depending on the |
| 11 | community, the watershed where it resides and how |
| 12 | progressive the public works director in those |
| 13 | communities are. In the DuPage River Salt Creek |
| 14 | Workgroup, aggressive implementation has been |
| 15 | ongoing for more than a decade with a high-degree |
| 16 | of participation by the municipalities. |
| 17 | To my knowledge, all of these |
| 18 | communities in the DuPage River Salt Creek |
| 19 | Workgroup Watershed have implemented BMP's |
| 20 | including training, collaboration, pavement |
| 21 | temperature monitoring and advanced water |
| 22 | forecasting servicing. Liquid use has been |
| 23 | increasing each year to where pre-treating and |
| 24 | pre-wetting are currently wildly practiced in |
| | |

| | Page 82 |
|----|--|
| 1 | these basins. Anti-icing is increasing annually. |
| 2 | Similar efforts in the Hickory |
| 3 | Creek Basin, the Lower Des Plaines Basin, the |
| 4 | Chicago Area Waterway System, Lake and McHenry |
| 5 | Counties have also been ongoing, but for not as |
| 6 | long as the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup |
| 7 | area. |
| 8 | MS. ZALEWSKI: B. Can you comment |
| 9 | on whether it would be premature to draw broad |
| 10 | conclusions on the effectiveness of BMP's to |
| 11 | reduce salt usage to meet the chloride standard? |
| 12 | MR. HUFF: The focus of the |
| 13 | regulating community has been to reduce salt usage |
| 14 | on an annual basis and progress has been made in |
| 15 | reducing salt on this basis. The problem is that |
| 16 | the standard is not an annual standard. It is a |
| 17 | not-to-exceed number. The question then becomes |
| 18 | under extreme conditions; freezing rain, dropping |
| 19 | temperatures, high wind conditions, et cetera, how |
| 20 | effective liquids training and weather tracking |
| 21 | will be under these extreme conditions. |
| 22 | The answer is that the regulated |
| 23 | community for safety purposes will need to apply |
| 24 | copious salt to keep the roads, parking lots and |
| | |

| | Page 83 |
|----|--|
| 1 | sidewalks safe during these extreme events. I |
| 2 | believe you can look at the trends in the DuPage |
| 3 | River Salt Creek Workgroup Basin and that data was |
| 4 | provided in my Technical Support Document and it |
| 5 | is apparent that the 500 mg/L maximum on Salt |
| 6 | Creek in the east branch of the DuPage River will |
| 7 | not be achieved through BMP's given the high |
| 8 | participation rate currently existing in those |
| 9 | basins. |
| 10 | I want to stress that |
| 11 | encouragement of BMP's is absolutely a correct |
| 12 | step to take. My point is we are striving for a |
| 13 | target that will not be achievable in many urban |
| 14 | streams, nor is it necessary to protect our |
| 15 | streams during winter months with that 500 mg/L $$ |
| 16 | standard. |
| 17 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Thanks. |
| 18 | MR. RAO: Question 46A. Please |
| 19 | comment on whether other sources besides sodium |
| 20 | chloride tend to be more or less toxic to aquatic |
| 21 | life. |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: David? |
| 23 | MR. SOUCEK: Yes. In general, |
| 24 | sodium chloride tends to be less toxic to aquatic |
| | |

| | Page 84 |
|----|--|
| 1 | life than magnesium chloride and potassium |
| 2 | chloride, but this can vary by species. For |
| 3 | example, ceriodaphnia dubia and lampsilis |
| 4 | siliquoidea, a fresh water mussel, have been found |
| 5 | to be much more sensitive to potassium chloride |
| 6 | than to sodium chloride by Mount, et al 2016 and |
| 7 | Wong, et al, 2018. However, sodium chloride and |
| 8 | potassium chloride have comparable toxicity on a |
| 9 | Muller basis to the mayfly neocloeon triangulifer, |
| 10 | a study that we established in Soucek, 2018. |
| 11 | It's been found that both |
| 12 | ceriodaphnia dubia and the mayfly neocloeon |
| 13 | triangulifer are more sensitive to magnesium salts |
| 14 | than sodium salts and Mount, et al, from 2016 |
| 15 | found that calcium has a toxicity that lies for C. |
| 16 | Dubia excuse me calcium chloride has a |
| 17 | toxicity that lies between that of sodium and |
| 18 | magnesium salts. |
| 19 | MR. RAO: 46B. Do you know if any |
| 20 | of the chloride BMP's currently being prescribed |
| 21 | consider the toxicity of other salts? If not, |
| 22 | should they? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: Calcium chloride and |
| 24 | magnesium chloride are both used typically either |
| | |

| | Page 85 |
|----|--|
| 1 | for pre-wetting or during colder pavement |
| 2 | temperatures when sodium chloride is either less |
| 3 | effective or not effective at all depending on the |
| 4 | temperature. There are corrosion issues with |
| 5 | magnesium chloride so it is typically not used on |
| 6 | bridges. Both magnesium and calcium chlorides are |
| 7 | considerably more expensive than sodium chloride, |
| 8 | but necessary at colder pavement temperatures and |
| 9 | can significantly reduce total chlorides applied |
| 10 | as opposed to sodium salts during cold |
| 11 | temperatures. |
| 12 | MR. RAO: Question 47. In your |
| 13 | testimony, you referred to a Connecticut |
| 14 | Department of Transportation study. |
| 15 | 47A. That study I think was |
| 16 | based on the use of sand-salt mixture compared to |
| 17 | salt? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. RAO: Are Illinois roadway |
| 20 | authorities considering alternatives other than |
| 21 | sand-salt mixture to reduce salt usage in urban |
| 22 | areas? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: Most of the best |
| 24 | management practices being implemented in Illinois |
| | |

| | Page 86 |
|----|--|
| 1 | are directed to more efficient application of salt |
| 2 | such as pre-wetting to reduce bounce off the |
| 3 | roadway, anti-icing prior to the storm to prevent |
| 4 | ice formation on the surface, annual calibration, |
| 5 | computer application based on vehicle speed, |
| 6 | plowing first before applying salt and tailoring a |
| 7 | salt application rate to the pavement temperature |
| 8 | and predicted pavement temperature. |
| 9 | Essentially, nearly all these |
| 10 | efforts are tailored towards optimizing the salt |
| 11 | application rate and reducing losses due to bounce |
| 12 | so there is no change in the effectiveness. The |
| 13 | addition of carbohydrates such as beet juice |
| 14 | reduces salt applied, but contributes to the |
| 15 | organic loading and you see pretty common in both |
| 16 | the anti-icing and in the pre-wetting where |
| 17 | they're using a 10 to 20 percent mixture of some |
| 18 | carbohydrate with the salt for the liquid portion. |
| 19 | MR. RAO: You already talked about |
| 20 | salt alternative options being considered here. |
| 21 | Are there any studies conducted |
| 22 | to evaluate the effectiveness of these |
| 23 | alternatives compared to sand-salt mixtures? |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: Are there any studies? |
| | |

| | Page 87 |
|----|---|
| 1 | There has certainly been a lot of work done. So I |
| 2 | would say, yes, there is a fair amount of data |
| 3 | that's out there. When you apply straight |
| 4 | carbohydrates, they tend to be very slippery and |
| 5 | increases accidents. So the City of Chicago tried |
| 6 | that at one point in time on a narrow area. So |
| 7 | they kind have gone to mixtures. You have a lot |
| 8 | of proprietary mixtures of the salt in various |
| 9 | carbohydrates from the vendors of the de-icing |
| 10 | chemicals today. |
| 11 | MR. RAO: 47C. |
| 12 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. |
| 13 | Before you go on, Mr. Huff, you noted that the |
| 14 | City of Chicago focused in on an area. |
| 15 | Was that part of a program or a |
| 16 | study that they did that has a report? |
| 17 | MR. HUFF: It was around City Hall |
| 18 | actually and they never did it again after that |
| 19 | day because they had a series of accidents from |
| 20 | the slipperiness of all of the beet juice that |
| 21 | they put down. I mean, the City is doing other |
| 22 | work, but there was no report on that one. They |
| 23 | just stopped that one. |
| 24 | MS. ZALEWSKI: Is there anything in |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 88 1 the record that applied the beet juice -- I 2 mean --3 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Is there 4 anything you can, like, submit? 5 MR. HUFF: Let me see what I can 6 find. 7 MR. RAO: Thank you. 47C. Please 8 clarify whether it is your opinion that "Highway 9 de-icing practices cannot be simply changed" or is it the consensus of roadway authorities in the 10 11 state? 12 This is my opinion having MR. HUFF: worked for the Tollway, the Skyway, the Illinois 13 Department of Transportation, county and municipal 14 15 highway projects for many years. Every roadway 16 expansion has to address the impact of the 17 associated de-icing practices and alternatives are 18 evaluated including organics such as acetates. 19 And in every case, more efficient application of 20 salt has been shown to be the only viable 21 alternative. 22 MS. LIU: Question 48. As Laura 23 argues in pre-filed testimony, based on that, 24 would you please clarify whether the SMAV used in

January 30, 2019

Page 89 1 your proposal needs to be revised considering more 2 recent studies that she cited. 3 MR. HUFF: We use the 2009 species list as a starting point and added 10°C 4 5 temperature information that we had. So with respect to the glochidia, the research out there 6 7 at 10°C is not available. 8 MS. LIU: Question 49. Would you 9 please comment on Ms. Barghusen's concern regarding the lack of studies to demonstrate that 10 the proposed standard affords adequate protection 11 12 to the glochidia. 13 MR. HUFF: Mussel glochidia have 14 been shown to be among the most sensitive 15 organisms to chloride. All studies so far have been conducted at or near 21°C. However, Gillis 16 17 reported LC50 values in the natural waters over 3 18 times higher than what they got in the laboratory 19 reconstituted water which could not be explained 20 simply with respect to hardness. So, clearly, 21 additional research is warranted with respect to 22 glochidia sensitivity to chlorides and natural waters in addition to tests at 10°C. 23 24 MR. RAO: I think that completes our

January 30, 2019

Page 90 1 questions. Thank you very much. 2 Thank you. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: 3 We will now go to the IEPA questions. You guys 4 are on mute, Springfield. 5 MS. DIERS: Thank you. Can we have 6 about five minutes just so I can talk to my 7 technical folks before I start asking our 8 questions? 9 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yeah. 10 Mr. Huff, do you have a problem with that? 11 MR. HUFF: No. 12 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. We can come back in five minutes. 13 14 MS. DIERS: All right. Thank you. 15 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Off the 16 record. 17 (Whereupon, a break was taken 18 after which the following 19 proceedings were had.) 20 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. We can go back on the record. All right. IEPA, 21 22 you may begin your questions. 23 MS. DIERS: Stefanie Diers from 24 Illinois EPA. I'm going to strike our question

January 30, 2019

Page 91 1 I believe it was already asked and answered. one. 2 So I'm going to go to question two. 3 On page three of your pre-filed 4 testimony, you state that work plans were 5 submitted to US EPA but that you heard nothing 6 back from them. 7 Did you follow-up with US EPA 8 concerning the work plans that you sent? 9 MR. HUFF: I did not. 10 MS. DIERS: You also state that you sent your work plans to Illinois EPA and did not 11 12 receive any comments, did you follow-up with them? 13 MR. HUFF: No, I did not say that. 14 I said I received a phone call from Scott Twait 15 and then Scott indicated there would be a 16 follow-up letter from the Agency commenting on the 17 work plan and nothing ever arrived. 18 MS. DIERS: Okay. So going on that, 19 that addresses question three where we state on 20 page 4 of your pre-filed testimony, you state that you spoke to Scott Twait at Illinois EPA and were 21 22 told the Agency would like to see more testing at 23 more temperatures. 24 Α. Why were additional

| 1temperatures not tested to appropriately derive a2slope, an associated final acute equation, and3final chronic equation for the proposed chloride4standards, as described in US EPA guidance?5MR. HUFF: Twofold. One, I was6strictly looking at the de-icing winter practices7and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations8and I offered if Scott could come up with the9money that we would be more than happy to run the10additional tests.11MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C12chloride water quality standards be protective of13aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C?14MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have15placed forward before the Board has resulted in16some confusion. There is a summer proposal17considerably more restrictive then the current 500 | |
|---|--|
| <pre>3 final chronic equation for the proposed chloride 4 standards, as described in US EPA guidance? 5 MR. HUFF: Twofold. One, I was 6 strictly looking at the de-icing winter practices 7 and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations 8 and I offered if Scott could come up with the 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the 10 additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal</pre> | |
| <pre>4 standards, as described in US EPA guidance? 5 MR. HUFF: Twofold. One, I was 6 strictly looking at the de-icing winter practices 7 and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations 8 and I offered if Scott could come up with the 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the 10 additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal</pre> | |
| 5 MR. HUFF: Twofold. One, I was 6 strictly looking at the de-icing winter practices 7 and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations 8 and I offered if Scott could come up with the 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the 10 additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| 6 strictly looking at the de-icing winter practices 7 and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations 8 and I offered if Scott could come up with the 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| <pre>7 and, second, was strictly budgetary considerations 8 and I offered if Scott could come up with the 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the 10 additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal</pre> | |
| and I offered if Scott could come up with the money that we would be more than happy to run the additional tests. MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C chloride water quality standards be protective of aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have placed forward before the Board has resulted in some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| 9 money that we would be more than happy to run the additional tests. 11 MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| 10additional tests.11MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C12chloride water quality standards be protective of13aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C?14MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have15placed forward before the Board has resulted in16some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| MS. DIERS: B. Would the 10°C chloride water quality standards be protective of aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have placed forward before the Board has resulted in some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| 12 chloride water quality standards be protective of 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| 13 aquatic life at temperatures slightly above 10°C? 14 MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have 15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| MR. HUFF: So the proposal I have placed forward before the Board has resulted in some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| <pre>15 placed forward before the Board has resulted in 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal</pre> | |
| 16 some confusion. There is a summer proposal | |
| | |
| 17 considerably more restrictive then the current 500 | |
| | |
| 18 mg/L standard. The only significant variable is | |
| 19 the highway de-icing practices which occurs as | |
| 20 defined episodic events. The winter standard was | |
| 21 intended to address these episodic events. Snow | |
| 22 is in a solid form of water, which means that it | |
| 23 exists at a temperature at or below 0°C. Snow | |
| 24 melt caused by salt application will result in the | |

January 30, 2019

Page 93 1 formation of a liquid at temperatures at or below 0°C. 2 3 Runoff from highways and parking 4 lots when salt was applied will be at temperatures below 10°C and this winter standard was intended 5 to address these scenarios. Now, if the stream 6 temperatures are above 10°C, the pavement 7 temperature will certainly be above 10°C and the 8 9 salt application would be minimal during these scenarios. Salt is primarily applied to break the 10 bond between the pavement and ice formation. 11 12 From the number of questions I 13 received regarding the winter temperatures, it is clear that the consensus of participants would 14 15 prefer a water quality standard based on 16 temperature, not seasons. I would have no 17 objections to changing the approach to a 18 temperature-based standard in the case of the data we have that when the stream is at or below 10°C. 19 20 MR. ETTINGER: May I follow-up on 21 that, please? 22 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yes. 23 MR. ETTINGER: As a general 24 question, did you consider the effect of chloride

| | Page 94 |
|----|---|
| 1 | entering streams through groundwater? |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: Antidotically? I believe |
| 3 | that would be an issue in March, April and into |
| 4 | May and sometimes into June where the other |
| 5 | proposed standard, the summer standard, would |
| 6 | apply in the latter two months of that. |
| 7 | MR. ETTINGER: Antidotically, so you |
| 8 | considered it antidotically, is that what your |
| 9 | answer is? I'm sorry. |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Not specifically. But |
| 11 | you would have to meet from that groundwater |
| 12 | migrating into the streams in May and June the |
| 13 | proposed 230 mg/L chronic standard. |
| 14 | MR. ETTINGER: Well, could we've |
| 15 | had some warm winters in the past, too. Could you |
| 16 | have groundwater enter in February during a |
| 17 | relatively warm winter also? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: During a warm winter? |
| 19 | MR. ETTINGER: Yes. |
| 20 | MR. HUFF: I think it depends on how |
| 21 | much salt has been applied. Right. If you're not |
| 22 | applying salt because you have warm weather, |
| 23 | you're not going to get that groundwater with the |
| 24 | elevated chloride. |
| | |

| · · | Page 95 |
|-----|--|
| 1 | MR. ETTINGER: I guess my question |
| 2 | is, though, we have situations have had |
| 3 | situations, my recent memory, in fact, in which we |
| 4 | had snowstorms in December and then an absurdly |
| 5 | warm January by historical standards. |
| 6 | Could you not see salt entering |
| 7 | the stream in January, in using my example, at |
| 8 | relatively warm temperatures? |
| 9 | MR. HUFF: The temperatures would be |
| 10 | below 50°F. So below 10°C. Groundwater is not |
| 11 | going to be above that temperature at that time of |
| 12 | year period. |
| 13 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ms. Yang? |
| 14 | MS. YANG: To follow-up on |
| 15 | Mr. Ettinger's comments on groundwater migration, |
| 16 | have you or would you consider that factor in |
| 17 | relationship to different permeabilities of soils |
| 18 | that are found in Illinois? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: Frankly, I don't think |
| 20 | it's relevant. If you have a water quality |
| 21 | standard, you're striving to meet that standard |
| 22 | independent of what the geology in the State of |
| 23 | Illinois is. |
| 24 | MS. YANG: But do you recognize how |

| | Page 96 |
|----|---|
| 1 | on certain soils at high porosity and groundwater |
| 2 | be impacted as opposed to soils with lower |
| 3 | permeability? |
| 4 | MR. HUFF: It would contribute at a |
| 5 | faster rate in the more permeable soils. |
| 6 | MS. YANG: Okay. Would that |
| 7 | would you consider looking into that impact as an |
| 8 | additional study to this proposal? |
| 9 | MR. HUFF: The short answer is no. |
| 10 | I don't think it's relevant. What we were trying |
| 11 | to do is establish whether chlorides are less |
| 12 | toxic at colder temperatures. That's what our |
| 13 | study was about. |
| 14 | MR. ETTINGER: Just to be clear as |
| 15 | to what we said before. Your testimony is, is |
| 16 | that groundwater has never been above 50°F in |
| 17 | January or February or March in the history of |
| 18 | Illinois? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: Well, you're I don't |
| 20 | think it would occur. I have never seen such data |
| 21 | that would suggest otherwise. |
| 22 | MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. |
| 23 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. |
| 24 | Ms. Diers, you can continue. |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 97 1 MS. DIERS: Okay. Question C. 2 Would chloride toxicity be further mitigated at test temperatures below 10°C? 3 MR. HUFF: Based on the work of 4 5 Jackson and Funk with mayflies where they tested the toxicity of temperatures at 5°C all the way up 6 7 to 25°C, I would say toxicity is further mitigated at colder temperatures below 10°C, yes. 8 9 MS. DIERS: Question 4. Did you share the regulatory proposal with US EPA before 10 11 filing the petition with the Illinois Pollution 12 Control Board? 13 MR. HUFF: No. 14 MS. DIERS: Why not? 15 MR. HUFF: Well, I tried to follow 16 the Illinois Pollution Control Board's procedures 17 for filing and budgetary contributions as well. 18 MS. DIERS: Have you talked to US 19 EPA to see what you have proposed is approvable by 20 US EPA? 21 MR. HUFF: I have not, no. 22 MS. DIERS: That takes care of 23 Ouestion 5. 24 Did you share the regulatory

January 30, 2019

Page 98 proposal with Illinois EPA before filing your 1 2 petition with the Board? 3 MR. HUFF: No, I, again, tried to follow the Pollution Control Board's procedure for 4 5 filing a regulatory rule change. Question 7. Did you 6 MS. DIERS: 7 conduct any outreach with stakeholders concerning 8 your proposal before you filed it with the Illinois Pollution Control Board? 9 10 MR. HUFF: I presented to the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup twice during the 11 12 project at its public meetings as well as to the 13 Hickory Creek Watershed. Both groups have 14 environmental stakeholders as members. In 15 addition, I sent out to the clients that funded 16 the research for progress reports along the way. 17 MS. DIERS: So did you talk to anybody in central or southern Illinois, 18 19 communities or anything, about your proposal? 20 MR. HUFF: No, I did not. 21 MS. DIERS: And why did you not talk 22 to other communities throughout the State of 23 Illinois before filing your proposal? 24 MR. HUFF: I basically went off my

January 30, 2019

Page 99 1 outreach when I put together my consortium with 2 the organizations that I had some familiarity 3 with. 4 MS. DIERS: Would you agree if 5 you're doing a statewide water quality standard 6 that you should talk to other people throughout 7 the state to see what the impact of the proposal 8 might be? 9 MR. HUFF: Well, again, my primary 10 focus was on the colder temperature in urban areas which is primarily northeast Illinois. 11 12 Question 9. As drafted, MS. DIERS: 13 this proposal contains a statewide water quality 14 standard. Did you look at chloride impacts and 15 road salt usage in central and southern Illinois? 16 MR. HUFF: No, I did not. I mean, 17 salt usage is salt usage. You have a storm and 18 you have the appropriate temperatures they're 19 going to be putting salt down at the same rates as 20 what would be applied here on an individual storm 21 They would just have fewer of them. event. 22 MS. DIERS: Ten. Please describe 23 how temperature and weather from northern, central 24 and southern Illinois vary.

| | Page 100 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: It's colder and likely |
| 2 | more snow the further north one is in Illinois. |
| 3 | With respect to stream temperature, again, my |
| 4 | focus was on the episodic salt application events |
| 5 | which can occur over the months proposed. |
| 6 | However, I have no objections to a cold |
| 7 | temperature standard based on the stream |
| 8 | temperatures. So we'd have a winter temperature |
| 9 | that would apply when the stream was at or below |
| 10 | 10°C. |
| 11 | MS. DIERS: Eleven. Does your |
| 12 | research consider the difference in temperature |
| 13 | and snowfall events for the southern half of the |
| 14 | state as compared to the northern half of the |
| 15 | state? |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: Yeah. Our research again |
| 17 | looked at the temperature effects on chloride |
| 18 | toxicity. The proposed winter water quality |
| 19 | standard was developed to address the episodic |
| 20 | snow events with the proposed summer standard |
| 21 | serving as the controlling standard in areas not |
| 22 | dominated by urban snow removal practices. |
| 23 | MS. DIERS: Twelve. It appears that |
| 24 | the cold water temperature standards were |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 101 1 developed to coincide with periods when road salt 2 usage is expected in northern Illinois. 3 Did you consider invariant sources of chloride from coal mines and water 4 5 treatment plants in the downstate area? 6 MR. HUFF: One would expect the coal 7 mines and water treatment plants to discharge 8 chloride mass independent of snowfall events. One 9 would not expect these industries to increase 10 chlorides in the winter just because there was a higher water quality standard in the winter. 11 The 12 proposed summer standard, which is less than 50 13 percent of the current standard, would seem to be controlling for these industries. Again, I would 14 15 have no objection to a winter standard based on 16 stream temperature independent of the month. 17 MS. MEYERS: Can I ask a follow-up 18 question? 19 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yes, qo 20 ahead. 21 MS. MEYERS: Stacy Meyers, 22 Openlands. But you do recognize that it's not an 23 either/or situation in that if there are other 24 chloride discharges into the streams, that would

January 30, 2019

Page 102 be in addition to instead of -- in lieu of salt on 1 2 roads, right? 3 MR. HUFF: I'll see if I can 4 Do I recognize that there are other paraphrase. 5 sources of salt that would be --MS. MEYERS: That those sources of 6 7 salt don't act independently of road salt, but would be combined with road salt as far as impacts 8 9 in the waterways, correct? 10 MR. HUFF: Strictly during the winter episodic events? 11 12 MS. MEYERS: Any time that you have 13 multiple sources of chlorides they would combine an effect, correct? 14 15 MR. HUFF: Correct, but they would also have to meet the summer proposed standard and 16 17 what would cause those same dischargers to 18 suddenly triple or whatever their salt loading in 19 the winter? 20 My point is that their salt 21 contribution would be independent of the stream 22 temperature, independent of the month of the year. 23 MS. MEYERS: But this standard is 24 for salt, correct?

| - | _ |
|----|--|
| | Page 103 |
| 1 | MR. HUFF: It's for chloride. |
| 2 | MS. MEYERS: Thank you. |
| 3 | MS. DIERS: Question 13. On page |
| 4 | six of your pre-filed testimony, you indicate that |
| 5 | Illinois EPA provided you with Illinois stream |
| 6 | temperature data from 2002 to 2016 and you state |
| 7 | in "Using just the data from December 1st to April |
| 8 | 30th yielded a 75th percentile temperature of |
| 9 | 9.3°C. |
| 10 | Based on these results, a |
| 11 | temperature of 10°C was selected for conducting |
| 12 | winter temperature toxicity testing." |
| 13 | Question A. Is it appropriate |
| 14 | to combine winter data, December, January and |
| 15 | February, with spring data, March and April, and |
| 16 | use the 75th percentile temperature to justify |
| 17 | inclusion of March and April as months suitable |
| 18 | for the 10°C standard? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: Again, my intent with |
| 20 | winter standard was to address snowfall de-icing |
| 21 | practices, which are episodic events, and I |
| 22 | believe would predominantly occur when the stream |
| 23 | temperatures are less than 10°C independent of the |
| 24 | month. The months were combined to address the |
| | |

| | Page 104 |
|----|--|
| 1 | snowfall months. Again, if a snowfall occurs when |
| 2 | pavement temperatures are above 0°C, salt |
| 3 | application declines very significantly to hills |
| 4 | and where snow may blow back onto the roadway. |
| 5 | Such events would not be expected to cause a spike |
| 6 | in chlorides in the receiving streams. |
| 7 | MS. DIERS: B. By including |
| 8 | temperature data from winter months, would there |
| 9 | be a bias towards a colder 75th percentile result? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Certainly. But, again, |
| 11 | the intent was to focus on stream conditions that |
| 12 | occur after snow melt when salt application is |
| 13 | necessary. Inclusion of March and April was |
| 14 | intended to cover the period when salt would be |
| 15 | applied in snow events when temperatures are at or |
| 16 | near 0°C, which I believe was important to the |
| 17 | Agency when writing future NPDES permits where |
| 18 | chloride limits are being considered. |
| 19 | MS. DIERS: C. Using the same |
| 20 | dataset referenced in this petition, what are the |
| 21 | 75th percentile temperatures of each individual |
| 22 | month? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: So November 10.8°C; |
| 24 | December 5.7°C; January 3.1°C; February 4.3°C; |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 105 1 March 8.8°C; and April 15.7°C. 2 MS. DIERS: D. Are there any 3 differences in stream temperatures between northern Illinois and southern Illinois? 4 5 MR. HUFF: The logical answer is, 6 yes, but, again, the proposed winter standard was 7 intended to cover episodic salt application events 8 for highway and parking lot de-icing. 9 MS. DIERS: E. Are there any locations in Illinois where water temperatures in 10 December through March are routinely above 10°C? 11 12 MR. HUFF: I have not evaluated this and I don't believe it's relevant. 13 Salt 14 application associated with snow events would be 15 minor when temperatures are above 10°C. Again, I have no issues with a chloride standard based on 16 17 actual stream temperatures. 18 MS. DIERS: Question 14. On page 6 19 of your pre-filed testimony, it states that "The 20 Agency has a protocol for computing the 75th percentile temperature and a similar approach for 21 22 pH for computing seasonal water quality standards 23 for each specific waterbody for ammonia and a 24 similar approach was used for developing winter

January 30, 2019

Page 106 1 chloride standards." 2 Have you looked at ammonia water 3 quality standards in Section 302.212(b)? 4 MR. HUFF: Yes. 5 MS. DIERS: A. In those equations, 6 what is T and what is pH? 7 MR. HUFF: Temperature is T and pH 8 is the pH of the stream both at the time of 9 sampling. 10 MS. DIERS: Β. When using those equations to determine compliance in the receiving 11 12 stream, the Agency uses the pH and temperature at 13 the time of ammonia sample. Were you instead 14 referring to how the Agency calculates permit 15 limits based on ambient data (75th percentile 16 temperature and 75th percentile and 50th 17 percentile pH) located at 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 355? 18 19 MR. HUFF: Yes, I was. 20 MS. DIERS: Fifteen. The proposed 21 regulatory language in Section 302.214(a) requires 22 a zone of initial dilution (ZID) for the acute 23 chronic water quality standard and requires a ZID 24 for the chronic chloride water quality standard.

| | Page 107 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Did you intend to require a |
| 2 | ZID for the acute chloride water quality standard |
| 3 | and a mixing zone or allowed mixing for the |
| 4 | chronic chloride water quality standard? |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I did. |
| 6 | MS. DIERS: Sixteen. The proposed |
| 7 | regulatory language in Section 302.214(b) requires |
| 8 | a ZID for the acute chloride water quality |
| 9 | standard and allows no mixing for the chloride |
| 10 | for the chronic chloride water quality standard. |
| 11 | Did you intend to require a ZID |
| 12 | for the acute chloride water quality standard and |
| 13 | a mixing zone or allow mixing for the chronic |
| 14 | chloride water quality standard? |
| 15 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I did. |
| 16 | MS. DIERS: Seventeen. In the |
| 17 | proposed regulatory language in Section |
| 18 | 302.214(b)(2), there is a statement that the |
| 19 | samples for determining compliance must be |
| 20 | collected in a manner that assures a |
| 21 | representative sample. |
| 22 | Did you intend for this |
| 23 | requirement to be in Section 302.214(a)(2) also? |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I did. |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 108 1 MS. DIERS: Is it your intention --2 this is 18. I'm sorry. 3 Is it your intention that these 4 proposed chloride water quality standards are the 5 general use standards or is it your intention that the proposed standards replace chloride standards 6 7 in Section 302.407(g)(2) and Section 303.449 for 8 the site specific standard for the Chicago 9 Sanitary and Ship Canal? MR. HUFF: Yeah, my intent was to 10 11 replace both the general use, the Chicago Area 12 Waterways and Lower Des Plaines and the site 13 specific on the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. 14 MS. BROWN: Can I follow up? 15 MS. DIERS: Mm-hmm. MS. BROWN: Hi. 16 Melissa Brown with 17 the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group again. 18 Are you aware of the pending 19 chloride time-limited water quality standard 20 proceedings in front of the Board? 21 MR. HUFF: Yes, I am. 22 MS. BROWN: And what's your 23 understanding of how your proposal, if adopted, 24 would affect -- excuse me -- the pending petitions

| | Page 109 |
|----|--|
| 1 | for the timing of the water quality standards? |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: I think they're somewhat |
| 3 | independent of each other and I think based on the |
| 4 | data I've seen there may be some watersheds |
| 5 | depending on what the ultimate winter number is. |
| 6 | They could drop the request for a variance, but |
| 7 | there is also a large number of those watersheds |
| 8 | that will still have to proceed with the |
| 9 | time-limited water quality variance. |
| 10 | MS. BROWN: Thank you. |
| 11 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ms. Rabczak? |
| 12 | MS. RABCZAK: I have a follow-up. |
| 13 | The reverse question. Tanya Rabczak with the |
| 14 | Board. Chairman, I have a question. |
| 15 | If the Board adopts the |
| 16 | time-limited water quality standards, how would |
| 17 | that affect pending rulemaking? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: How will that affect? |
| 19 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Pending |
| 20 | rulemaking. |
| 21 | MR. HUFF: My my proposal? |
| 22 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yes. |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: I really believe they're |
| 24 | independent of each other. If the Board adopts |
| | |

| | Page 110 |
|----|--|
| 1 | time-limited water quality variances, if a |
| 2 | watershed now meets the new winter standard, they |
| 3 | would drop the need for having the variance. But |
| 4 | those watersheds that are still over whatever is |
| 5 | adopted here in the way of a winter chloride will |
| 6 | still have to proceed with a time-limited water |
| 7 | quality variance and aggressively implement and |
| 8 | report the best management practices. |
| 9 | MS. RABCZAK: Another question I |
| 10 | have is can you please clarify the scope of |
| 11 | regulated entity under your proposal versus the |
| 12 | regulated entity under the time-limited water |
| 13 | quality petition that we have for chloride. |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: I'm sorry. Can you |
| 15 | repeat that? |
| 16 | MS. RABCZAK: Could you please |
| 17 | clarify the scope of the regulated entity under |
| 18 | your proposal versus the proposal in the |
| 19 | time-limited water quality petition for chloride? |
| 20 | MR. HUFF: I believe that the scope |
| 21 | of my proposal would basically apply to every |
| 22 | operation that practices de-icing practices in the |
| 23 | State of Illinois because that's going to affect |
| 24 | their water quality standards whereas the |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 111 1 time-limited water quality variances are based on 2 specific watersheds where data exists that they 3 are above currently the 500 mg/L standard. 4 And if the Board were to adopt a 5 new winter standard, each of those watersheds 6 would have to go back and determine whether they 7 needed to continue with that variance because they don't need the new winter standard or whether if 8 9 they feel comfortable they meet the winter 10 standard, they would drop the variance. 11 MS. RABCZAK: So your proposal has a 12 broad -- a much broader scope of regulated 13 entities than the current time of the water 14 quality standards? 15 MR. HUFF: Yes, I would agree with 16 that. Yes. 17 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ms. Diers, 18 you can continue. 19 MS. DIERS: Question 19. On page 20 eight of your pre-filed testimony, you state in 21 that "From the Technical Support Document, each 22 exceedance was generally less than a week duration 23 which formed the basis for asking Dr. Soucek to 24 run the third series of toxicity testing with the

| | Page 112 |
|----|--|
| 1 | exposure to elevated chloride for seven days |
| 2 | followed by returning the chlorides to a lower |
| 3 | concentration over a period of days." |
| 4 | Is this representative of |
| 5 | discharge from an industry that has a consistent |
| 6 | discharge of chloride? |
| 7 | MR. HUFF: Again, the intent was to |
| 8 | look at de-icing runoff durations. I would not |
| 9 | expect an industry to increase its chloride |
| 10 | discharge during the winter season because the |
| 11 | water quality standard increased. If industry |
| 12 | achieved a proposed summer water quality standard |
| 13 | or even the existing water quality standard, there |
| 14 | is no reason to expect they would suddenly begin |
| 15 | in the winter months to discharge more chlorides |
| 16 | but for their own pavement de-icing practices. |
| 17 | MS. DIERS: Question 20. On page 94 |
| 18 | of the regulatory petition, it states that "Using |
| 19 | the toxicity data published in the 1988 Ambient |
| 20 | Water Quality for Chlorides and then modifying the |
| 21 | results for certain species based on the current |
| 22 | 10°C research, winter water quality criteria for |
| 23 | chlorides can be derived. Table 1 presents a |
| 24 | listing of the chloride genus and species mean |

January 30, 2019

Page 113 1 acute values ranked from the most tolerant -- most 2 tolerant chlorides to the least tolerant species." 3 Α. However, Table 1, page 95 of 4 404, is not from the 1988 National Criteria, 5 rather it appears this is a dataset used in the 6 2009 Iowa chloride standard with the exception 7 being the inclusion modification of GMAVs for the 8 organisms recently tested in support of this 9 petition, is that correct? 10 MR. HUFF: Yes, it is. 11 В. Was the dataset from MS. DIERS: 12 Iowa ultimately used as the baseline for deriving 13 the cold temperature standards? MR. HUFF: The 2009 dataset was 14 15 ultimately used as the dataset as this dataset was 16 agreed upon by Iowa and Stephan's of US EPA as 17 desirable to incorporate in more recent toxicity 18 data than was available in 1988. 19 MS. DIERS: Then why were the 1988 20 National Criteria proposed for the General Use 21 standards, whereas a modified dataset of the 2009 22 Iowa standard was used in derivation of the cold 23 temperature standards? That's still in B. 24 MR. HUFF: Because for the summer I

| | Page 114 |
|----|---|
| 1 | really my focus was on the winter, but I |
| 2 | thought if the Board was going to open up |
| 3 | proceedings on chlorides, it was appropriate to |
| 4 | have a discussion on summer as well and the 1988 |
| 5 | National Criteria was the most recent actually |
| 6 | published document from EPA where they have |
| 7 | specific water quality criteria. So that's what I |
| 8 | used for the summer. |
| 9 | MS. DIERS: So in C, why was the |
| 10 | cold water temperature database not appropriately |
| 11 | identified as the 2009 Iowa dataset in the |
| 12 | petition? |
| 13 | MR. HUFF: I'm sorry. Could you |
| 14 | repeat that question? |
| 15 | MS. DIERS: It's question C. Why |
| 16 | was the cold temperature database not |
| 17 | appropriately identified as the 2009 Iowa dataset |
| 18 | in the petition? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: That was just a mistake |
| 20 | on our part. |
| 21 | MS. DIERS: D. The 2009 Iowa |
| 22 | chloride standards are hardness and |
| 23 | sulfate-dependent. Why were hardness and sulfate |
| 24 | not incorporated into the new standards proposed |
| | |

Page 115 1 by this petition? Well, I think because 2 MR. HUFF: 3 Illinois currently has a chloride standard of 500 4 mg/L without regard to the sulfate or hardness. 5 When the Agency proposed a chloride standard for the Chicago Area Waterway, they again went with 6 7 500 mg/L without consideration of hardness or 8 sulfates and I was just trying to keep this simple. 9 10 So I have absolutely no reservations about incorporating sulfate and 11 12 hardness into a water quality standard and I have 13 reservations that the data doesn't exist at colder 14 temperatures and we're making the assumption that 15 the current relationship between sulfate and 16 hardness that was established at higher 17 temperatures would hold at colder temperatures. 18 MS. DIERS: Twenty-one. The GMAVs 19 in Table 1 were ascertained from the 2009 Iowa 20 dataset and are normalized to a hardness of 300 21 mg/L and a sulfate of 65 mg/L which appears to 22 inflate the reported GMAV values compared to the 23 non-normalized GMAVs that are representative of 24 the actual reported literature values.

ſ

| | Page 116 |
|----|--|
| 1 | A. Was it your intent to |
| 2 | incorporate the hardness and sulfate dependent |
| 3 | toxicity of chloride into the GMAVs? |
| 4 | MR. HUFF: We use that Table 1 in a |
| 5 | normalized fashion and then plug in our 10°C. I |
| 6 | think the intent was that those normalized |
| 7 | hardness and sulfate are closer to what there is |
| 8 | in Illinois as compared to what the researchers |
| 9 | were doing using for their hardness and |
| 10 | sulfate. |
| 11 | MS. DIERS: B. The use of the |
| 12 | hardness and sulfate normalized GMAVs in Table 1 |
| 13 | may lead to the derivation of less stringent acute |
| 14 | and, via the ACR approach, chronic standards. |
| 15 | Was an attempt made to report |
| 16 | the GMAVs in a non-normalized format? |
| 17 | MR. HUFF: We we did not |
| 18 | normalize our results that were put into Table 1. |
| 19 | Had we normalized those, they would have resulted |
| 20 | in higher proposed numbers. I think our intent |
| 21 | when we resubmit Table 1 we will normalize the |
| 22 | data and then we will also compute the CMC and the |
| 23 | CCC based on the mean concentrations of hardness |
| 24 | and sulfate in Illinois. |

Page 117 1 MS. DIERS: Twenty-two. On page 94 2 of the petition, you state that the 1988 Ambient 3 Water Quality for Chlorides was used as the 4 initial source of toxicity data, however, the 5 species list on page 95 of your petition does not 6 match the species list in the 1988 National 7 Criteria document. 8 Why is the species list 9 different from the 1988 National Criteria 10 document? 11 MR. KLOCEK: The 1988 dataset 12 contained 12 taxa used for the GMAV. The 2009 13 dataset initially contained 29 taxa reflecting newer data than available in 1988. More recent 14 15 databases are available since 2009. However, the 2009 dataset and 16 17 procedure utilized by Iowa had been approved by 18 the US EPA. I do not believe the expanded dataset 19 would materially change our calculations for a 20 winter standard. 21 MS. DIERS: Twenty-three. I'm not 22 going to ask you. We already talked about that 23 earlier. 24 MR. KOCH: Ask it.

Page 118 1 MS. DIERS: Nevermind. My technical 2 person would like me to ask you 23. 3 During the Chicago waterway 4 hearings, US EPA took the position that the Iowa 5 standard was no longer approvable. Have you communicated with US EPA about their position 6 7 concerning Iowa's chloride standard? 8 MR. HUFF: No. Again, my focus was 9 strictly on the temperature effects of chloride 10 toxicity. 11 MS. DIERS: If you are aware that US 12 EPA would no longer approve the Iowa standard, why 13 was it used to support your petition? 14 MR. HUFF: Well, again, we focus on 15 the research that shows that chlorides are less toxic in the winter. The Iowa methodology in the 16 17 Stephan 2009 were just offered and I guess in a convenient way to calculate out what a winter 18 19 standard would be. 20 MS. DIERS: Twenty-five. I'm going 21 to skip 24. We talked about that. 22 Twenty-five. Have there been 23 any other studies since the 2009 Iowa derivation? 24 MR. HUFF: Yes, and some of those

January 30, 2019

Page 119 1 studies were included in the literature review, 2 Laura Barghusen's testimony and Roger Klocek's 3 testimony. 4 Twenty-six. On page 5 MS. DIERS: 5 of your pre-filed testimony, you state that in "As the four most sensitive species drive the 6 7 derivation of the FAV, and subsequently the CMC 8 and CCC, the work plans selected the four species 9 most sensitive to chlorides for toxicity testing. 10 The approach was to substitute the results for these four species and similar 11 12 organisms in the list of the genus mean acute 13 values (GMAV) leaving the remaining species results as published without temperature 14 15 adjustment and then recompute the new FAV with 16 this mixed temperature list." 17 Α. Have the four species most 18 acutely sensitive to chloride been tested under 19 cold temperatures? 20 MR. KLOCEK: Our tests on sphaerium 21 and ceriodaphnia represented two of the four most 22 sensitive species on the list of the Iowa taxa. 23 Neocloeon was added as a taxon acutely sensitive 24 to chloride at standard test temperatures 25°C.

| | Page 120 |
|----|--|
| 1 | The fourth taxon is villosa, a mussel, and was not |
| 2 | tested by us. We chose to avoid testing mussel |
| 3 | glochidia as being difficult to obtain regularly |
| 4 | and also due to the elevated cost for glochidia |
| 5 | testing. Few labs regularly test glochidia which |
| 6 | added to our decision to test only non-glochidia |
| 7 | bearing taxa. We believe that obtaining data to |
| 8 | show that lower temperature ameliorated the |
| 9 | effects of chloride toxicity would be sufficient |
| 10 | to apply the effect across broad taxa |
| 11 | designations. |
| 12 | MS. DIERS: B. It seems when using |
| 13 | the non-normalized Iowa dataset and supplementing |
| 14 | it with cold temperature test results lampsilis |
| 15 | and physa are among the most acutely sensitive |
| 16 | taxa. |
| 17 | Why were these genera not |
| 18 | selected for cold temperature testing? |
| 19 | MR. KLOCEK: We used the 29 taxa |
| 20 | normalized data list as it represents the same |
| 21 | list we used during the Chicago Ship Canal |
| 22 | proceedings in 2011. Originally, we used a |
| 23 | non-normalized list in 2011 but received a comment |
| 24 | that we should use normalized data. Hence, we |
| | |

| | Page 121 |
|----|--|
| 1 | used the normalized value list for the current |
| 2 | petition, for the standard temperature data, and |
| 3 | non-normalized for the species we tested at 10°C. |
| 4 | By not normalizing the 10°C |
| 5 | data, the results are more conservative. We did |
| 6 | this because the relationship for hardness and |
| 7 | sulfate have not been established at 10°C, thus |
| 8 | requiring an assumption that the same relationship |
| 9 | at 25°C holds at 10°C. We would not have chosen |
| 10 | to test lampsilis mussels or any other mussels due |
| 11 | to limited funding and the high cost of glochidial |
| 12 | testing. |
| 13 | MS. BARGHUSEN: I'm Laura Barghusen, |
| 14 | B-A-R-G-H-U-S-E-N, from Openlands. |
| 15 | Are you aware of whether the |
| 16 | GMAVs or FMAVs for mussels in the database |
| 17 | presented in Table 1 included early life stages of |
| 18 | mussels in computing the values? |
| 19 | MR. KLOCEK: I don't believe they |
| 20 | did. |
| 21 | MR. HUFF: Talk |
| 22 | THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear |
| 23 | that. |
| 24 | MR. KLOCEK: I don't think they |
| | |

ſ

| | Page 122 |
|----|--|
| 1 | included glochidia in the 2009 lampsilis mussel |
| 2 | test. I think it was just juvenile mussels. |
| 3 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Thank you. |
| 4 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Let me take |
| 5 | a check here. It's 1:10 and I don't know if it's |
| 6 | past people's lunchtime, but we can take a break |
| 7 | here and then reconvene at 2:00 or we can power |
| 8 | through. We're approaching the end of IEPA's |
| 9 | questions. So I don't know if |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Power through. |
| 11 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Power |
| 12 | through them then we'll take a break for lunch, |
| 13 | does that work? |
| 14 | MS. SANTOS: That's fine. |
| 15 | MS. DIERS: Question 27. Would you |
| 16 | agree the new acute toxicity data for chloride is |
| 17 | available and is unaccounted for in the dataset |
| 18 | used in this petition? |
| 19 | MR. KLOCEK: We agree that new data |
| 20 | exists that was not accounted for in our petition |
| 21 | but virtually all of the new data was conducted at |
| 22 | warmer temperatures. It is our contention that |
| 23 | data from chloride toxicity tests conducted at |
| 24 | cooler temperatures will show that chloride |
| | |

| | Page 123 |
|----|--|
| 1 | toxicity is ameliorated by cooler temperatures |
| 2 | across broad taxa lines as demonstrated by our own |
| 3 | data and other data presented in our petition. We |
| 4 | will amend Tables 1 and 2, with the recently |
| 5 | published paper on mayflies with the 10°C results |
| 6 | and normalize our data. |
| 7 | MS. DIERS: Twenty-eight. Would the |
| 8 | incorporation of new acute toxicity data modify |
| 9 | the standards proposed in this petition? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: There are a number of |
| 11 | approaches to developing water quality standards |
| 12 | and the available literature continues to evolve. |
| 13 | Certainly, whatever approach in dataset that is |
| 14 | selected will yield somewhat unique water quality |
| 15 | standards. With the incorporation of the mayfly |
| 16 | data in there, which is normalized, it won't have |
| 17 | a material effect on the final calculated values. |
| 18 | MS. DIERS: Twenty-nine. Would you |
| 19 | agree the new chronic toxicity data for chloride |
| 20 | is available and is unaccounted for for the |
| 21 | derivation of chronic standards proposed by this |
| 22 | petition? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: Well, again, our focus |
| 24 | was on the colder temperature 10°C. In the first |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 124 1 round of testing, we did a 10°C. We failed to 2 show any chronic effects. We extended that 3 testing for longer term exposure and the spike concentrations of chloride where some chronic 4 5 effects were observed. We ended up using the ACR to derive the chronic standard and use our test 6 7 results to compare with the computed chronic 8 standard as part of the sensitivity analysis and 9 the Technical Support Document. I am unaware of 10 any additional chronic toxicity data generated at colder temperatures, but look forward to seeing 11 12 such information. 13 MS. DIERS: I'm going to go to B. 14 Would the incorporation of new chronic toxicity 15 data allow for the derivation of chronic standards 16 that may be derived using GMCVs in lieu of the ACR 17 approach? It's 29B. 18 MR. KLOCEK: Well, yes, it's 19 possible that that could be done. 20 David, do you have a take on 21 that also that with the incorporation of new 22 chronic toxicity data allow for the derivation of 23 chronic standards that may be derived using GMCVs 24 in lieu of the ACR approach?

| | Page 125 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. SOUCEK: I mean, I think |
| 2 | we've we've decided that there aren't |
| 3 | sufficient cold temperature chronic data out |
| 4 | there, but if there were that we had from the |
| 5 | eight eight families, then, potentially, yes, |
| 6 | that would be the case. |
| 7 | MS. DIERS: Okay. I'm going to |
| 8 | strike C. We have already talked about 30. The |
| 9 | Board asked that earlier. So I'll go to 31. |
| 10 | Both the 1988 National Criteria |
| 11 | document and the 2009 Iowa standard included a |
| 12 | GMCV for pimephales (fathead minnow) of 433 mg/L, |
| 13 | which was the second most sensitive GMCV in the |
| 14 | dataset. The ceriodaphnia GMCV equals less than |
| 15 | 419 mg/L). Yet, the cold temperature chronic |
| 16 | standard was developed using an invertebrate ACR |
| 17 | that is twofold less protective than the |
| 18 | vertebrate ACR. |
| 19 | A. Why was |
| 20 | temperature-dependent chloride testing not |
| 21 | conducted on |
| 22 | MR. KOCH: Pimephales. |
| 23 | MS. DIERS: pimephales? |
| 24 | MR. KLOCEK: We selected the most |
| | |

| | Page 126 |
|----|--|
| 1 | sensitive species based on the acute toxicity test |
| 2 | as likely that almost all cold-blooded vertebrates |
| 3 | and invertebrates on any chloride toxicity list |
| 4 | would show amelioration of chloride toxicity when |
| 5 | tested at cooler temperatures. |
| 6 | MS. DIERS: B. Does the |
| 7 | invertebrate ACR result in a chronic cold |
| 8 | temperature standard that's protective of |
| 9 | pimephales and other vertebras? |
| 10 | MR. KLOCEK: A vertebrate ACR should |
| 11 | be used for vertebrates. The pimephales chronic |
| 12 | value of 413 mg/L is based upon one study from |
| 13 | 1985. More recent data from Elphick 2011 shows a |
| 14 | chronic value of 704 mg/L with an ACR of 5.8 $$ |
| 15 | conducted at 25°C. |
| 16 | MS. DIERS: Thirty-two. Was any |
| 17 | consideration given to testing vertebrates, for |
| 18 | example, fish, under cold temperatures? |
| 19 | MR. HUFF: Not not as part of our |
| 20 | study. We just didn't have the budget for it. |
| 21 | MS. DIERS: Thirty-three are you |
| 22 | aware of any I'm sorry. |
| 23 | MR. KOCH: 32A. |
| 24 | MS. DIERS: 32A. I'm sorry. I |
| | |

1 jumped ahead. 2 Is there any evidence that 3 suggests vertebrate sensitivity to chloride is 4 temperature variant. 5 MR. HUFF: Cool temperatures, slow 6 metabolism of any cold-blooded organism and slow 7 metabolism can ameliorate effects of toxicity 8 compared to toxicity at higher temperatures. 9 MS. DIERS: B. Is there any 10 evidence to suggest that invertebrates would be the most sensitive organism under cold 11 12 temperatures? 13 MR. HUFF: Invertebrate taxa are 14 considered the most sensitive organisms to 15 chloride at lab temperatures and show a higher tolerance of chloride at 10°C. It is expected 16 17 that fish will show a similar amelioration to chloride toxicity at cooler temperatures. 18 19 If this were not correct, one 20 would expect to see fish kills associated with 21 de-icing runoff, which I am unaware occurs. Т 22 would also note Mr. McCracken's written comments 23 in these proceedings regarding elevated winter 24 chlorides and aquatic community health.

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

Page 127

ſ

| | Page 128 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. DIERS: C. Could other |
| 2 | temperature invariant taxa such as vertebrates be |
| 3 | more sensitive under cold temperatures? |
| 4 | MR. KLOCEK: I would refer back to |
| 5 | the response for question 32B. |
| 6 | MS. DIERS: Thirty-three. Are you |
| 7 | aware of any Illinois invertebrates with |
| 8 | lifecycles that require or prefer temperatures of |
| 9 | 10°C or lower for completing mating, egg |
| 10 | MR. KOCH: Deposition. |
| 11 | MS. DIERS: deposition I'm |
| 12 | sorry and development of offspring? |
| 13 | MR. KLOCEK: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. DIERS: Is there any chloride |
| 15 | toxicity data for these taxa? That would be 33A. |
| 16 | MR. KLOCEK: The fingernail clam, |
| 17 | sphaerium simile has toxicity data at temperatures |
| 18 | of 25°C and 10°C. This clam can incubate live |
| 19 | young in gill marsupium and release them during |
| 20 | winter much like some of the winter brooding |
| 21 | freshwater mussels incubate glochidia larvae in |
| 22 | gill marsupium and release them during winter. |
| 23 | There is a large amount of recent toxicity data |
| 24 | for mussels tested at 25°C but no data for mussels |

1 tested at 10°C. 2 MS. DIERS: B. Would the proposed 3 cold temperature chloride standards be protective of invertebrates that utilize cooler temperatures 4 5 to complete their life cycles? 6 MR. KLOCEK: Based on sphaerium and 7 other invertebrate data, we believe that the 8 proposed chloride standard would protect sensitive 9 invertebrates that use cooler temperatures to 10 complete their reproductive cycle. 11 Again, I would refer you to 12 Mr. McCracken's written comments on the actual 13 stream biology data. MS. DIERS: Ouestion 34. 14 You 15 mention that the ACR of 3.187 was ascertained from the 2009 Iowa chloride standard and that this ACR 16 17 was solely developed from invertebrate data. What was the justification 18 Α. 19 for developing the chronic standard using the 20 invertebrate ACR, while dismissing the vertebrate ACR of 7.308? 21 22 MR. HUFF: We tested four sensitive 23 species based on an acute toxicity and all were 24 invertebrate taxa. Thus, we used the 2009

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

Page 129

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | invertebrate ARC for these test results. |
| 2 | MS. DIERS: B. Is it appropriate to |
| 3 | use the acute to chronic ratio (ACR) when enough |
| 4 | data is available to compute the compute the |
| 5 | chronic standard without the ACR? |
| 6 | MR. KLOCEK: We do not believe there |
| 7 | is sufficient chronic data at 10°C and the |
| 8 | standard testing has to be extended at 10 C |
| 9 | 10°C to find any chronic effects. Based on this, |
| 10 | using the ARC is appropriate and the sensitivity |
| 11 | analysis that we referenced in the Technical |
| 12 | Support Documents confirm that the ACR approach |
| 13 | yielded conservative results. |
| 14 | MS. DIERS: C. Would it be more |
| 15 | appropriate to rank GMCVs, calculate an FCV, then |
| 16 | adjust the FCV with a multiplier ascertained from |
| 17 | the paired cold temperature and warm temperature |
| 18 | tests conducted in support of this petition? |
| 19 | MR. KLOCEK: Possibly. But pairing |
| 20 | the warm and cool temperature data together would |
| 21 | diffuse the effect that cool temperature has on |
| 22 | mitigating chloride toxicity. Because of the |
| 23 | large difference in cool and warm temperature |
| 24 | testing values, it is more appropriate to keep the |
| | |

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

ge 130 P

January 30, 2019

Page 131 1 cool temperature values separate in this petition. 2 That's all we have. MS. DIERS: 3 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. So it is 1:20. We can take a break for lunch. Be back 4 5 here by 2:20. Does that work? Can we do 45 6 minutes? Would it be all right with a 45-minute 7 lunch and maybe see if we can try to finish this 8 up today? 9 MR. HUFF: 2:05? 10 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: 2:05. 11 MR. ETTINGER: Depends what you mean 12 by this up. 13 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry? 14 MR. ETTINGER: Depends what you mean 15 by this up. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: That's fair. 16 17 All right. So be back at 2:05. 18 (Whereupon, a break was taken 19 after which the following 20 proceedings were had.) 21 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: If we can go 22 on the record. Before we start with questions, a 23 couple of things that I need to address. 24 First, Ms. Diers, can you guys

Page 132 1 unmute Springfield? 2 MS. DIERS: Sorry. 3 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can you 4 please introduce who the technical advisors are 5 with you because I think they made comments or were saying stuff so just for the court reporter. 6 7 MS. DIERS: They are -- I'll let 8 them introduce themselves and tell you their positions here at the Agency. 9 MR. KOCH: Brian Koch. Last name is 10 spelled K-O-C-H. I work in the water quality 11 12 standards section and I'm the technical advisor. 13 MR. TWAIT: Scott Twait, T-W-A-I-T. 14 I'm the manager of the water quality standards 15 section. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Great. 16 17 Thank you. And then before we also begin, we need 18 to do a step that we should have done at the 19 beginning, but could the court reporter please 20 swear in the three witnesses. 21 WHEREUPON: 22 JAMES HUFF, ROGER KLOCEK and DAVID SOUCEK 23 called as a witness herein, having been first duly 24 sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:

January 30, 2019

Page 133 1 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. 2 Great. Thank you. 3 So now, Ms. Yang, you can 4 proceed with IDNR's questions. 5 MS. YANG: Thank you. My name is 6 Virginia Yang, spelled Y-A-N-G. I'm legal counsel 7 for the Illinois Department of Natural Resources 8 and I'm providing comments on behalf of the 9 Illinois Department of Natural Resources as well 10 as Illinois Nature Preserve Commission. 11 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can you 12 folks mute in Springfield? 13 MS. DIERS: Yes. 14 MS. ZALEWSKI: Waive if you can't 15 hear us. Okay? 16 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorrv, 17 Ms. Yang. You can proceed. MS. YANG: Before I start with the 18 19 questions and comments from the Illinois 20 Department of Natural Resources, I have a few 21 questions just to clarify some of the concepts and 22 terminology that has been used and in your 23 comments earlier this morning you use the terms 24 episodic snowfall events and winter weather

1 conditions. 2 Can you explain the intent of 3 that or what the criteria of that is, those 4 concepts? 5 MR. HUFF: So the concept is that during the winter when we have storms and salt is 6 7 applied there is a period of time where the snow 8 melt will carry high levels of sodium chloride into the receiving streams and it's an episodic 9 10 It goes up fairly rapidly and then it will event. have a tail coming down and that episodic event 11 12 may last one day, seven days and really in extreme 13 cases on bigger streams it can last longer than 14 seven days. 15 MS. YANG: Are you only considering snowfall or other conditions of winter? 16 17 MR. HUFF: Well, freezing rain. 18 Whenever -- whenever de-icing salt would be 19 applied. 20 MS. YANG: Okay. And did you look 21 into the differences of these events in the 22 northeastern part of the state as opposed to 23 central Illinois and southern Illinois? 24 MR. HUFF: No, I looked at -- the

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

Page 134

January 30, 2019

Page 135 1 episodic events will occur wherever they are 2 applying de-icing salt and they apply those 3 throughout the region. It's more the frequency of 4 which they're applied in the south as opposed to 5 the north. 6 MS. YANG: Okay. 7 MR. ETTINGER: Sorry. Could I 8 follow up on that? 9 Is it your understanding that 10 the only thing that would cause an episodic event 11 is road salt? 12 MR. HUFF: Well, it's not strictly 13 roads. Right. I have parking lots, any kind of 14 de-icing practice that would occur. MR. ETTINGER: For example, have you 15 studied how hog lagoons might be emptied or 16 17 controlled -- other controlled lagoon discharges? 18 MR. HUFF: I have not. 19 Thank you. MR. ETTINGER: 20 MS. YANG: Okay. I'm going to go 21 through the comment -- the questions and comments 22 that were developed by IDNR as well as Illinois Nature Preserve Commission and the format that we 23 24 used was a question and then in order to give a

January 30, 2019

Page 136 1 basis for that question, we developed a comment 2 just to show what our thinking was for that 3 question. 4 So I'm just going to go 5 through -- there are like five or six of these and 6 ask you to comment on DNR's recommendation. Okay. 7 So the first --8 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ms. Yang, 9 you don't have to read them all. 10 MS. YANG: Okay. 11 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: They are in 12 the record as if read. So --13 MS. YANG: I will just read the question then and cite to the comment. 14 15 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yup. That 16 works. 17 MS. YANG: All right. The first 18 concept talked about range of chloride sensitivity 19 for Illinois aquatic species and life stages. The 20 question is, how does a petitioner address the 21 range of chloride sensitivity exhibited by 22 Illinois aquatic species and life stages? And 23 then the comment is that Illinois aquatic life is 24 represented by approximately 217 extant species of

| | Page 137 |
|----|--|
| 1 | fish, 65 mussels, 32 benthic crustaceans, and |
| 2 | hundreds of aquatic insects and other |
| 3 | invertebrates, plants and algae. All of these |
| 4 | species and their life stages vary in sensitivity |
| 5 | to chlorides. |
| 6 | The comment of the approach to |
| 7 | deriving water quality standards based on |
| 8 | laboratory toxicity tests using a limited number |
| 9 | of representative species, like that used by the |
| 10 | petitioner, is being re-evaluated by many |
| 11 | professional scientists and science-based |
| 12 | organizations which we cite in our comment and we |
| 13 | also cite that these organizations and |
| 14 | professionals nationally and worldwide are making |
| 15 | advances in modernizing water quality criteria |
| 16 | methods, including expanding the definition of |
| 17 | acceptable data beyond the limited toxicity test |
| 18 | protocols. |
| 19 | So I'd like you to comment on |
| 20 | DNR's recommendation that petitioner incorporate |
| 21 | the full range of chloride sensitivity exhibited |
| 22 | by Illinois aquatic life by means of utilizing |
| 23 | more contemporary and community-based methods such |
| 24 | as SS SSD's which are species sensitivity |
| | |

| | Page 138 |
|----|--|
| 1 | distributions in developing the chloride standard. |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: Again, I think our |
| 3 | purpose was to determine whether chloride exhibits |
| 4 | less toxicity in colder temperatures and that's |
| 5 | where our focus was. We selected from the acute |
| 6 | toxicity list, from the Iowa list, the four most |
| 7 | sensitive species and ran the colder temperature |
| 8 | studies with those four species. These results |
| 9 | were then incorporated into the 2009 Iowa chloride |
| 10 | dataset and only adjusted the toxicities for the |
| 11 | species that we tested as a conservative approach. |
| 12 | The Iowa listing is believed to |
| 13 | be similar to the Illinois species where chloride |
| 14 | toxicity data are available as the majority of |
| 15 | data was generated in higher temperatures, the |
| 16 | computed water quality standard is conservative |
| 17 | and these alternative methods, I believe, will |
| 18 | require more data at the colder temperature in |
| 19 | order to carry those out. |
| 20 | MS. YANG: The next question deals |
| 21 | with protection of Illinois aquatic life for |
| 22 | mortality and other sublethal responses. The |
| 23 | question is how does the petitioner ensure the |
| 24 | proposed chloride standards are protective of |
| | |

| | Page 139 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Illinois's aquatic life given that mortality and |
| 2 | other sublethal responses that occur at chloride |
| 3 | concentrations less than those required to produce |
| 4 | the LD50? |
| 5 | LD50 is the median lethal dose |
| 6 | of the amount of the substance required to kill 50 |
| 7 | percent of exposed individuals. We note in our |
| 8 | question that both lethal and sublethal responses |
| 9 | can reduce the likelihood of population |
| 10 | persistence and in the context of protected |
| 11 | species would be prohibited as "take" as defined |
| 12 | by the Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act. |
| 13 | We would like petitioner to |
| 14 | comment on IDNR's recommendation that there is an |
| 15 | evaluation of chloride sensitivity at lethal |
| 16 | endpoints below the LD50 sublethal endpoints for |
| 17 | aquatic life including protected species. |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: So in addition to running |
| 19 | the acute toxicity tests, which you're referring |
| 20 | to with the LD50, we ran chronic tests to evaluate |
| 21 | the sublethal effects to ensure the proposed |
| 22 | chloride standards are protective of Illinois |
| 23 | aquatic life. We ran those tests. |
| 24 | MS. YANG: Was that was there |
| | |

1 consideration of Illinois protected species during 2 those tests? 3 MR. HUFF: Again, we used the four 4 most sensitive species from the acute toxicity 5 list which were generated where they were made available from Iowa. 6 7 MS. YANG: The third topic concerns 8 impacts of increased chloride concentrations in 9 Illinois surface water and groundwater. The 10 question is to what extent will the proposed 11 chloride standards contribute to increased 12 chlorides in Illinois surface water and 13 groundwater? We note that chloride concentrations 14 are increasing in Illinois surface waters and 15 groundwater and we specifically cite to the Class 16 3 groundwater requirements under 30 Ill. Adm. Code 17 62.230 Class 3 special resources groundwater that 18 impacts IDNR's protected and dedicated lands under 19 the Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act and we 20 would like petitioner's comment on DNR's 21 recommendation as to further evaluation of the 22 contributions of proposed chloride standards to 23 the observed trends of increasing chlorides in 24 Illinois surface water and groundwaters.

Page 141

| 1 | MR. HUFF: So I think your question |
|----|--|
| 2 | assumes that if the Board were to adopt the winter |
| 3 | and summer numbers that there would be an increase |
| 4 | in chlorides and I would argue that just the |
| 5 | opposite is going to happen. We're going to |
| 6 | continue to reduce chlorides to meet the more |
| 7 | restrictive summer numbers and we don't currently |
| 8 | meet the 500 mg/L in urban areas now in the winter |
| 9 | and this will allow those watersheds an |
| 10 | opportunity, through best management practices, to |
| 11 | either get closer to or to achieve those. |
| 12 | The proposed non-winter acute |
| 13 | standards is less than half the current chloride |
| 14 | water quality standard in Illinois. So you |
| 15 | wouldn't expect an increase in chloride from that. |
| 16 | Non-urban areas, if the stream achieves this |
| 17 | non-winter standard, there is no technical reason |
| 18 | one would experience an increase in chlorides |
| 19 | during the winter months. |
| 20 | In urban areas, the existing 500 |
| 21 | mg/L standard is not being currently achieved and |
| 22 | even the proposed winter standards are not being |
| 23 | achieved strictly due to the de-icing practices |
| 24 | with sodium chloride. A change in the winter |

January 30, 2019

Page 142 1 standard will provide a target for watersheds that 2 can be achieved through the implementation of 3 BMP's in many of our streams. 4 In summary, the proposed water 5 quality standard will result in an overall reduction in chloride concentrations in Illinois 6 7 surface and groundwater. 8 MS. YANG: The fourth topic concerns 9 the once per three-year exceedance which is 10 insufficient to protect Illinois aquatic life. The question is, what is the justification for the 11 12 once per three-year exceedances under the proposed 13 water standards and its impact on aquatic life? 14 We would like you to comment on DNR's 15 recommendation that petitioner estimate frequency 16 and intensity of exceedances in Illinois waters 17 and evaluate the responses of the Illinois aquatic 18 life to these exceedances. 19 MR. HUFF: So I would refer to the 20 comments of Steve McCracken as submitted in this 21 regulatory proceeding from the DuPage River Salt 22 Creek Workgroup where he has gone out and 23 collected biological stream data throughout the 24 watershed and he is seeing in the west branch of

| | Page 143 |
|----|--|
| 1 | the DuPage River where they have chloride levels |
| 2 | above 500 mg/L in the winter, but lower than the |
| 3 | 233 mg/L in the summer where they have put a |
| 4 | biological community there as part of the support |
| 5 | for what we're doing. |
| 6 | The intent of the once per three |
| 7 | years was they announced we're having more and |
| 8 | more intense storm events. It's much like the |
| 9 | hundred year rain events that we seem to have |
| 10 | every year now and there will be snow events with |
| 11 | dropping temperatures and freezing rains that will |
| 12 | require salt applications for longer duration than |
| 13 | the typical storm events and I was just trying to |
| 14 | allow for an accommodation of these extreme |
| 15 | events. These events already occur and the |
| 16 | chloride data was presented in the Technical |
| 17 | Support Document as several of the watersheds |
| 18 | clearly show these periodic spikes. |
| 19 | MS. YANG: Do you have a comparable |
| 20 | study or are you aware of any ongoing studies for |
| 21 | central Illinois and southern Illinois? |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: With respect to chlorides |
| 23 | in their streams, I am not aware of any studies. |
| 24 | MS. YANG: Okay. Fifth topic would |
| | |

| | Page 144 |
|----|--|
| 1 | be adverse effect of Illinois aquatic life to |
| 2 | chlorides under increased water temperature. The |
| 3 | question is, how would water temperatures above |
| 4 | those in the experiments used to derive the |
| 5 | proposed chloride standards impact Illinois's |
| 6 | aquatic life? |
| 7 | The comment says that the |
| 8 | petitioner used laboratory toxicity experiments at |
| 9 | 10°C to derive winter period chloride standards |
| 10 | with the following assumptions. One, that the |
| 11 | test conditions are representative of water |
| 12 | temperatures through Illinois winters and, two, |
| 13 | that sensitivity of aquatic life to chloride |
| 14 | decreases with temperature. |
| 15 | The comment we have is that |
| 16 | Illinois stream and river temperatures exceed 10°C |
| 17 | and 28 percent of EPA's winter period records. |
| 18 | During the most recent 11 years, it exceeded 15°C |
| 19 | in nearly 10 percent of those records. |
| 20 | So the question is, we would |
| 21 | like a comment regarding the petitioner's |
| 22 | evaluation of chloride sensitivities in Illinois |
| 23 | aquatic life and all seasonal ranges of |
| 24 | temperatures incurring in all Illinois waters. |
| | |

Page 145

| 1 | MR. HUFF: So the winter standard |
|----|--|
| 2 | proposed was, again, intended to address these |
| 3 | episodic snow melt, runoff events. The runoff |
| 4 | temperature streams will be below 10°C during such |
| 5 | events. If a stream achieves the proposed |
| 6 | non-winter standard, then when stream temperatures |
| 7 | are above 10°C, the chlorides would be less than |
| 8 | the lower non-winter standard during those periods |
| 9 | of time. The proposed winter standard could also |
| 10 | be limited to when the stream temperatures are |
| 11 | less than 10°C as opposed to the seasonal |
| 12 | approach. This change would seem to alleviate a |
| 13 | number of concerns for the current proposal. |
| 14 | MS. YANG: Sixth question is |
| 15 | concerns the impact on early aquatic life stages |
| 16 | during winter season. The petitioner account |
| 17 | does the petitioner account for the sensitive life |
| 18 | stages of Illinois's aquatic life when delineating |
| 19 | the temporal extent of the winter standards |
| 20 | period? |
| 21 | The comment talks about the life |
| 22 | stages of Illinois aquatic life most sensitive to |
| 23 | chloride will be present during the winter period. |
| 24 | The eggs fish eggs and larvae are present in |
| | |

| | Page 146 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Illinois waters in early spring, which is within |
| 2 | the petitioner's proposed water period at water |
| 3 | temperatures below 15°C and these aquatic early |
| 4 | aquatic life stages are more sensitive to chloride |
| 5 | than that of the adult. |
| 6 | DNR would like a comment |
| 7 | regarding petitioner to evaluate the timing of |
| 8 | sensitive life history stages and incorporating |
| 9 | the relative stages into the development of those |
| 10 | proposed chloride standards. |
| 11 | MR. HUFF: I think if we go instead |
| 12 | of a seasonal water quality standard we go to the |
| 13 | 10°C specific stream temperature, unless when the |
| 14 | winter chloride standard would apply, that would |
| 15 | alleviate some of the concern in that question. |
| 16 | Again, we selected four |
| 17 | sensitive species that and show that in all |
| 18 | four cases that chloride toxicity is reduced as |
| 19 | the temperature 10°C temperature as opposed to |
| 20 | 25°C and we would expect that same relationship to |
| 21 | hold for all aquatic species. |
| 22 | MS. YANG: Next question concerns |
| 23 | the impact arising from varied sources of |
| 24 | chlorides. The question is, how do the proposed |
| | |

Page 147 1 standards address the varying sources of chloride 2 in Illinois? 3 And the comment is because of 4 these multiple forms of chlorides, the differing 5 toxicities, the multiple sources of chlorides statewide and regionally, differs in abundance 6 7 with those compounds, we believe it is critical to understand the chlorides from these other elements 8 9 and the relative toxicity testing of such 10 compounds. We would like a comment 11 12 regarding the estimate of the spatial temporal 13 prevalence and toxicity of chlorides other than 14 sodium and use of these estimates to evaluate 15 impact on Illinois aquatic life. 16 MR. HUFF: Dr. Soucek provided an 17 answer to one of the other questions, the relative 18 toxicity of the other forms of chlorides or 19 potassium chloride, magnesium chloride. Our 20 current standard is 500 mg/L. The proposed summer 21 acute standard is less than 50 percent of the 22 current general use water quality standard. The 23 proposed winter standard is --24 MR. ETTINGER: Wait. Did you mean

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 148 1 to say that your proposed standard is less than 50 2 percent of the current --3 MR. HUFF: No, the chronic standard 4 Yes. I caught that. is. Sorry. 5 MR. ETTINGER: Sorry. Perhaps --6 sorry for interrupting, but do you want to start 7 over and say what you meant to say? 8 MR. HUFF: Sure. The proposed 9 summer chronic standard is less than 50 percent of 10 the current general use water quality standard. The proposed winter standard is focused upon 11 12 winter de-icing practices which is predominantly 13 sodium chloride. The seasonal spikes in chlorides 14 are from sodium chloride. There is no reason to 15 expect a change in any -- any forms of chlorides discharged by other sources as a result of this 16 17 proposal. 18 MS. YANG: Last question concerns 19 water quality impacts upon semi-aquatic 20 communities and types of habitats. The question 21 is, does the petitioner account for water --22 MS. LIU: Ms. Yang? 23 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. We 24 have a question.

| | Page 149 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. YANG: Okay. |
| 2 | MS. LIU: May I follow up on your |
| 3 | earlier question? You mentioned agricultural |
| 4 | sources of chloride. Are there episodic events |
| 5 | associated with applications of potassium chloride |
| 6 | fertilizer that would impact streams similarly to |
| 7 | the way urban streams are impacted by de-icing |
| 8 | practices? |
| 9 | MR. HUFF: I don't believe that |
| 10 | during the winter months that there would be |
| 11 | application of the potassium to the agricultural |
| 12 | fields. So there is certainly potentially |
| 13 | episodic events from such applications when that's |
| 14 | applied either in the fall or in the spring |
| 15 | months, but those would then be compared to the |
| 16 | summer standard. |
| 17 | MS. LIU: Thank you. |
| 18 | MR. ETTINGER: I'm sorry. Do you |
| 19 | mean to say you don't believe agriculture in |
| 20 | Illinois receives application of fertilizer or |
| 21 | other things in the month of April? |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: No. During the winter |
| 23 | months, potassium chloride the source of |
| 24 | potassium I don't believe is applied during the |
| | |

Page 150 1 winter months. 2 MR. ETTINGER: But winter months, in 3 your answer now, does not include April or March or it does? 4 MR. HUFF: It would be when the 5 temperature is less than 10°C in the stream. 6 7 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. So your 8 testimony is that you don't believe that 9 fertilizer or pesticides are ever applied at less than 10°C? 10 11 MR. HUFF: My answer was potassium 12 chloride. 13 MR. ETTINGER: Potassium chloride. 14 Thank you. 15 My question -- so the MS. YANG: 16 question is, does the petitioner account for water 17 quality changes that may occur in semi-aquatic 18 community-types/habitats, such as wetlands, and 19 the biota that inhabit them if the proposed 20 chloride standards are approved? 21 MR. HUFF: Point source discharges 22 in Illinois are generally to streams in Illinois, 23 not wetlands or fens. Design practices for new 24 and expanded roadways specifically address the

| | Page 151 |
|----|--|
| 1 | impact on fens and wetlands during the |
| 2 | alternatives evaluation, with avoidance of roadway |
| 3 | drainage the preferred approach. Where fens and |
| 4 | wetlands are already impacted by de-icing runoff, |
| 5 | the proposed standard would have no impact over |
| 6 | the no action alternative. |
| 7 | MS. MEYERS: I have a follow-up |
| 8 | question to that. |
| 9 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Go ahead. |
| 10 | MS. MEYERS: Do we anticipate there |
| 11 | will be new or widened roads throughout |
| 12 | northeastern Illinois and other urban places in |
| 13 | our state over time? |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: I have no idea. |
| 15 | MS. MEYERS: Do we think that the |
| 16 | only roads that are probably going to exist are |
| 17 | the roads that we have today? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: I would say we're |
| 19 | substantially built out. |
| 20 | MS. MEYERS: Are you familiar, for |
| 21 | instance, with Quintin Road? |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 23 | MS. MEYERS: And that is a road |
| 24 | that's going to be widened? |
| | |

| | Page 152 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 2 | MS. MEYERS: And there is right next |
| 3 | to it wetlands that are a part of the federal |
| 4 | wetland mitigation bank or project? |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 6 | MS. MEYERS: And that there is |
| 7 | something called salt splash or spray? |
| 8 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. MEYERS: And when roads are |
| 10 | widened, that salt splash and spray can impact |
| 11 | adjacent wetlands and other natural areas? |
| 12 | MR. HUFF: Unless they reduce the |
| 13 | speed limit to reduce the spray, that's correct, |
| 14 | which is what has been proposed on Quintin Road. |
| 15 | MS. MEYERS: We can go into that |
| 16 | further. However, suffice to say that, isn't it |
| 17 | probable that with roads that are widened |
| 18 | throughout northeastern Illinois or added |
| 19 | throughout northeastern Illinois or where there |
| 20 | are wetlands present, that this could, in fact, |
| 21 | impact more wetlands than it presently does? |
| 22 | MR. HUFF: Theoretically possible, |
| 23 | yes. |
| 24 | MS. YANG: I have no further |
| | |

Page 153 1 questions. 2 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. Then 3 moving on I was thinking we would go with 4 Openlands's pre-filed questions, does that work? 5 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. I'm Laura 6 Barghusen, B-A-R-G-H-U-S-E-N, from Openlands and I 7 will be asking some pre-filed questions of Mr. Huff and Dr. Klocek. 8 9 My first question is for 10 Mr. Huff. In your testimony, you state that there is no basis for believing that BMP's by themselves 11 12 will result in achieving a 500 mg/L not-to-exceed 13 winter standard. Smaller streams still have peak 14 chloride concentrations in excess of 1,500 mg/L 15 and it is not realistic to expect a 67 percent 16 reduction in salt usage that would be required 17 during the worst runoff events in order to achieve 18 compliance. That's from page two, paragraph two 19 of Huff testimony. I believe the efforts will 20 fall far short of achieving a 500 mg/L 21 not-to-exceed chloride level from page three, 22 paragraph two. 23 So the question is, what is your 24 basis for stating that the BMP's can't result in

| | Page 154 |
|----|---|
| 1 | meeting these standards everywhere in the state? |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: As noted in my testimony, |
| 3 | urban streams are currently experiencing peak |
| 4 | chlorides in excess of 1,500 mg/L. If you assume |
| 5 | the background chlorides in the same streams are |
| 6 | only 200 mg/L, then the de-icing practices are |
| 7 | contributing 1,300 mg/L during these events. |
| 8 | To be successful then, the |
| 9 | regulated community would have to cut salt |
| 10 | application by 84 percent not on an annual basis, |
| 11 | but on these bad storm events through best |
| 12 | management practices. For that to be possible |
| 13 | suggests the regulated community is currently |
| 14 | wasting 84 percent of the salt it applies. The |
| 15 | DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup has been a |
| 16 | leader in implementing BMP's for more than a |
| 17 | decade and the stream data continues to show |
| 18 | violations of the current water quality standard |
| 19 | and, at best, a modest reduction in peak chloride |
| 20 | concentrations. That's the basis. |
| 21 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. And so that |
| 22 | defines BMP as just reduce salt application? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: Well, there is a lot of |
| 24 | tools in a best management practice toolkit, |
| | |

| | Page 155 |
|----|--|
| 1 | whether that's applying salt based on the pavement |
| 2 | temperature and the predicted temperature |
| 3 | overnight if it's going on there to more accurate |
| 4 | weather forecasting and use of liquids, those |
| 5 | types of things. |
| 6 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Question 2. |
| 7 | In your testimony, you state that "I reached out |
| 8 | to US EPA at the end of the UAA proceedings about |
| 9 | the possibility of funding coal temperature |
| 10 | toxicity testing as they had recently funded |
| 11 | chloride toxicity testing on several aquatic |
| 12 | species." |
| 13 | My question is, what were the |
| 14 | studies regarding recently funded chloride |
| 15 | toxicity testing by the US EPA? |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: I'd like Dr. Soucek to |
| 17 | answer that. |
| 18 | MR. SOUCEK: My laboratory was |
| 19 | supported to research the toxicity of chlorides to |
| 20 | various species. The original project I did for |
| 21 | the Iowa chloride standard was funded with Region |
| 22 | 5 funds that were sent directly to Great Lakes |
| 23 | Environmental Center but I was a subcontract on |
| 24 | that. The grant was received in 2008 and we |
| | |

6

| | Page 15 |
|----|--|
| 1 | published a paper on that in 2011. |
| 2 | Then I received another grant |
| 3 | from Region 5 funds Great Lakes Restoration |
| 4 | Initiative funds in 2012. Those fund were, again, |
| 5 | passed from Region 5 through USGS, a different |
| 6 | entity, to be and those funds we developed |
| 7 | methods for full life chronic toxicity testing |
| 8 | with this mayfly neocloeon triangulifer and for |
| 9 | that project we published a paper with chronic |
| 10 | chloride toxicity data at 25°C and that paper was |
| 11 | published in 2015 and then finally I received |
| 12 | another grant in 2013, again, Great Lakes |
| 13 | Restoration Initiative Funds, from Region 5 passed |
| 14 | through USGS to study the influence of dilution |
| 15 | water chemistry on acute major ion toxicity |
| 16 | including sodium chloride and other chloride salts |
| 17 | and we published those results in 2018. |
| 18 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Thank you. To your |
| 19 | knowledge, did any of the studies include the |
| 20 | following on glochidia of fat muckets, that would |
| 21 | be Wang, et al, 2018, acute toxicity of sodium |
| 22 | chloride and potassium chloride to a unit of |
| 23 | mussel, lampsilis siliquoidea in water exposures, |
| 24 | was that, to your knowledge, part of the recently |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 157 1 funded chloride toxicity testing? 2 MR. HUFF: I have no knowledge on 3 where that funding came from. 4 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Thank you. 5 Were you aware of the study as you were working on 6 your petition? 7 MR. HUFF: No. 8 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. 9 MR. HUFF: No, I wasn't. 10 MS. BARGHUSEN: And did you -- were you aware of -- well, I think did you utilize the 11 12 study by Gillis, which presents data showing that 13 the glochidia of two species present in Illinois 14 waters (the wavy-rayed lamp mussel and northern 15 riffleshell) have significantly lower acute 16 tolerances to chloride than the ones presented in 17 your petition? 18 MR. HUFF: Our research was on the 19 temperature effect on the toxicity of chlorides to 20 the four sensitive aquatic species. What our 21 research showed is that temperature is an 22 important variable in the toxicity of chloride. 23 Gillis noted that the glochidia were significantly 24 less than sensitive to salt than natural waters

| | Page 158 |
|----|--|
| 1 | that could not be attributed to the hardness |
| 2 | difference alone. To EC50 and natural water from |
| 3 | the Grand River for P |
| 4 | MR. KLOCEK: Fasciolaris |
| 5 | MR. HUFF: Fasciolaris 3,416 mg/L |
| 6 | of chloride was three times higher than the |
| 7 | reconstituted water. These studies were all |
| 8 | conducted at 21°C and, again, our focus was on the |
| 9 | 10°C results that we could find. |
| 10 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Thank you. Were the |
| 11 | studies that you referenced, Dr. Soucek, were they |
| 12 | in process or were they complete when you |
| 13 | originated the cold water studies presented in |
| 14 | your petition? |
| 15 | MR. SOUCEK: The studies that I |
| 16 | mentioned, two of them were completed. The one on |
| 17 | the for the development of the data for the |
| 18 | Iowa chloride standard and the the one on the |
| 19 | development of the chronic toxicity testing method |
| 20 | for the mayfly those were complete. The third one |
| 21 | was maybe in process and almost finishing up when |
| 22 | we started doing the initial work for this cold |
| 23 | temperature study. |
| 24 | MS. BARGHUSEN: And how did you |
| | |

Page 159 1 consider the results of those completed studies in 2 your proposal? MR. SOUCEK: Well, we used the 3 4 previous study that I did to form reference points 5 for the temperatures -- for the treatment levels, the chloride concentrations that we used to test 6 7 the mayfly and the fingernail clam and the 8 amphipod. 9 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Thank you. 10 Okay. Question -- the next question is in the petition for the proposed chloride standard. 11 12 In reviewing Table 1, chloride 13 genus and species mean acute values the four most 14 sensitive species are listed as the mayfly, the 15 water flea species, the lampsilis mussel and the 16 fingernail clam. 17 So the questions are, some of 18 these may already be answered, but I'm going to 19 read them through. 20 Are you aware that the 2011 21 Gillis report that the toxicities for these 22 species are significantly lower than the numbers 23 in Table 1 of the four sensitive species in the 24 Huff proposal?

| | Page 160 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Again, the purpose of our |
| 2 | research was to look at temperature effects on the |
| 3 | toxicity of chloride studies. Gillis's studies |
| 4 | were conducted at 21°C and at a hardness between |
| 5 | 95 and 115. So Table 1 the value you're looking |
| 6 | at has already been normalized. |
| 7 | MS. BARGHUSEN: And assessing the |
| 8 | toxicity of sodium chloride to the glochidia of |
| 9 | fresh water mussel I'm sorry. That's just the |
| 10 | study name. Going onto the next one. |
| 11 | Are you aware that the northern |
| 12 | riffleshell, the wavy-rayed lamp mussel and the |
| 13 | fat mucket live in Illinois waters? |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: Yes, I am. |
| 15 | MS. BARGHUSEN: And have you read as |
| 16 | part of your literature review of the Gillis 2011 |
| 17 | report, which is referenced in your literature |
| 18 | review, that the acute threshold for these species |
| 19 | is much lower than the species mean acute value in |
| 20 | Table 1 of the Huff proposal? |
| 21 | MR. HUFF: Well, again, we took that |
| 22 | Table 1 from Iowa and then what we tried to do was |
| 23 | plug in our results that were at 10°C into that. |
| 24 | So we didn't try to modify the other data that was |
| | |

| | Page 161 |
|----|--|
| 1 | in there. On the Gillis study, she tested the |
| 2 | same species in the natural water and obtained an |
| 3 | EC50 that was fourfold higher. The natural water |
| 4 | had higher hardness, the increases in EC50 was |
| 5 | much greater than accounted for for hardness alone |
| 6 | in the natural waters. |
| 7 | MS. BARGHUSEN: And did the values |
| 8 | you state in this table reflect the acute mean |
| 9 | values for glochidia and juvenile mussels? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Again, at 10°C, that work |
| 11 | hasn't been done. So the answer is it hasn't been |
| 12 | established. |
| 13 | MS. BARGHUSEN: In your opinion, the |
| 14 | studies such as the two published by Wang, et al, |
| 15 | demonstrate that more stringent chloride |
| 16 | thresholds are necessary to protect all life |
| 17 | stages of these and other mussels. |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: Our research again was |
| 19 | focused on the effective temperature. Wang did |
| 20 | not address temperature effects using 23°C for his |
| 21 | test. Wang demonstrated that hardness is a |
| 22 | critical variable on chloride toxicity for fat |
| 23 | mucket, glochidia and juveniles. |
| 24 | MS. BARGHUSEN: In the petition for |
| | |

Page 162 1 the proposed chloride standard, the US EPA used a 2 protocol to compute the seasonal water quality 3 standards for each specific waterbody for ammonia. 4 It states that the Huff proposal is premised upon 5 a similar approach to develop winter chloride standards. 6 7 My question is, are you aware 8 how variable the temperatures are across the state 9 as compared to addressing the seasonal figures for 10 a specific waterbody? Don't the temperatures in southern Illinois vary widely from the ones in 11 12 northern Illinois? 13 MR. HUFF: So, again, the purpose of the proposed winter time period was to reflect 14 15 when snowfall potential is present. Runoff from 16 snow melt events where sodium chloride is applied 17 would have temperatures well below 10°C and the 18 receiving streams during such events would also be expected to be less than 10°C. However, I have no 19 20 objection to a winter water quality standard that 21 applies only when the waterbody temperature is at 22 or below 10°C which would eliminate the concern 23 over temperature differences across the state. 24 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. According to

Γ

| | Page 163 |
|----|--|
| 1 | a map presented on the USGS website, there is |
| 2 | softer waters present in southern Illinois when |
| 3 | compared to northern Illinois. The questions are, |
| 4 | are you aware that studies like the two referenced |
| 5 | by Wang have found that softer waters result in |
| 6 | lower chloride toxicities as have been |
| 7 | demonstrated in the fat mucket mussel? |
| 8 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. BARGHUSEN: And would you agree |
| 10 | that aquatic life will be less protected from |
| 11 | chlorides overall in southern Illinois than |
| 12 | northern Illinois in softer waters? |
| 13 | MR. HUFF: If what? |
| 14 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Just in general if |
| 15 | there is chlorides in the water. |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: If there are chlorides in |
| 17 | the water? So they'd be more sensitive chlorides |
| 18 | in the water because of softer water. |
| 19 | MS. BARGHUSEN: In southern |
| 20 | Illinois? |
| 21 | MR. HUFF: In southern Illinois. |
| 22 | MS. BARGHUSEN: So you agree with |
| 23 | that? |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: I agree with what I just |

Page 164 1 said, that they are more susceptible to chloride 2 in softer water that's present in those streams. 3 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Are you aware 4 of places mapped as having harder water such as 5 McHenry County that are using water softeners that contain chlorides? 6 7 MR. HUFF: So water softeners are 8 regenerated with a sodium chloride brine and the 9 backwash from this regeneration contains high concentrations of chlorides which would be 10 predominantly sodium chloride. However, this 11 12 source of chlorides, our streams, would not have a 13 seasonal component. So if the summer water quality standards are achieved, this source would 14 15 not be a factor in determining whether the winter standards would be achieved. It's not a variable. 16 17 It's a relatively constant load to the streams. 18 MS. BARGHUSEN: How did you account 19 for these variables in your analysis and proposal? 20 MR. HUFF: Our work was directed at 21 the toxicity of chlorides at colder temperatures 22 and then we used the results to derive an 23 alternative winter water quality standard based on 24 these results. These variables such as water

| | Page 165 |
|----|--|
| 1 | softeners, softer water, are not relevant to |
| 2 | attempting to adjust the current chloride |
| 3 | standards for the lower toxicity at colder |
| 4 | temperatures. We recognize that hardness |
| 5 | particularly plays an important role in chloride |
| 6 | toxicity, but the relationship at colder |
| 7 | temperatures have not yet been established. |
| 8 | Until that work is completed, I |
| 9 | believe our cold temperature work offers the best |
| 10 | current signs for adjusting develop for |
| 11 | adjusting a winter standard. Once the hardness |
| 12 | work is completed at colder temperatures, the |
| 13 | chloride standard should be revisited. With |
| 14 | respect to the summer standard, the standards |
| 15 | offered with the most recent recommendation from |
| 16 | the US EPA in final form, we recognize there has |
| 17 | been a significant amount of work on chloride |
| 18 | toxicity in warmer temperatures and the proposed |
| 19 | summer limits were offered to begin a discussion |
| 20 | on the appropriate summer limits. |
| 21 | MS. BARGHUSEN: All right. It |
| 22 | appears that in the Huff petition and accompanying |
| 23 | materials that fat mucket glochidia were not |
| 24 | tested at 10°C. Why? |
| | |

| | Page 166 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: The testing on glochidia |
| 2 | is a relatively new research area. We selected |
| 3 | four species from the 2009 Iowa listing that were |
| 4 | the most sensitive from an acute toxicity point of |
| 5 | view and conducted our research on those. |
| 6 | MR. ETTINGER: Then we have if |
| 7 | you're assuming that this adds protection to more |
| 8 | sensitive species, then why are the figures still |
| 9 | so much higher than the ones found for acute |
| 10 | toxicity for glochidia in Gillis and Wang? |
| 11 | MR. HUFF: Well, again, I'm not sure |
| 12 | that data has been normalized. It hasn't been run |
| 13 | at 10°C on there. So I think it's like comparing |
| 14 | apples to oranges. |
| 15 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Now, I have |
| 16 | some questions for Dr. Soucek. The first one is |
| 17 | in in your testimony you talked about the |
| 18 | chloride toxicity to fingernail clams as well as |
| 19 | two other non-mussel species that were studied. |
| 20 | Your pre-filed testimony indicated a finding that |
| 21 | the fingernail clam did not get relief in terms of |
| 22 | chronic chloride toxicities at the lower |
| 23 | temperature which was 10°C. |
| 24 | So the questions are, do you |
| | |

| | Page 167 |
|----|---|
| 1 | think this means that the lower temperature would |
| 2 | not protect fingernail clams from the chronic |
| 3 | effects of chloride that might be seen at higher |
| 4 | temperatures? |
| 5 | MR. SOUCEK: Pardon me. While the |
| 6 | process of developing water quality standards or |
| 7 | criteria uses toxicity test results with a |
| 8 | relatively limited number of species |
| 9 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. |
| 10 | Mr. Soucek, can you slow down a little bit? |
| 11 | MR. SOUCEK: I apologize. I'll |
| 12 | start over. While the process of developing water |
| 13 | quality standards or criteria uses toxicity test |
| 14 | results with the relatively limited number of |
| 15 | species to estimate safe levels for others, I do |
| 16 | not believe it is prudent to use the specific |
| 17 | result of a single test with a single species to |
| 18 | predict specific responses or potential trends in |
| 19 | responses of other distantly related species. |
| 20 | Since fingernail clams are not |
| 21 | mussels, which mussels are an order of unionidae, |
| 22 | fingernail clams belong to a different order of |
| 23 | Bivalvia Veneroida. In other words, as different |
| 24 | anatomically as mayflies are from dragon flies or |

| | Page 168 |
|----|--|
| 1 | amphipods from decapods or mice are from cats, I |
| 2 | will not be comfortable applying trends in the |
| 3 | result of fingernail clam studies to mussels. |
| 4 | Just to further illustrate this |
| 5 | in a 2015 publication we compared the influence of |
| 6 | chloride on nitrate toxicity to genetic strains of |
| 7 | the same species of hyalella azteca and amphipod |
| 8 | and found that while varying background chloride |
| 9 | concentration in the dilution water had a very |
| 10 | strong effect on nitrate LC50 for one strain, |
| 11 | about a tenfold change in the LC50, it had no |
| 12 | influence whatsoever on the nitrate LC50 for the |
| 13 | other strain. |
| 14 | So these are the same species |
| 15 | and very different very different trends in |
| 16 | responses based on water quality. So I think it's |
| 17 | difficult to predict from one species to the other |
| 18 | and particularly from one family one order to |
| 19 | another family. |
| 20 | MR. ETTINGER: Excuse me. Could I |
| 21 | follow-up on that? Were you finished with your |
| 22 | answer to that part of the question? |
| 23 | MR. SOUCEK: Yes. |
| 24 | MR. ETTINGER: I'm interested in |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 169 1 this study on nitrate and chloride. Could you 2 describe that a little bit more? MR. SOUCEK: Yeah, we looked at the 3 4 influence of background chloride concentration or 5 relatively low concentrations from 5 mg/L up to about 100 mg/L and using these genetically 6 7 distinct strains of amphipods, so this is the US 8 lab strain and the Burlington strain, these are two different -- the two different strains that 9 10 are used in most toxicity tests and we looked -we use these different chloride concentrations in 11 12 background dilution water to assess acute and 13 chronic nitrate toxicity. What we found was that if you 14 15 change chloride in the background water from 5 16 mg/L to about 100 for the one strain of hyalella 17 you get a change in LC -- in LC50 of about a tenfold difference, whereas with the other strain 18 19 it was basically a flat line. No matter what the 20 background chloride concentration, the LC50 was 21 the same for nitrate. 22 So I'm trying to MR. ETTINGER: 23 understand. So as to some strains, the 24 combination of nitrate and chloride is more toxic

Page 170 1 than just chloride alone? 2 MR. SOUCEK: No, it was more a 3 matter of if the chloride was too low -- so it's 4 the opposite trend. For the one strain when 5 chloride was too low, nitrate toxicity was much higher whereas if chloride got up above 20 up to 6 7 100 nitrate toxicity it decreased. 8 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. So chloride 9 will actually reduce nitrate toxicity in some cases and the absence of chloride would increase 10 nitrate toxicity in some cases? 11 12 MR. SOUCEK: Over the range of chloride concentrations that we tested. 13 14 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Which are actually lower than we're looking at here? 15 MR. SOUCEK: Correct. 16 17 MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. 18 MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Moving onto 19 the next question. 20 How was it decided to limit the 21 representation of mussels in the 10°C testing 22 solely to the fingernail clam? 23 MR. SOUCEK: Fingernail clams were 24 not chosen to represent mussels. They were chosen

| | Page 171 |
|----|--|
| 1 | because that particular species, sphaerium simile, |
| 2 | was previously shown to be sensitive to sodium |
| 3 | chloride in tests conducted in my laboratory, |
| 4 | Soucek, et al, 2011, and it's a species it's a |
| 5 | species that I've used on multiple occasions for |
| 6 | toxicity testing. |
| 7 | I chose the three species we |
| 8 | used because they were relatively sensitive and I |
| 9 | have worked with them a lot. Introducing a new |
| 10 | variable like cold temperature can make |
| 11 | experiments difficult. So for this study, I |
| 12 | thought it best to work with species with which |
| 13 | I'm familiar. |
| 14 | MS. BARGHUSEN: How did you account |
| 15 | for softer waters in different parts of the state |
| 16 | in your findings on mussel species sensitivity? |
| 17 | MR. SOUCEK: Again, I did not |
| 18 | conduct any tests with mussel for this study. I |
| 19 | was given sufficient funds to do a relatively |
| 20 | limited number of tests with three chosen species. |
| 21 | We chose a moderately hard water to conduct the |
| 22 | testing with all three species. Having published |
| 23 | a number of papers on the influence of hardness on |
| 24 | major ion toxicity, I'm well-aware of that effect. |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 172 1 We simply didn't have the funds to do the testing 2 on multiple hardness levels. 3 MS. BARGHUSEN: This last one is in 4 your experience as a toxicologist, is it your opinion that at 10°C, you would likely see a 5 similar influence of hardness on chloride 6 7 toxicities to mussels as seen at warmer 8 temperatures? 9 MR. SOUCEK: I would be interested 10 in conducting studies to determine whether this is 11 I have not seen data of this sort. the case. 12 Having worked on major ion toxicities since 2003, 13 I have observed that while, in general, increasing hardness ameliorates sodium and salt toxicity to 14 15 most species, this is not always the case and the 16 degree to which it occur varies. 17 Furthermore, different species 18 respond differently to different salts. We're 19 talking potassium versus sodium versus magnesium 20 and making sweeping generalizations is not 21 prudent. In the absence of any data on the effect 22 of low testimony on hardness amelioration of salt 23 toxicity, I would not be comfortable guessing what 24 might happen.

| | Page 173 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Thank you. And |
| 2 | you're familiar that Wang found the correlation of |
| 3 | mussels and chloride toxicities at warmer |
| 4 | temperatures? |
| 5 | MR. SOUCEK: The correlation between |
| 6 | what? |
| 7 | MS. BARGHUSEN: I'm sorry. Hardness |
| 8 | and chloride toxicity, that chloride toxicity |
| 9 | varied with hardness at warmer temperatures? |
| 10 | You're familiar with that research? |
| 11 | MR. SOUCEK: Yes, I'm familiar with |
| 12 | that. That's been shown with lots of species. |
| 13 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Okay. Thank you. I |
| 14 | think that's it. Thank you. |
| 15 | MR. SOUCEK: Thank you. |
| 16 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. I'll |
| 17 | check on the time here. Do you want to take a |
| 18 | ten-minute break and start up with Sierra Club's |
| 19 | questions? |
| 20 | MR. ETTINGER: If you would like to |
| 21 | take a ten-minute break, we can do that. |
| 22 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: I'm fine |
| 23 | going forward. Everyone can talk? Yeah? Okay. |
| 24 | We can keep going. Mr. Ettinger, you can go |
| | |

Page 174 1 ahead. 2 MR. ETTINGER: I quess these quite 3 aren't on my script, but I kind of want to see 4 what we're doing here. 5 Do I understand before I ask you 6 a bunch of questions about months of the year, 7 that the months of the year proposition is off the 8 table now and you're going to go back and get us a 9 new proposal that deals with 10°C? 10 MR. HUFF: Yes. 11 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. So that's off 12 the table. Then I also heard you say that you 13 just wanted to begin the discussion as to offseason temperature standards. We've had some 14 15 discussion -- I guess we'll have some discussion in the future, but is that part of your proposal 16 17 anymore? 18 MR. HUFF: Well, I just felt if the 19 Board was going to open up a proceeding on the 20 winter chloride, they ought to look at the summer chloride as well. 21 22 I agree they should, MR. ETTINGER: 23 but I'm asking what your proposal is now as opposed to --24

Page 175 1 I have a proposal that in MR. HUFF: 2 the petition as is from US EPA their 1988 document 3 is kind of a starting point. 4 MR. ETTINGER: I quess I'm just --5 we're -- it's nice to have discussions. I'm just 6 trying to figure out what's formally before the 7 Board and as of right now what's formally before 8 the Board is a winter proposal that's going to be 9 modified and a summer proposal based on a 1988 US 10 EPA document, is that correct? 11 MR. HUFF: Yes, sir. 12 Okay. Have you -- do MR. ETTINGER: 13 you have any reason to believe that US EPA would approve a standard based on its 1988 document? 14 15 MR. HUFF: I have no opinion one way 16 or the other. I don't have that experience. 17 MR. ETTINGER: Okay. Now, I'll go 18 to my pre-filed questions. 19 On page three, what is the basis 20 for your statement that as to impaired waters any 21 future growth involving additional roadways, 22 parking lots or driveways will be virtually 23 impossible? 24 MR. HUFF: As I understand the

| , | Page 176 |
|----|--|
| 1 | regulations, a new discharger cannot further |
| 2 | degrade an impaired waterway. So where a stream |
| 3 | has been identified as impaired for chlorides, the |
| 4 | applicant for a new facility would have to offset |
| 5 | the de-icing salt it will need to manage snow and |
| 6 | ice on its property. With the existing |
| 7 | dischargers already committed to implementing best |
| 8 | management practices, additional offsets will need |
| 9 | to be found beyond BMP's already committed to by |
| 10 | the existing dischargers. I think new growth will |
| 11 | find it near impossible and certainty |
| 12 | cost-prohibitive to find chloride offsets to |
| 13 | purchase. |
| 14 | MR. ETTINGER: And this is your |
| 15 | based on your understanding of the current |
| 16 | Pollution Control Board regulations involving |
| 17 | new new or increased discharges? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. ETTINGER: Page four. Please |
| 20 | detail the documents and studies that are the |
| 21 | basis for the conclusion that summer values of |
| 22 | less than 200 mg/L appear to be more important in |
| 23 | supporting benthic communities. |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: This is based on personal |
| | |

| | Page 177 |
|----|---|
| 1 | communication with Steven McCracken of the DuPage |
| 2 | River Salt Creek Workgroup, which is correlated |
| 3 | water quality with the aquatic community quality. |
| 4 | This organization has found that summer chlorides |
| 5 | less than approximately 200 mg/L is important in |
| 6 | maintaining a healthy aquatic community. |
| 7 | MR. ETTINGER: And I presume that |
| 8 | some that those studies should be considered by |
| 9 | the Board in setting summer standards? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: Was that a question? I'm |
| 11 | sorry. |
| 12 | MR. ETTINGER: Well, do you believe |
| 13 | that those studies that you referred to by |
| 14 | Mr. McCracken should be considered when the Board |
| 15 | undertakes to set the summer standard? |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: It seems reasonable to |
| 17 | me, yes, sir. |
| 18 | MR. ETTINGER: Maybe it appeared |
| 19 | somewhere, but I didn't really see the |
| 20 | mathematical calculation that you used for the |
| 21 | four species. Is that produced somewhere in the |
| 22 | documents? |
| 23 | MR. HUFF: At Table 1 and Table 2. |
| 24 | MR. ETTINGER: I didn't really see |
| | |

| | Page 178 |
|----|--|
| 1 | how the formula was run. It's there, though? |
| 2 | MR. KLOCEK: But it's going to be |
| 3 | replaced because there are errors with it. |
| 4 | MR. ETTINGER: Okay. So we're going |
| 5 | to see a new calculation? |
| 6 | MR. KLOCEK: Yes. |
| 7 | MR. HUFF: Off the record. |
| 8 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: We can go |
| 9 | off the record. |
| 10 | (Whereupon, a discussion was had |
| 11 | off the record.) |
| 12 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: We can go |
| 13 | back on the record. |
| 14 | MR. ETTINGER: On page on page |
| 15 | 13, we ask how is it anticipated that the standard |
| 16 | can be exceeded once every three years on average |
| 17 | will affect NPDES permit writing? |
| 18 | MR. HUFF: The intent of this |
| 19 | provision was simply to acknowledge that more |
| 20 | intense storms are occurring and for safety |
| 21 | reasons salt will be necessary to reopen roads and |
| 22 | businesses in larger quantities. I believe the |
| 23 | sole impact would be to not list these receiving |
| 24 | streams as impaired from such events. |
| | |

| | Page 179 |
|----|--|
| 1 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: So you'd |
| 2 | anticipate that dischargers who were not having |
| 3 | these episodic discharges, but were having |
| 4 | continual discharges, would not have different |
| 5 | permit limits than they have now? |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: Correct. |
| 7 | MR. ETTINGER: Okay. Statement of |
| 8 | reasons. I put down statement of reasons. That's |
| 9 | probably why. |
| 10 | On page two, can you elaborate |
| 11 | on why you consider the fact that elevated winter |
| 12 | chloride levels are present in waterways with |
| 13 | moderately impacted aquatic communities "support |
| 14 | the position that elevated winter concentrations |
| 15 | are less destructive to aquatic communities?" |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: Our research clearly |
| 17 | demonstrated that temperature is a critical factor |
| 18 | with respect to chloride toxicity. To see if this |
| 19 | finding is supported by actual stream work, I turn |
| 20 | to Steven McCracken of the DuPage River Salt Creek |
| 21 | Workgroup. |
| 22 | What their extensive work has |
| 23 | shown is that summer chloride concentrations have |
| 24 | a significant effect on the aquatic community |
| | |

Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 1/30/2019

January 30, 2019

Page 180 1 quality while winter chloride concentrations do 2 not as long as the summer chlorides are down below 3 that approximately 200 mg/L. 4 MR. ETTINGER: Have you considered 5 how groundwater discharge into these waterbodies 6 might be affected by elevated use of chloride in 7 the winter? 8 MR. HUFF: I'm not quite sure of the 9 relevance of considering groundwater. We have 10 monitoring data in the streams. So to the extent that groundwater is contributing chlorides, it's 11 12 picked up in the stream data that was presented in 13 the Technical Support Document. Well, let's --14 MR. ETTINGER: 15 MS. BROWN: We have a follow-up. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: There is a 16 17 follow-up. 18 MS. BROWN: Yes. Melissa Brown with 19 Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group. 20 The McCracken studies that you 21 have been referencing, are they in the record? 22 MR. HUFF: They are not. 23 Will you be able to MS. BROWN: 24 provide copies of those studies and put them in

January 30, 2019

Page 181 1 the record? 2 MR. HUFF: I believe so. The ones 3 that have been finalized they're on their website. MS. BROWN: And have those studies 4 5 been included in peer reviewed publications? MR. HUFF: Some of that work has 6 7 been that I'm aware of, yes. 8 MS. BROWN: Okay. 9 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can you 10 identify what some of it is has been published? 11 MR. HUFF: I will follow up on that 12 when I pull that material together. 13 MR. ETTINGER: Thank you. I'll ask 14 it. 15 What do you consider sufficient 16 monitoring to determine that streams that are 17 currently not listed as impaired due to chlorides 18 are actually unimpaired, as you contend? 19 The Agency has encouraged MR. HUFF: 20 continuous conductivity monitors to collect better 21 data with respect to snow melt runoff. This is a 22 very good approach. As the routine stream 23 monitoring is bias towards nicer weather, episodic 24 spikes are easily missed in the winter months.

| | Page 182 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Grab samples are to be collected. Depending upon |
| 2 | the size of the stream, they need to be collected |
| 3 | during or immediately after temperatures warm to |
| 4 | generate sufficient runoff. |
| 5 | MR. ETTINGER: With regard to the |
| 6 | Section B of the statement of reasons on page |
| 7 | five, what chronic chloride water quality criteria |
| 8 | are you referring to in the last sentence of |
| 9 | Section B? |
| 10 | MR. HUFF: The ones we develop my |
| 11 | point was simply to note our chronic standard is |
| 12 | conservative. |
| 13 | MR. ETTINGER: Conservative compared |
| 14 | to what? |
| 15 | MR. HUFF: In that we only adjusted |
| 16 | the temperature for the species we tested plus in |
| 17 | the original submittal of three daphnia as well. |
| 18 | So all the rest are still the test results on |
| 19 | toxicity from the 23 to 25°C. |
| 20 | MR. ETTINGER: Section D. You raise |
| 21 | the issue of the need for a spring standard for |
| 22 | water temperatures near 15°C. |
| 23 | Do you have plans to test |
| 24 | organisms at this temperature and make a proposal |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 183 1 for a standard? 2 Financial support from MR. HUFF: 3 the regulated community will be dependent upon the 4 outcome of these proceedings. If a winter 5 standard is not achieved, then there will be insufficient financial support from the regulated 6 7 community to fund additional research. 8 However, if a winter chloride 9 standard is the outcome of these proceedings, then 10 I believe there would be sufficient support to continue to evaluate 15°C and on a personal note, 11 12 I will not be involved upon completion of this 13 proceeding because I'm going to retire. 14 MR. ETTINGER: Can I object to that? 15 On page six, have you compiled the data to show 16 that de-icing chloride spikes are less than 17 96-hour episodic events as stated? MR. HUFF: Section 4 the Technical 18 19 Support Document presented data on this question. 20 In general, the larger the drainage area, the 21 longer the duration of the spikes, but at lower 22 concentrations. Smaller streams tend to be 23 flashier, higher peak, but shorter duration. Please explain the 24 MR. ETTINGER:

January 30, 2019

Page 184 1 statement that "If exposure is extended, chronic effects can be observed, but at higher chloride 2 3 concentrations of exposure." 4 MR. HUFF: The higher concentrations of chloride refers to the 10°C versus the chronic 5 effects found at 25°C. 6 7 MR. ETTINGER: Regarding the C. Dubia 96-hour chronic toxicity testing at 10°C, 8 9 did all chronic indicators show no change, independent of chloride levels? 10 11 MR. HUFF: Correct. 12 MR. ETTINGER: I'm going to skip I'm going to drop the next given the fact 13 this. that the monthly is dead. We did not take into 14 15 account -- this is on the Technical Support 16 Document. 17 Were tests done in anything 18 other than moderately hard water? 19 MR. HUFF: No. 20 MR. ETTINGER: What is the 21 definition of moderately hard water that was used, 22 that we're using here? 23 MR. HUFF: David, can you answer 24 that?

January 30, 2019

Page 185 MR. SOUCEK: Yes, the US EPA method 1 2 documents for acute toxicity testing I think the 3 wet testing documents moderately hard water is 4 between the range of, I believe, 80 to 120. 5 MR. ETTINGER: Section 5.1. Are there conditions in which chlorides could be 6 7 elevated in Illinois streams longer than 35 days? 8 MR. HUFF: If you're talking about 9 from de-icing practices or just in general? 10 MR. ETTINGER: I'm talking about in general. 11 12 Oh, absolutely. MR. HUFF: 13 What strain of MR. ETTINGER: 14 hyalella is likely to be present in southern 15 Tllinois? MR. HUFF: I'll let David answer 16 17 that one. 18 MR. SOUCEK: I have a masters 19 student Kali Major working in my lab at Natural 20 History Survey collected hyalella specimens from 21 Jackson County, Coles, Edgar, Perry, Saline and 22 Gallatin Counties in Illinois and sequenced their 23 cytochrome c oxidase 1 genes and published those 24 results in Major, et al, 2013. All the specimens

| , | Page 186 |
|----|--|
| 1 | she collected from those counties in southern |
| 2 | Illinois belong to what she called the flat branch |
| 3 | strain which is genetically distinct from both the |
| 4 | Burlington stain that was used in this study and |
| 5 | the US lab strain, which is the most commonly |
| 6 | tested strain. I then later published a paper in |
| 7 | 2015. I described this flat branch strain of |
| 8 | hyalella azteca as a new species called hyalella |
| 9 | wellborni. Just antidotically this species is |
| 10 | widespread throughout central and southern |
| 11 | Illinois. |
| 12 | MR. ETTINGER: Are you using this |
| 13 | strain for testing now? |
| 14 | MR. SOUCEK: We tried to culture |
| 15 | that one. It was a lot harder to culture in the |
| 16 | laboratory than the other strains are. We tried |
| 17 | to, but we're not currently at this time. |
| 18 | MR. ETTINGER: It's just a wild, |
| 19 | southern boy or what's the |
| 20 | MR. SOUCEK: It doesn't reproduce as |
| 21 | much and it can go a couple generations it seems |
| 22 | like and then it just loses vitality. |
| 23 | So it's something that I would |
| 24 | like to continue working on because it's a pretty |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 187 1 widespread strain, but the other two are much 2 easier to work with. 3 MR. ETTINGER: I think we're done. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Done. 4 A11 5 Let's see. 3:20. Let's take a ten-minute right. break and then we'll reconvene and figure out how 6 7 we want -- where we want to go from there, does 8 that sound good? 9 MS. MEYERS: Sounds great. Thank 10 you. 11 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Off the 12 record. 13 (Whereupon, a break was taken after which the following 14 15 proceedings were had.) 16 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: We can go 17 back on the record. 18 MR. ETTINGER: I believe 19 Dr. Skrukrud would go first. So maybe we need to 20 move you to where the court reporter can hear you 21 better. 22 Do you want to go --MS. BARGHUSEN: 23 THE COURT REPORTER: How about right 24 there.

January 30, 2019

Page 188 1 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Can the 2 reporter please swear the witness in. 3 WHEREUPON: 4 CINDY SKRUKRUD 5 called as a witness herein, having been first duly 6 sworn, deposeth and saith as follows: 7 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. 8 MR. ETTINGER: Let me say one other 9 We tendered corrected testimony. thing. There 10 was one paragraph which I handed to Mr. Klein. 11 There is one paragraph where we made a correction 12 and you're free to ask about that, but it has to 13 do with paragraph five, I believe. HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Have you 14 15 provided a copy to Mr. Huff? MR. ETTINGER: I have not. 16 17 MS. SKRUKRUD: I can share mine with 18 him. I gave you a second copy. I can give that 19 to Jim. 20 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: All right. 21 Mr. Huff, that's an amended copy. So if there's 22 no objection, I will enter the amended testimony 23 into the record. It's entered. Mr. Huff, you can 24 proceed.

189

| | Page |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Dr. Skrukrud, question |
| 2 | one. Bullet one of your pre-filed testimony |
| 3 | indicates that the petition makes little sense as |
| 4 | applied as it focuses on highway de-icing |
| 5 | practices. |
| 6 | Is not highway/pavement de-icing |
| 7 | the primary winter source of chlorides in Illinois |
| 8 | streams. |
| 9 | MS. SKRUKRUD: Chlorides from winter |
| 10 | de-icings are a major source of chlorides in |
| 11 | Illinois waters. Bullet one raises the issue that |
| 12 | there are other sources of chloride pollution to |
| 13 | Illinois waters that need to be considered in this |
| 14 | rulemaking including water softener discharges and |
| 15 | discharges from industrial sources like oil fields |
| 16 | and coal mines. |
| 17 | As an example, the Pond Creek |
| 18 | Coal Mine in Williamson County is proposing to |
| 19 | discharge 2.7 million gallons per day of |
| 20 | groundwater infiltration into their underground |
| 21 | mine. They're proposing to discharge it into the |
| 22 | Big Muddy River. Discharges would contain an |
| 23 | average of 2,237 mg/L of chloride and 1,940 mg/L $$ |
| 24 | of sulfate. |
| | |

| | Page 190 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: So would there be a |
| 2 | seasonal component that a coal mine the oil and |
| 3 | gas or water softeners that you've lifted up? |
| 4 | MS. SKRUKRUD: No, I don't think |
| 5 | there would be a seasonal component for those. |
| 6 | MR. HUFF: So would not they be |
| 7 | controlled by the proposed summer standard then? |
| 8 | If they met the summer standards, would you expect |
| 9 | them to discharge more in the winter? |
| 10 | MS. SKRUKRUD: Your question is, |
| 11 | yes, I think they would need to comply with the |
| 12 | summer standards and in terms of changing their |
| 13 | operations, I'm not an expert on coal mines. So I |
| 14 | would just be speculating. |
| 15 | MR. HUFF: Okay. That was really |
| 16 | question two. Question six. While acknowledging |
| 17 | the proposed summer quality standards are from the |
| 18 | US EPA, you express concern they are not |
| 19 | restrictive enough. |
| 20 | What would you propose for |
| 21 | summer chloride standards and what would be the |
| 22 | impact on the Illinois economy. |
| 23 | MS. SKRUKRUD: I don't have a |
| 24 | proposal for the summer standards. As we consider |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 191 1 this rulemaking, we need to develop standards 2 protective of Illinois aquatic species in all life 3 stages and I have not analyzed the impact on the 4 Illinois economy. 5 MR. HUFF: That's all the questions I have for Dr. Skrukrud. 6 7 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Does anyone 8 else have questions? All right. Ms. Laura 9 Barghusen -- oh, there is a question. MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Martine, this is 10 Chairman Papadimitriu. May I ask a few questions? 11 12 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Yes. 13 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Thank you. 14 Mr. Huff, good afternoon. 15 MR. HUFF: Good afternoon. MS. PAPADIMITRIU: I have two 16 17 questions that you may have covered this morning. 18 I was at another hearing. So I apologize if this 19 is duplicative. 20 What is the basis for your 21 belief that the current chloride standard will not 22 be achievable in the future? 23 MR. HUFF: So this question is for 24 me.

January 30, 2019

Page 192 1 HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: It's for 2 Mr. Huff. 3 MR. HUFF: The DuPage River Salt 4 Creek Workgroup has been implementing best 5 management practices for over a decade. They are 6 about 12 years in. They have a very high 7 participation rate. I believe every municipality 8 within those drainage basins has implemented best 9 management practices. If you look at the data 10 submitted with the Technical Support Document, you can see maybe a declining trend in chlorides on an 11 12 annual basis, but it's -- it's slow-going and you 13 have these larger storms like what we're experiencing today that the BMP's aren't going to 14 be sufficient to cut the salt usage down on those 15 16 most intense storms. 17 The BMP's are doing a fine job 18 on more efficient salt application on an annual 19 basis, but the streams are just too far away to 20 achieve a 500 mg/L not-to-exceed basis where they 21 already have a background chloride, say, on the 22 order of 200 mg/L and they're spiking up in these 23 bad storms to like up to 1,500 mg/L. 24 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Okay. And second

January 30, 2019

Page 193 question, is it my -- is my understanding correct 1 2 that you're seeking a permanent standard? 3 MR. HUFF: Yes. 4 In perpetuity? MS. PAPADIMITRIU: 5 MR. HUFF: Well, I believe chlorides 6 are like every other pollutant. As we develop 7 more science, we need to go back and revisit these and there is a mechanism. There is a triennial 8 review of the water quality standards. Here, we 9 10 really need to do additional temperatures. We 11 need to do sulfate and -- and hardness testing at 12 colder temperature and that -- that data has not 13 been assembled yet. So I would liken these as 14 almost an interim standard. When that work is 15 done, then we'll be in a basis to make a more refined chloride standard. 16 17 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: So from your 18 answer, and I don't want to put words in your 19 mouth, it sounds like a temporary standard, one 20 longer than three years, but shorter than forever, 21 might be acceptable to you? 22 MR. HUFF: Absolutely. 23 MS. PAPADIMITRIU: Okay. Thank you. 24 That's all I have. Thank you.

| _ | |
|----|--|
| , | Page 194 |
| 1 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. So we |
| 2 | can move on now to Ms. Barghusen. If the court |
| 3 | reporter can swear her in. |
| 4 | WHEREUPON: |
| 5 | LAURA BARGHUSEN |
| 6 | called as a witness herein, having been first duly |
| 7 | sworn, deposeth and saith as follows: |
| 8 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Ms. |
| 9 | Barghusen, actually, I'm going to backtrack |
| 10 | because I didn't provide Ms. Skrukrud this |
| 11 | opportunity. |
| 12 | Was there an opening statement |
| 13 | that you wanted to make. |
| 14 | MS. SKRUKRUD: No, that's fine. |
| 15 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sure? |
| 16 | MS. SKRUKRUD: Yes. |
| 17 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sorry. |
| 18 | Ms. Barghusen, if you have an opening statement, |
| 19 | you can make it now. |
| 20 | MS. BARGHUSEN: I do not have an |
| 21 | opening statement. |
| 22 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Mr. Huff, |
| 23 | you can proceed to questions. |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: Thank you. On page one, |
| | |

| | Page 195 |
|----|--|
| 1 | you state that a more lenient study for chlorides |
| 2 | would ultimately result in greater pollution in |
| 3 | these waters. The proposed summer chronic |
| 4 | standard is more restrictive than the current |
| 5 | standard. So presumably the statement refers to |
| 6 | the proposed winter standard. |
| 7 | As no urban stream in Illinois |
| 8 | currently meets the 500 mg/L chloride standard |
| 9 | during snow melt periods, a condition that has |
| 10 | existed for more than 40 years, can you explain |
| 11 | how the proposal will result in greater pollution |
| 12 | in urban streams. |
| 13 | MR. ETTINGER: I'm going to object |
| 14 | to the question as based on a legal conclusion |
| 15 | that's not correct, but, with that, she should do |
| 16 | the best she can. |
| 17 | MS. MEYERS: Thank you, Albert. |
| 18 | MS. BARGHUSEN: My thought was that |
| 19 | the chlorides would enter the waterways at the |
| 20 | amount permitted, or at least that they could, and |
| 21 | in some cases would and I was also assuming that |
| 22 | people, government and industry would work to meet |
| 23 | a permitted standard and that the standard would |
| 24 | be met. |

| | Page 196 |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Question two. Is the |
| 2 | substance of your testimony that the Illinois |
| 3 | Pollution Control Board should reject the proposed |
| 4 | summer/winter chloride standards and simply |
| 5 | maintain the 500 mg/L chloride standard? |
| 6 | MS. MEYERS: I would object to that |
| 7 | as to provide a legal conclusion, but, Laura, if |
| 8 | you want to answer, you can. |
| 9 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Yeah, I really am |
| 10 | not suggesting what standard we should use. I'm |
| 11 | merely providing testimony on the current petition |
| 12 | and whether I think it would be protective of |
| 13 | certain creatures that I have studied. |
| 14 | MR. HUFF: Question six. On page |
| 15 | four, you also cited a study by Wallace and |
| 16 | Biastoch that found a threshold for diversity in |
| 17 | abundance at chloride concentrations between 50 |
| 18 | and 90 mg/L. |
| 19 | Did this study look at seasonal |
| 20 | chlorides, maximum chlorides or summer chlorides? |
| 21 | MS. BARGHUSEN: This study found |
| 22 | that there was a threshold for diversity in |
| 23 | abundance of macroinvertebrates at chloride levels |
| 24 | between 50 and 90 mg/L. The study consisted of |
| | |

| | Page 197 |
|----|--|
| 1 | monthly grab sampling. So it was a sample taken |
| 2 | at one specific time at 20 sites across the |
| 3 | Toronto region. The total number of samples taken |
| 4 | was 321. The samples were taken in 2002 and then |
| 5 | again in 2012. |
| 6 | So all months were represented |
| 7 | by those samples in those two years. Summary |
| 8 | statistics were then calculated for the study. |
| 9 | The authors report that the median chloride levels |
| 10 | were significantly higher in 2012 at 159 mg/L than |
| 11 | they were in 2002 at which time they were 92 mg/L. |
| 12 | They attributed this to the increasing |
| 13 | salinization of the rivers and stream between |
| 14 | those years. They sampled macroinvertebrates in |
| 15 | 2002 and then in 2012 at 51 sites across the same |
| 16 | ten watersheds in the Toronto area during the |
| 17 | months of June to September. |
| 18 | At the same time that they |
| 19 | sampled the macroinvertebrates, they took specific |
| 20 | conductance at the sites and then related that to |
| 21 | chloride levels in regressions that they had run |
| 22 | previously so that they could convert the specific |
| 23 | conductance into an estimated chloride level. And |
| 24 | so that data was collected in the June to |
| | |

198

| | Page |
|----|--|
| 1 | September months and the chloride levels used were |
| 2 | the ones measured as specific conductance and |
| 3 | converted the chlorides during the |
| 4 | macroinvertebrate sampling at each site. |
| 5 | And the reason I included this |
| 6 | study in my testimony is because it raises issues |
| 7 | of community shifts in aquatic life at lower at |
| 8 | levels lower than the ones we're considering here |
| 9 | and because it also raises the issue which is |
| 10 | discussed in the same study in the discussion of |
| 11 | seepage of chlorides into soil and groundwater |
| 12 | that then can be released into streams and rivers |
| 13 | all year as groundwater is released raising the |
| 14 | chloride levels all year round and it it cites |
| 15 | a study that Williams, et al, did that showed |
| 16 | chloride contamination and groundwater in springs |
| 17 | in the greater Toronto area. |
| 18 | And then to quote the threshold |
| 19 | study in a discussion retention of chloride and |
| 20 | groundwater in soils prolongs exposure beyond |
| 21 | winter and early spring and leads to elevated |
| 22 | concentrations during summer when reproduction may |
| 23 | be occurring. And they cite that to another |
| 24 | study, Findlay and Kelly 2011. |

| | Page 199 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. HUFF: Thank you. Question 8. |
| 2 | In a Gillis article, he noted that the poor |
| 3 | quality of the glochidia survival, 77.4 percent |
| 4 | control, may have impacted the low EC50 that he |
| 5 | reported of a 168 mg Cl-/L and Wang found the EC50 $$ |
| 6 | and low hardness water was 441 mg/L. |
| 7 | Significantly higher than Gillis. And those |
| 8 | results were 20 degrees. |
| 9 | So is that correct, that |
| 10 | statement, that the Gillis one basically had a |
| 11 | problem with his control that he had in his paper? |
| 12 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Yes, I think that |
| 13 | those things that you said are true. However, if |
| 14 | you look at the data that's presented in both the |
| 15 | Gillis paper and in the two papers by Wang, et al, |
| 16 | I think you see really many results that indicate |
| 17 | a low chloride toxicity, acute chloride toxicity, |
| 18 | in mussel glochidia. And from my way of thinking, |
| 19 | the fact that it's repeated over studies gives it |
| 20 | more credibility. |
| 21 | So, for example, I can read them |
| 22 | to you. So the acute EC50's, meaning the |
| 23 | concentration with 50 percent of the glochidia are |
| 24 | effectively dead, of mussel glochidia in Gillis, |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 200 1 et al, 20 -- or just Gillis, I'm sorry, 2011 and 2 Wang, et al, 2018, are reported in their 3 publications as follows. 4 For the fat mucket in 2008, 5 tested in reconstituted moderately hard water of 95 to 115 mg CaCO3/L there was an acute EC50 of 6 7 168 mg Cl-/L in glochidia from Cox Creek -- and I 8 think that's the one you were referencing. 9 MR. HUFF: Right, that's the one 10 that controls. 11 MS. BARGHUSEN: And then they did 12 another one where the fat mucket in 2009 tested in 13 reconstituted moderately hard water of 95 to 115 14 hardness, the acute EC50 was 1,430 mg Cl-/L from 15 glochidia from the Maitland River. The Plain 16 Pocketbook tested in reconstituted moderately hard 17 water at 817 mg Cl-/L. These are acute 18 toxicities. The wavy-rayed lamp mussel in 2008 19 tested in reconstituted moderately hard water at 20 113 mg Cl-/L. The wavy-rayed lamp mussel in 2009 21 tested in reconstituted moderately hard water with 22 an acute EC50 of 285 mg Cl-/L. The northern 23 riffleshell tested in reconstituted moderately 24 hard water with an acute EC50 of 244 mg Cl-/L.

January 30, 2019

Page 201 1 So those were among tests that 2 Gillis reported and then looking at Wang, et al, 3 with tests on fat mucket. Glochidia they did it 4 in moderately hard reconstituted water and got an 5 EC50 for the glochidia of 728 mg Cl-/L. They also tested the glochidia at different hardnesses in 6 7 the Columbia Environmental Research Center well 8 water and at 50 degrees hard, as you noted, they 9 got an EC50 of 441 mg Cl-/L. At 100 hard, they 10 got an EC50 of 544 mg Cl-/L. 11 Once they were up to 200 hard, 12 they got an EC50 of 1,288 mg Cl-/L and once they 13 were up to 300 hard, they got an EC50 of 1,597 mg I think it's important to remember when 14 Cl-/L. considering these that the concentrations at which 15 16 half of the test animals effectively die that a 17 protected standard would presumably have to be 18 lower than that and that even if you take the very 19 highest one at 300 hardness, you get a value --20 and cut it in half, say, you'd still get a value 21 of 798.5 mg Cl-/L, which would be still lower than 22 either the summer or winter acute in the proposal 23 and you note that -- I think you asked me really 24 about the poor quality of the glochidia and so I

| | Page 202 |
|----|--|
| 1 | think that the fact that there have been several |
| 2 | tests of acute chronic chloride I mean, acute |
| 3 | chloride toxicity in which glochidia from several |
| 4 | different mussel species have repeatedly tested |
| 5 | below the proposed acute winter and summer |
| 6 | standards is relevant and I think let's see. |
| 7 | And Gillis can you tell me this question number |
| 8 | again? It's eight, right. |
| 9 | MR. HUFF: Eight. |
| 10 | MS. BARGHUSEN: Eight. Okay. Good. |
| 11 | And Gillis did comment that the natural river |
| 12 | water that she tested did offer more protection |
| 13 | than the reconstituted water. She wasn't sure |
| 14 | exactly why that was. She noted that the natural |
| 15 | river water was harder than the reconstituted |
| 16 | water that's usually used in chloride and other |
| 17 | contaminant testing and that this could be part of |
| 18 | the reason since harder water offers protection, |
| 19 | but she thought that that couldn't really account |
| 20 | for the great difference that she was seeing and |
| 21 | she thought other water chemistry factors might |
| 22 | also have contributed to the reduced toxicity of |
| 23 | chloride in the natural water that she tested. |
| 24 | But basically it was unclear why |
| | |

| | Page 203 |
|----|--|
| 1 | the natural water was affording protection in that |
| 2 | test and she did talk about the advantages of |
| 3 | using reconstituted water in the tests that they |
| 4 | provide consistency. A lot of the tests that are |
| 5 | done are done in reconstituted waters so you can |
| 6 | compare them between tests or between studies |
| 7 | and so they permit comparison between studies and |
| 8 | between species and then notes that there is a |
| 9 | disadvantage that they may not necessarily predict |
| 10 | how an organism is going to respond to that |
| 11 | contaminate in its natural environment. She said |
| 12 | on the other hand one disadvantage of natural |
| 13 | water exposure is other contaminates may be |
| 14 | present which can contribute to toxicity. So to |
| 15 | sum up |
| 16 | MR. HUFF: Just I'm sorry. I |
| 17 | thought you were done. |
| 18 | MS. BARGHUSEN: To sum up, I think |
| 19 | the repeated tests at sort of accepted ways of |
| 20 | testing glochidia in through methods that are |
| 21 | often used and repeated tests that are giving |
| 22 | comparatively low chloride toxicities should be |
| 23 | taken into account. |
| 24 | MR. HUFF: So you noted that those |
| | |

January 30, 2019

Page 204 1 were lower than the proposed winter toxicity. 2 Were any of those tests done at 3 colder temperatures or were they all above 20 4 degrees? 5 MS. BARGHUSEN: Yeah, these tests 6 were all above 20 degrees. 7 MR. HUFF: So it's really not 8 appropriate to compare to the winter proposed 9 standard? MS. BARGHUSEN: Well, I don't know 10 because they haven't been tested at 10°C. 11 12 Question 14. On page 7, MR. HUFF: vou describe the translocation of the northern 13 riffleshell mussels into the Vermillion River. 14 Can you describe the peak 15 chlorides recorded in this watershed where the 16 17 mussels were translocated? 18 MS. BARGHUSEN: No, I have not 19 studied the chlorides in the Vermilion basin. 20 MR. HUFF: So do you think they considered that before they translocated those 21 22 mussels? 23 Objection. She just MS. MEYERS: 24 said she wasn't aware.

| , | Page 205 |
|----|--|
| 1 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Sustained. |
| 2 | MR. HUFF: I have no further |
| 3 | questions. Thank you. |
| 4 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. Can |
| 5 | we go off the record real quick. |
| 6 | (Whereupon, a break was taken |
| 7 | after which the following |
| 8 | proceedings were had.) |
| 9 | HEARING OFFICER KLEIN: Okay. So |
| 10 | during that break, we discussed the next steps for |
| 11 | the hearing. What we have decided is that the |
| 12 | March 6th hearing is going to be canceled. I will |
| 13 | issue a hearing officer order to that effect. |
| 14 | Then I will schedule a prehearing conference in |
| 15 | approximately 30 days at which time we will expect |
| 16 | or see if Mr. Huff has filed a modified proposal |
| 17 | and, if not, then check on the status of that. |
| 18 | And if we are far enough long, |
| 19 | schedule potentially schedule subsequent |
| 20 | hearings at that prehearing conference. |
| 21 | Tomorrow's continuation is canceled because it is |
| 22 | unnecessary. Today's transcript should be |
| 23 | available sometime next week and it will be |
| 24 | available on COOL, the clerk's online filing |
| | |

| | Page 206 |
|----|---|
| 1 | system, and it can be viewed and printed by |
| 2 | anybody. |
| З | Is there anything else that |
| 4 | needs to be addressed at this time? Hearing none, |
| 5 | I would like to thank everyone for braving the |
| 6 | weather and making the trip downtown and |
| 7 | participating in this first hearing and it is now |
| 8 | adjourned. Thank you. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | |

Γ

| | Page 207 |
|----|--|
| 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 hearing |
| 8 | aforesaid, and that the foregoing is a true, |
| 9 | complete and correct transcript of the proceedings |
| 10 | of said hearing 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., 2019. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | STEVEN BRICKEY, CSR |
| 21 | 8 West Monroe Street |
| 22 | Suite 2007 Chicago, Illinois 60603 |
| 23 | Phone: (312) 419-9292 CSR No. 084-004675 |
| 24 | |
| | |

| | • | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Α | 141:11 153:17 | 130:3 138:5 | addressed 29:17 | 109:17,18 110:23 |
| A.D 207:15 | 192:20 | 139:19 140:4 | 30:21 206:4 | 178:17 |
| a.m 1:9 4:13 | achieved 79:21 | 141:12 147:21 | addresses 91:19 | affording 203:1 |
| abbreviated 15:18 | 83:7 112:12 | 156:15,21 157:15 | addressing 70:6 | affords 89:11 |
| able 31:14 65:18 | 141:21,23 142:2 | 159:13 160:18,19 | 162:9 | aforesaid 207:8 |
| 78:17 79:9 80:22 | 164:14,16 183:5 | 161:8 166:4,9 | adds 166:7 | afternoon 191:14 |
| 180:23 | achieves 141:16 | 169:12 185:2 | adequate 89:11 | 191:15 |
| absence 170:10 | 145:5 | 199:17,22 200:6 | adjacent 79:1 | Agency 5:2 39:19 |
| 172:21 | achieving 12:10 | 200:14,17,22,24 | 152:11 | 40:9,17 41:5,13 |
| absent 51:4 | 79:3 153:12,20 | 201:22 202:2,2,5 | adjourned 206:8 | 42:3,6,16 43:10 |
| absolutely 83:11 | acknowledge 13:17 | acute-chronic | adjust 130:16 | 48:7 50:18 67:10 |
| 115:10 185:12 | 178:19 | 72:12,18 | 165:2 | 76:3 91:16,22 |
| 193:22 | acknowledging | acutely 119:18,23 | adjusted 55:21 | 104:17 105:20 |
| absurdly 95:4 | 190:16 | 120:15 | 61:15,20 62:7 | 106:12,14 115:5 |
| abundance 147:6 | acquire 79:9 | add 3:18 10:19 | 138:10 182:15 | 132:9 181:19 |
| 196:17,23 | ACR 116:14 124:5 | 29:5 54:2,4,4 | adjusting 165:10 | aggressive 81:14 |
| acceptable 34:6 | 124:16,24 125:16 | added 21:23 44:10 | 165:11 | aggressively 110:7 |
| 137:17 193:21 | 125:18 126:7,10 | 59:24 68:17 89:4 | adjustment 63:5 | ago 27:10 |
| accepted 3:22 | 126:14 129:15,16 | 119:23 120:6 | 119:15 | agree 12:6 58:23 |
| 203:19 | 129:20,21 130:3,5 | 152:18 | adjustments 62:24 | 99:4 111:15 |
| accepts 6:8 | 130:12 | adding 24:15 38:9 | Adm 13:1,13 43:21 | 122:16,19 123:19 |
| access 35:22 40:5 | acronyms 55:14 | 38:23 55:3 59:8 | 106:17 140:16 | 163:9,22,24 |
| accessed 34:3 36:10 | act 102:7 139:12 | 69:2,16 | Administrative | 174:22 |
| accidents 87:5,19 | 140:19 | addition 5:13 11:24 | | agreed 113:16 |
| acclimation 21:10 | action 35:21 151:6 | 13:10 30:24 50:24 | admitted 5:15 6:24 | agreement 78:12 |
| accommodation | actual 49:3 105:17 | 54:13 86:13 89:23 | 35:17 | agreements 79:10 |
| 13:22 143:14 | 115:24 129:12 | 98:15 102:1 | adopt 111:4 141:2 | 80:1,6,6,10,17 |
| accompanying | 179:19 | 139:18 | adopted 33:14,17 | agricultural 149:3 |
| 165:22 | acute 13:1,12 15:15 | additional 7:4 25:7 | 33:21 35:4 44:3,8 | 149:11 |
| account 33:4 37:12 | 16:14,19,24 19:1 | 27:16 45:23 52:24 | 47:8 74:10 108:23 | agriculture 149:19 |
| 73:7 145:16,17 | 19:14,18 23:5 | 53:10,11,18,20 | 110:5 | ahead 17:13 29:17 |
| 148:21 150:16 | 32:11 36:15 38:4 | 54:2,2,5,8 80:6 | adopting 33:16 | 34:10 101:20 |
| 164:18 171:14 | 38:23 39:4,4 45:5 | 89:21 91:24 92:10 | 35:7 74:4 | 127:1 151:9 174:1 |
| 184:15 202:19 | 46:9,16 53:19,20 | 96:8 124:10 | adopts 109:15,24 | Airport 79:2 |
| 203:23 | 55:13 60:14 62:13 | 175:21 176:8 | adult 18:4 146:5 | al 16:4 17:5 52:8 |
| accounted 122:20 | 64:6,19,23 66:2,4 | 183:7 193:10 | adults 21:22,23 | 84:6,7,14 156:21 |
| 161:5 | 66:12,15 67:20,24 | Additionally 60:6 | 22:2 | 161:14 171:4 |
| accounts 35:8 | 67:24 68:7,9,16 | address 4:9 10:8 | advanced 81:21 | 185:24 198:15 |
| accurate 24:10 | 68:18 69:18 71:3 | 35:23,24 73:10 | advances 137:15 | 199:15 200:1,2 |
| 42:5 155:3 | 71:5 72:1 73:15 | 76:14 88:16 92:21 | advantages 203:2 | 201:2 |
| acetates 88:18 | 92:2 106:22 107:2 | 93:6 100:19 | adverse 144:1 | Albert 2:10 195:17 |
| achievable 83:13 | 107:8,12 113:1 | 103:20,24 131:23 | advisor 2:3,5 3:11 | algae 137:3 |
| 191:22 | 116:13 119:12 | 136:20 145:2 | 3:13 64:1 132:12 | Alisa 2:4 3:9 64:5 |
| 1/1.44 | | 147:1 150:24 | advisors 132:4 | alleviate 145:12 |
| achieve 12.7 74.5 | 122:16 123:8 | 14/.1 130.24 | auvisus 1J2.T | |
| achieve 12:7 74:5 77:12,21 79:16 | 122.10 123.8 | 161:20 | affect 108:24 | 146:15 |

| | | | | 2 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| allocated 79:11 | 75:20 124:8 | appeared 177:18 | 137:6 138:11 | 157:20 163:10 |
| allow 6:2 21:9 74:4 | 130:11 164:19 | appears 61:22 | 145:12 151:3 | 177:3,6 179:13,15 |
| 107:13 124:15,22 | analytically 23:24 | 70:18 100:23 | 162:5 181:22 | 179:24 191:2 |
| 141:9 143:14 | 24·12 | 113:5 115:21 | approached 28:3 | 198:7 |
| allowed 31:4 107:3 | analyzed 191:3 | 165:22 207:10 | 52:19 | ARC 130:1,10 |
| allows 58:3 107:9 | Anand 2:5 3:8 | Appendix 31:10 | approaches 123:11 | area 50:15 79:4 |
| alter 71:11 | anatomically | apples 166:14 | approaching 122:8 | 82:4,7 87:6,14 |
| alternative 71:17 | 167:24 | applicability 47:1 | appropriate 31:6 | 101:5 108:11 |
| 71:18 72:4,15,16 | and/or 12:1 13:19 | applicable 20:20 | 57:19 67:13 99:18 | 115:6 166:2 |
| 86:20 88:21 | animals 38:5 | applicant 176:4 | 103:13 114:3 | 183:20 197:16 |
| 138:17 151:6 | 201:16 | application 50:24 | 130:2,10,15,24 | 198:17 |
| 164:23 | announced 143:7 | 86:1,5,7,11 88:19 | 165:20 204:8 | areas 12:1 85:22 |
| alternatives 85:20 | annual 82:14,16 | 92:24 93:9 100:4 | | 99:10 100:21 |
| 86:23 88:17 151:2 | 86:4 154:10 | | appropriately 92:1 114:10,17 | 140:19 141:8,16 |
| | | 104:3,12 105:7,14 | , | 140.19 141.8,10 |
| ambient 39:15 | 192:12,18 | 149:11,20 154:10 154:22 192:18 | appropriateness | |
| 49:13 106:15 | annually 82:1 | | 63:7 | argue 141:4 |
| 112:19 117:2 | answer 6:1 17:12 | applications 13:20 | approvable 30:14 | argues 88:23 |
| ameliorate 127:7 | 20:1,16 24:6 | 143:12 149:5,13 | 97:19 118:5 | arising 146:23 |
| ameliorated 120:8 | 32:20 39:20 59:4 | applied 28:9 36:4 | approve 118:12 | arithmetic 13:5 |
| 123:1 | 69:20 71:7 82:22 | 85:9 86:14 88:1 | 175:14 | arrive 61:5 66:23 |
| ameliorates 172:14 | 94:9 96:9 105:5 | 93:4,10 94:21 | approved 28:22 | arrived 91:17 |
| ameliorating 57:9 | 147:17 150:3,11 | 99:20 104:15 | 30:11 32:13 34:16 | article 34:2 44:18 |
| amelioration 126:4 | 155:17 161:11 | 134:7,19 135:4 | 117:17 150:20 | 52:9,14 68:21 |
| 127:17 172:22 | 168:22 184:23 | 149:14,24 150:9 | approximate 79:16 | 199:2 |
| amend 3:16 32:5 | 185:16 193:18 | 162:16 189:4 | approximately | articles 31:19 |
| 123:4 | 196:8 | applies 154:14 | 17:23 39:10 41:21 | ascertained 115:19 |
| amended 188:21,22 | answered 23:15 | 162:21 | 43:15 53:4,6 | 129:15 130:16 |
| amendments 1:4 | 30:18 51:12 53:16 | apply 26:4 46:19 | 136:24 177:5 | asked 5:23 7:23 8:3 |
| 3:4,19 | 91:1 159:18 | 62:19 67:19 78:17 | 180:3 205:15 | 26:15 39:19 41:13 |
| American 15:17 | anti-icing 82:1 86:3 | 82:23 87:3 94:6 | April 48:20 50:1 | 42:1 76:3 91:1 |
| ammonia 32:18 | 86:16 | 100:9 110:21 | 94:3 103:7,15,17 | 125:9 201:23 |
| 105:23 106:2,13 | anticipate 151:10 | 120:10 135:2 | 104:13 105:1 | asking 8:20 90:7 |
| 162:3 | 179:2 | 146:14 | 149:21 150:3 | 111:23 153:7 |
| amount 43:15 | anticipated 178:15 | applying 86:6 | aquatic 35:6 36:12 | 174:23 |
| 79:18 87:2 128:23 | antidotically 94:2,7 | 94:22 135:2 155:1 | 38:4 43:24 45:1,5 | asks 43:19 |
| 139:6 165:17 | 94:8 186:9 | 168:2 | 46:20 47:24 73:17 | assembled 193:13 |
| 195:20 | anybody 98:18 | appreciate 42:7 | 83:20,24 92:13 | assess 169:12 |
| amounts 79:10 | 206:2 | approach 29:4,14 | 127:24 136:19,22 | assessed 41:1 |
| amphipod 15:21 | anymore 174:17 | 29:15 30:14 33:8 | 136:23 137:2,22 | assessing 160:7 |
| 18:7 21:19 159:8 | apologize 167:11 | 53:23 57:19 63:8 | 138:21 139:1,17 | associated 88:17 |
| 168:7 | 191:18 | 64:15 71:18 72:15 | 139:23 142:10,13 | 92:2 105:14 |
| amphipods 21:6,7 | apparent 83:5 | 72:17 93:17 | 142:17 144:1,6,13 | 127:20 149:5 |
| 21:9 168:1 169:7 | appear 15:4 58:14 | 105:21,24 116:14 | 144:23 145:15,18 | Associates 5:8 |
| analysis 19:11 | 58:23 59:20 60:6 | 119:10 123:13 | 145:22 146:3,4,21 | assume 24:4,9,20 |
| 45:18 67:22 72:11 | 70:13 176:22 | 124:17,24 130:12 | 147:15 155:11 | 40:8 46:22 154:4 |
| | | | | |
| l | | | | |

| Г | | | | 2 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| assumes 141:2 | avoid 120:2 | 121:13 122:3 | basically 12:2 | 183:10 185:4 |
| assuming 53:1,22 | avoid 120.2 avoidance 151:2 | 153:5,6 154:21 | 19:13 37:2 66:8 | 187:18 188:13 |
| 54:14 166:7 | aware 26:24 27:4 | 155:6 156:18 | 98:24 110:21 | 192:7 193:5 |
| 195:21 | 43:20 51:13 79:2 | 157:4,8,10 158:10 | 169:19 199:10 | believed 138:12 |
| | 108:18 118:11 | 158:24 159:9 | 202:24 | believes 30:13 |
| assumption 115:14 121:8 | 121:15 126:22 | | basin 82:3,3 83:3 | |
| | | 160:7,15 161:7,13 161:24 162:24 | 204:19 | believing 153:11 |
| assumptions 144:10 | 128:7 143:20,23 157:5,11 159:20 | 161.24 162.24 | basins 77:24 82:1 | belong 59:13 167:22 186:2 |
| | 160:11 162:7 | | | |
| assure 75:19 | 163:4 164:3 181:7 | 164:3,18 165:21 | 83:9 192:8 | benefit 73:16,23 Bensenville 80:5 |
| assures 107:20 | | 166:15 170:18 | basis 57:4 66:15 | |
| ASTM 15:18,19 | 204:24 | 171:14 172:3 | 71:20 82:14,15 | benthic 137:1 |
| 16:5,23 17:7 | azteca 58:22,24 | 173:1,7,13 187:22 | 84:9 111:23 136:1 | 176:23 |
| 60:15 | 59:1 168:7 186:8 | 191:9 194:2,5,9 | 153:11,24 154:10 | best 40:11 55:24 |
| atomic 61:8 | <u> </u> | 194:18,20 195:18 | 154:20 175:19 | 58:8 62:9 63:10 |
| attachment 15:14 | b 13:2,14 14:4,11 | 196:9,21 199:12 | 176:21 191:20 | 73:1 74:6 76:22 |
| 17:10 19:24 20:15 | 23:11 27:5 31:24 | 200:11 202:10 | 192:12,19,20 | 85:23 110:8 |
| attachments 4:19 | 32:24 51:11 53:15 | 203:18 204:5,10 | 193:15 D | 141:10 154:11,19 |
| 6:17 7:3 | 78:16 82:8 92:11 | 204:18 | Bauer 28:4 | 154:24 165:9 |
| attainable 74:4 | | Barghusen's 89:9 | bear 5:15 | 171:12 176:7 |
| attainment 14:13 | 104:7 106:10 | 119:2 | bearing 120:7 | 192:4,8 195:16 |
| attempt 21:8 75:23 | 113:11,23 116:11 | base 66:23 | beet 86:13 87:20 | better 19:8 39:19 |
| 116:15 | 120:12 124:13 | based 10:10 16:14 | 88:1 | 41:13 42:16 76:3 |
| attempting 165:2 | 126:6 127:9 129:2 | 16:16 18:22 22:15 | beginning 21:22 | 181:20 187:21 |
| attempts 21:24 | 130:2 182:6,9 | 32:1,14 33:3 | 132:19 | beyond 31:20 |
| attorney 2:3,5 3:11 | B-A-R-G-H-U-S | 36:12 37:11 38:10 | behalf 4:20,21,22 | 137:17 176:9 |
| 3:13 64:1 | 121:14 153:6 | 42:11 44:7 46:13 | 77:4 133:8 | 198:20 |
| attributed 158:1 | back 8:16 19:8 | 48:4 50:3 55:21 | belief 12:13 191:21 | bias 41:16 51:3 |
| 197:12 | 24:15 25:10 26:10 | 55:24 56:5 58:7 | believe 29:13 31:6 | 104:9 181:23 |
| audience 3:13 | 40:9 62:21,21 | 60:7,15 61:8,21 | 31:21 32:19 34:17 | biased 51:1 |
| authorities 85:20 | 63:16 65:14 90:13 | 62:7 63:1,6,9 64:7 | 39:20 41:18 44:16 | Biastoch 196:16 |
| 88:10 | 90:21 91:6 104:4 | 65:20 66:18 69:21 | 45:13 49:22 50:6 | Big 189:22 |
| Authority 78:7,18 | 111:6 128:4 131:4 | 70:14 71:24 72:17 | 50:24 57:10 66:7 | bigger 134:13 |
| authors 197:9 | 131:17 174:8 | 75:24 76:10 85:16 | 74:3,11 75:17 | Bioassay 22:6 |
| automatic 43:3 | 178:13 187:17 | 86:5 88:23 93:15 | 76:2,12 83:2 91:1 | 38:13,16 39:2 |
| available 27:19 | 193:7 | 97:4 100:7 101:15 | 94:2 103:22 | 55:23 61:2,18 |
| 32:4 53:20 58:1 | background 8:13 | 103:10 105:16 | 104:16 105:13 | 64:21 |
| 89:7 113:18 | 39:16 154:5 168:8 | 106:15 109:3 | 109:23 110:20 | biological 142:23 |
| 117:14,15 122:17 | 169:4,12,15,20 | 111:1 112:21 | 117:18 120:7 | 143:4 |
| 123:12,20 130:4 | 192:21 | 116:23 126:1,12 | 121:19 129:7 | biology 129:13 |
| 138:14 140:6 | backtrack 194:9 | 129:6,23 130:9 | 130:6 138:17 | biota 150:19 |
| 205:23,24 | backwash 164:9 | 137:7 155:1 | 147:7 149:9,19,24 | bit 167:10 169:2 |
| average 13:5,5 | bad 154:11 192:23 | 164:23 168:16 | 150:8 153:19 | Bivalvia 167:23 |
| 16:15,16 49:16,18 | bank 152:4 | 175:9,14 176:15 | 165:9 167:16 | blow 104:4 |
| 50:1 178:16 | Barghusen 2:11 | 176:24 195:14 | 175:13 177:12 | bluegill 59:11 |
| 189:23 | 4:21 7:9 121:13 | baseline 113:12 | 178:22 181:2 | BMP 79:11 80:10 |
| | | | | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| 154:22 | bridges 85:6 | calculates 106:14 | causes 50:20 | chemicals 87:10 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| BMP's 12:18,20 | brief 7:15 | calculation 66:3 | CCC 66:5,17,21 | chemistry 45:6 |
| 80:13,23 81:1,8,9 | briefer 17:12 | 69:4,17 71:13 | 71:13 116:23 | 156:15 202:21 |
| 81:19 82:10 83:7 | briefly 25:11 | 72:1,3 177:20 | 119:8 | Chicago 1:8 4:8 6:5 |
| 83:11 84:20 142:3 | brine 164:8 | 178:5 | Center 27:24 28:2 | 11:19 47:7,12,15 |
| 153:11,24 154:16 | brings 22:20 | calculations 35:19 | 155:23 201:7 | 50:15 70:2 82:4 |
| 176:9 192:14,17 | broad 31:18 82:9 | 64:17 70:23 | central 9:21 98:18 | 87:5,14 108:8,11 |
| Board 1:1,7 2:2,3,4 | 111:12 120:10 | 117:19 | 99:15,23 134:23 | 108:13 115:6 |
| 2:6,6 3:6,7,11,21 | 123:2 | calibration 86:4 | 143:21 186:10 | 118:3 120:21 |
| 3:24 4:2,18 5:5,5 | broader 111:12 | call 8:4 91:14 | ceriodaphnia 17:1 | 207:22 |
| 5:16 6:8,14 7:22 | brooding 128:20 | called 1:7 132:23 | 22:19 55:22 56:4 | chloride 3:5,20 |
| 8:2 9:6 10:7 11:2 | brought 19:7 | 152:7 186:2,8 | 61:17 62:8,14,17 | 9:11 10:12 12:14 |
| 11:13 26:14,15 | Brown 2:14 76:24 | 188:5 194:6 | 63:2 84:3,12 | 13:15 16:14 19:6 |
| 35:22 39:8 44:3 | 77:3,3,16 78:3 | Canal 47:7,12,16 | 119:21 125:14 | 19:7,17,19 20:3 |
| 51:10,19 52:13 | 108:14,16,16,22 | 70:3 108:9,13 | certain 51:17 96:1 | 24:1,13,17,18 |
| 63:17,24 65:17 | 109:10 180:15,18 | 120:21 | 112:21 196:13 | 26:21 27:2,3,8,21 |
| 73:6 78:11 92:15 | 180:18,23 181:4,8 | canceled 205:12,21 | certainly 57:11 | 28:3,6,13,17,21 |
| 97:12 98:2,9 | budget 126:20 | Candice 28:4 | 77:21 87:1 93:8 | 28:23 29:2 30:7 |
| 108:20 109:14,15 | budgetary 92:7 | cap 79:14 | 104:10 123:13 | 30:21 31:9,18 |
| 109:24 111:4 | 97:17 | capture 18:8 49:19 | 149:12 | 32:10 33:3,14,17 |
| 114:2 125:9 141:2 | built 151:19 | carbohydrate | certainty 176:11 | 33:20,24 35:4,6 |
| 174:19 175:7,8 | Bullet 189:2,11 | 86:18 | Certified 207:5 | 35:11,13 36:2,12 |
| 176:16 177:9,14 | bunch 174:6 | carbohydrates | certify 207:6 | 36:13 37:20 38:4 |
| 196:3 | Burlington 59:2 | 86:13 87:4,9 | cetera 82:19 | 43:20 44:6,12,17 |
| Board's 3:9,17,19 | 169:8 186:4 | carbonate 23:8 | Chairman 2:2 | 45:8 46:9 47:5 |
| 5:10,18 6:18 | businesses 178:22 | care 97:22 | 63:23 64:1 109:14 | 50:12 51:8,13 |
| 10:24 14:19 45:3 | | Carrie 2:2 3:7 | 191:11 | 52:5,9 53:19 |
| 97:16 98:4 | C | carry 134:8 138:19 | chamber 21:23 | 54:10 55:12 56:14 |
| bond 93:11 | c 2:1 27:14 52:4 | Carter 2:6 63:24 | change 66:3 86:12 | 57:21 61:3,4,5,9 |
| bottom 66:9 | 54:7 64:13 66:20 | case 10:11 17:6 | 98:5 117:19 | 68:1,7 74:10 |
| bounce 86:2,11 | 79:8 84:15 97:1 | 18:6 20:2,17 | 141:24 145:12 | 76:22 78:2,5 |
| boy 186:19 | 104:19 114:9,15 | 25:22 26:5 30:18 | 148:15 168:11 | 79:17 80:23 82:11 |
| branch 12:15,15 | 125:8 128:1 130:8 | 51:12 60:20 76:13 | 169:15,17 184:9 | 83:20,24 84:1,2,5 |
| 83:6 142:24 186:2 | 130:14 184:7 | 88:19 93:18 125:6 | changed 34:12,14 | 84:6,7,8,16,20,23 |
| 186:7 | 185:23 | 172:11,15 | 88:9 | 84:24 85:2,5,7 |
| braving 206:5 | CaCO3/L 200:6 | cases 17:1,16 42:23 | changes 14:18,22 | 89:15 92:3,12 |
| break 63:16,18 | calcium 23:8 35:12 | 43:7 57:8 134:13 | 150:17 | 93:24 94:24 97:2 |
| 90:17 93:10 122:6 | 84:15,16,23 85:6 | 146:18 170:10,11 | changing 49:2 | 99:14 100:17 |
| 122:12 131:4,18 | calculate 58:3 | 195:21 | 93:17 190:12 | 101:4,8,24 103:1 |
| 173:18,21 187:6 | 72:20 118:18 | category 23:9 | characteristics | 104:18 105:16 |
| 187:13 205:6,10 | 130:15 | cats 168:1 | 31:8 43:19 | 106:1,24 107:2,4 |
| Brenda 2:6 63:24 | calculated 20:21 | caught 148:4 | charge 43:14,14 | 107:8,9,10,12,14 |
| Brian 2:13 132:10 | 21:2 38:20 55:17 | cause 1:6 102:17 | Charles 27:6,9 | 108:4,6,19 110:5 |
| Brickey 1:7 207:5 | 58:6 72:12 123:17 | 104:5 135:10 | check 122:5 173:17 | 110:13,19 112:1,6 |
| 207:20 | 197:8 | caused 92:24 | 205:17 | 112:9,24 113:6 |
| | | - | | , |
| | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | raye ZIZ |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 114.22 115.2 5 | 106.22 107.0 21 | 71.10 72.2 2 6 9 | 122.21 | 27.24 45.1 46.22 |
| 114:22 115:3,5 | 196:23 197:9,21 | 71:19 72:2,3,6,8 | 133:21 | 37:24 45:1 46:23 |
| 116:3 118:7,9 | 197:23 198:1,14 | 72:13,19,21 73:15 | Class 140:15,17 | 49:17 52:20 53:8 |
| 119:18,24 120:9 | 198:16,19 199:17 | 73:18 75:4,8,23 | classified 50:16 | 57:9,22,24 85:1,8 |
| 122:16,23,24 | 199:17 202:2,3,16 | 92:3 94:13 106:23 | clause 71:20 | 96:12 97:8 99:10 |
| 123:19 124:4 | 202:23 203:22 | 106:24 107:4,10 | Clean 35:21 | 100:1 104:9 |
| 125:20 126:3,4 | chlorides 1:5 9:9 | 107:13 116:14 | clear 5:17 42:4 | 115:13,17 123:24 |
| 127:3,15,16,18 | 10:9 31:5,11 44:6 | 123:19,21 124:2,4 | 72:14 93:14 96:14 | 124:11 138:4,7,18 |
| 128:14 129:3,8,16 | 51:21 57:23 72:9 | 124:6,7,10,14,15 | clearly 7:21 28:7 | 164:21 165:3,6,12 |
| 130:22 134:8 | 74:1 76:14 85:6,9 | 124:22,23 125:3 | 45:15 49:16 51:7 | 193:12 204:3 |
| 136:18,21 137:21 | 89:22 96:11 | 125:15 126:7,11 | 57:23 89:20 | Coles 185:21 |
| 138:1,3,9,13,24 | 101:10 102:13 | 126:14 129:19 | 143:18 179:16 | collaboration |
| 139:2,15,22 140:8 | 104:6 112:2,15,20 | 130:3,5,7,9 | clerk's 205:24 | 81:20 |
| 140:11,13,22 | 112:23 113:2 | 139:20 148:3,9 | clients 98:15 | collect 181:20 |
| 141:13,15,24 | 114:3 117:3 | 156:7,9 158:19 | climate 52:6 | collected 43:11 |
| 142:6 143:1,16 | 118:15 119:9 | 166:22 167:2 | clogging 69:13 | 45:24 107:20 |
| 144:5,9,13,22 | 127:24 137:5 | 169:13 182:7,11 | close 24:2 | 142:23 182:1,2 |
| 145:23 146:4,10 | 140:12,23 141:4,6 | 184:1,5,8,9 195:3 | closely 14:6,12 | 185:20 186:1 |
| 146:14,18 147:1 | 141:18 143:22 | 202:2 | closer 9:15 116:7 | 197:24 |
| 147:19,19 148:13 | 144:2 145:7 | Cindy 4:22 188:4 | 141:11 | Columbia 201:7 |
| , | 144.2 143.7 146:24 147:4,5,8 | citations 33:19 | closest 41:5 | |
| 148:14 149:4,5,23 | | | | column 22:7,9 32:2 |
| 150:12,13,20 | 147:13,18 148:13 | cite 15:4 56:12 | Club 4:23 5:4 8:1 | combination |
| 153:14,21 154:19 | 148:15 154:4,5 | 57:14 63:3 136:14 | Club's 173:18 | 169:24 |
| 155:11,14,21 | 155:19 157:19 | 137:12,13 140:15 | CMC 66:5,17,21 | combine 102:13 |
| 156:10,16,16,22 | 163:11,15,16,17 | 198:23 | 116:22 119:7 | 103:14 |
| 156:22 157:1,16 | 164:6,10,12,21 | cited 46:7 89:2 | coal 101:4,6 155:9 | combined 102:8 |
| 157:22 158:6,18 | 176:3 177:4 180:2 | 196:15 | 189:16,18 190:2 | 103:24 |
| 159:6,11,12 160:3 | 180:11 181:17 | cites 198:14 | 190:13 | come 52:1 63:16 |
| 160:8 161:15,22 | 185:6 189:7,9,10 | CITGO 47:8 | Code 13:1,13 34:2 | 90:13 92:8 |
| 162:1,5,16 163:6 | 192:11 193:5 | cities 50:20 | 43:21 106:17 | comfortable 111:9 |
| 164:1,8,11 165:2 | 195:1,19 196:20 | City 11:19 87:5,14 | 140:16 | 168:2 172:23 |
| 165:5,13,17 | 196:20,20 198:3 | 87:17,21 | codes 48:8 | coming 8:9 14:1 |
| 166:18,22 167:3 | 198:11 204:16,19 | Cl-/L 199:5 200:7 | coincide 101:1 | 134:11 |
| 168:6,8 169:1,4 | Choe 2:6 3:14 | 200:14,17,20,22 | cold 9:8 21:10 28:6 | commencing 1:9 |
| 169:11,15,20,24 | chose 17:16 120:2 | 200:24 201:5,9,10 | 28:12 30:3 85:10 | comment 3:22 5:20 |
| 170:1,3,5,6,8,10 | 171:7,21 | 201:12,14,21 | 100:6,24 113:13 | 6:3,7,10 12:5 |
| 170:13 171:3 | chosen 121:9 | clam 19:17 59:19 | 113:22 114:10,16 | 28:22 30:20 32:1 |
| 172:6 173:3,8,8 | 170:24,24 171:20 | 61:20 128:16,18 | 119:19 120:14,18 | 36:3 37:16 38:9 |
| 174:20,21 176:12 | chronic 13:1,13 | 159:7,16 166:21 | 125:3,15 126:7,18 | 38:23 39:3 52:22 |
| 179:12,18,23 | 14:5,11 15:20 | 168:3 170:22 | 127:11 128:3 | 53:17 54:8 56:7 |
| 180:1,6 182:7 | 16:5,15,19 17:3,8 | clams 16:6 166:18 | 129:3 130:17 | 57:1 64:18 66:2 |
| 183:8,16 184:2,5 | 17:9,16,18,21 | 167:2,20,22 | 158:13,22 165:9 | 66:17 67:5 68:3,8 |
| 184:10 189:12,23 | 19:3,15,18 20:10 | 170:23 | 171:10 | 68:15 69:1,15 |
| · · · · · · | | | | - |
| 190:21 191:21 | 21:6,19 23:5 | clarification 24:24 | cold-blooded 126:2 | 70:15 71:10,22 |
| 192:21 193:16 | 32:11 36:14 53:19 | clarify 21:12 88:8 | 127:6 | 81:5 82:8 83:19 |
| 195:8 196:4,5,17 | 66:4 71:4,5,11,17 | 88:24 110:10,17 | colder 10:9 29:2,15 | 89:9 120:23 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | raye 215 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 135:21 136:1,6,14 | comparable 84:8 | 124:7 138:16 | conclusions 5:19 | 181:15 190:24 |
| 136:23 137:6,12 | 143:19 | computer 86:5 | 82:10 | considerably 85:7 |
| 130.23 137.0,12 | | - | condition 195:9 | 92:17 |
| | comparatively 203:22 | computerized 40:6 | | 92.17 consideration |
| 140:20 142:14 | | computing 105:20 | conditions 16:1 | |
| 144:7,15,21 | compare 124:7 | 105:22 121:18 | 52:6 56:10,22 | 115:7 126:17 |
| 145:21 146:6 | 203:6 204:8 | concentration | 82:18,19,21 | 140:1 |
| 147:3,11 202:11 | compared 18:4 | 16:15,17 19:8 | 104:11 134:1,16 | considerations |
| commenting 91:16 | 85:16 86:23 | 20:3 22:12,13,17 | 144:11 185:6 | 92:7 |
| comments 5:6 6:9 | 100:14 115:22 | 23:17,18,23 24:17 | conduct 17:17 | considered 48:18 |
| 7:1 35:20 40:3 | 116:8 127:8 | 25:16 30:24 38:6 | 27:16 47:23 52:23 | 50:4 59:2 62:2 |
| 73:23 91:12 95:15 | 149:15 162:9 | 38:11,17 40:2 | 98:7 171:18,21 | 86:20 94:8 104:18 |
| 127:22 129:12 | 163:3 168:5 | 54:12 56:17 62:17 | conductance | 127:14 177:8,14 |
| 132:5 133:8,19,23 | 182:13 | 69:19 112:3 168:9 | 197:20,23 198:2 | 180:4 189:13 |
| 135:21 142:20 | comparing 19:13 | 169:4,20 199:23 | conducted 15:16,21 | 204:21 |
| Commerce 4:1 | 166:13 | concentrations | 17:21 18:15 31:17 | considering 85:20 |
| commercial 12:1 | comparison 203:7 | 22:20 23:24 24:1 | 40:21 53:5 57:7 | 89:1 134:15 180:9 |
| 41:20 | compiled 31:16 | 24:3,5,20 25:24 | 73:22 86:21 89:16 | 198:8 201:15 |
| Commission | 183:15 | 40:24 50:12 51:16 | 122:21,23 125:21 | consisted 196:24 |
| 133:10 135:23 | complete 5:18 11:9 | 52:11 68:2,8 | 126:15 130:18 | consistency 65:3 |
| committed 176:7,9 | 25:5 53:5,7 129:5 | 116:23 124:4 | 158:8 160:4 166:5 | 203:4 |
| common 52:12 | 129:10 158:12,20 | 139:3 140:8,13 | 171:3 | consistent 12:12 |
| 86:15 | 207:9 | 142:6 153:14 | conducting 52:20 | 13:9,14 57:12 |
| commonly 186:5 | completed 9:7 | 154:20 159:6 | 103:11 172:10 | 64:22 112:5 |
| communicated | 10:10 68:22 | 164:10 169:5,11 | conductivity 68:6 | consistently 13:7 |
| 118:6 | 158:16 159:1 | 170:13 179:14,23 | 181:20 | 22:8 |
| | | - | | |
| communication | 165:8,12 | 180:1 183:22 | conference 6:18 | consortium 99:1 |
| 177:1 | completely 81:2 | 184:3,4 196:17 | 205:14,20 | constant 164:17 |
| communities 42:24 | completes 89:24 | 198:22 201:15 | confidence 20:4,7 | constructed 79:5 |
| 43:1,2 73:17 | completing 128:9 | concept 134:5 | confirm 23:1,18 | contact 27:12 |
| 78:13,17,20 79:1 | completion 183:12 | 136:18 | 61:7 130:12 | contacting 27:6 |
| 79:9,14,18,24 | complex 53:14 | concepts 133:21 | confirmed 46:2 | contain 45:4 164:6 |
| 80:3,8,15,22 81:1 | complexity 55:5 | 134:4 | confused 25:14 | 189:22 |
| 81:13,18 98:19,22 | compliance 41:1 | concern 3:19 12:10 | 32:20 | contained 117:12 |
| 148:20 176:23 | 106:11 107:19 | 49:23 89:9 146:15 | confusion 92:16 | 117:13 |
| 179:13,15 | 153:18 | 162:22 190:18 | Connecticut 85:13 | contains 31:10 |
| community 12:7,11 | comply 190:11 | concerning 38:3 | consensus 88:10 | 99:13 164:9 |
| 79:21 81:4,11 | component 31:1 | 91:8 98:7 118:7 | 93:14 | contaminant |
| 82:13,23 127:24 | 54:13 76:7 164:13 | concerns 49:5 | conservative 58:6 | 202:17 |
| 143:4 154:9,13 | 190:2,5 | 140:7 142:8 | 62:19 121:5 | contaminate |
| 177:3,6 179:24 | composite 42:19 | 145:13,15 146:22 | 130:13 138:11,16 | 203:11 |
| 183:3,7 198:7 | compounds 147:7 | 148:18 | 182:12,13 | contaminates |
| community-based | 147:10 | concludes 36:16 | consider 36:19 | 203:13 |
| 137:23 | compute 116:22 | conclusion 74:8 | 84:21 93:24 95:16 | contamination |
| community-types | 130:4,4 162:2 | 76:5 176:21 | 96:7 100:12 101:3 | 198:16 |
| 150:18 | computed 55:20 | 195:14 196:7 | 159:1 179:11 | contemplate 64:16 |
| | | | | pince 0 1.10 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

| | | | | _ |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| contemporary | 205:24 | county 11:20 88:14 | 112:21 115:15 | 46:11 48:3,9 51:6 |
| 137:23 | cooler 122:24 123:1 | 164:5 185:21 | 121:1 141:13 | 51:14 52:5 56:12 |
| contend 181:18 | 126:5 127:18 | 189:18 207:3,14 | 145:13 147:20,22 | 56:13 57:12,24 |
| contention 122:22 | 129:4,9 | couple 56:11 | 148:2,10 154:18 | 58:1 62:1,21 65:2 |
| context 139:10 | copied 37:2 | 131:23 186:21 | 165:2,10 176:15 | 65:8 66:12 67:10 |
| continual 179:4 | copies 26:15 180:24 | court 7:19,21 | 191:21 195:4 | 68:11 69:2,4,16 |
| continuation | copious 82:24 | 121:22 132:6,19 | 196:11 | 70:20 72:13 83:3 |
| 205:21 | copy 36:2 52:12 | 187:20,23 194:2 | currently 27:1 | 87:2 93:18 96:20 |
| continue 4:12 7:8 | 188:15,18,21 | cover 29:21 48:13 | 33:16 39:21 51:20 | 103:6,7,14,15 |
| 17:4 28:12 69:11 | correct 29:23 61:23 | 104:14 105:7 | 74:7 75:4 77:17 | 104:8 106:15 |
| 74:13 76:18 77:23 | 70:3,20 75:2,3,5 | covered 191:17 | 80:2,7 81:24 83:8 | 109:4 111:2 |
| 96:24 111:7,18 | 83:11 102:9,14,15 | covers 29:22 | 84:20 111:3 115:3 | 112:19 113:18 |
| 141:6 183:11 | 102:24 113:9 | Cox 200:7 | 141:7,21 154:3,13 | 115:13 116:22 |
| 186:24 | 127:19 152:13 | creating 32:1 | 181:17 186:17 | 117:4,14 120:7,20 |
| continues 123:12 | 170:16 175:10 | creation 38:9 | 195:8 | 120:24 121:2,5 |
| 154:17 | 179:6 184:11 | creatures 196:13 | cut 154:9 192:15 | 122:16,19,21,23 |
| continuos 51:5 | 193:1 195:15 | credibility 199:20 | 201:20 | 123:3,3,6,8,16,19 |
| continuous 181:20 | 199:9 207:9 | Creek 5:7 12:14,16 | cyanide 44:6 | 124:10,15,22 |
| contribute 96:4 | corrected 59:17 | 51:3,6 73:21 | cycle 129:10 | 125:3 126:13 |
| 140:11 203:14 | 60:3 70:24 188:9 | 81:13,18 82:3,6 | cycles 129:5 | 128:15,17,23,24 |
| contributed 202:22 | correcting 60:9 | 83:3,6 98:11,13 | Cynthia 2:3 3:7,11 | 129:7,13,17 130:4 |
| contributes 86:14 | correction 188:11 | 142:22 154:15 | 3:12 | 130:7,20 137:17 |
| contributing 154:7 | corrections 59:7 | 177:2 179:20 | cytochrome 185:23 | 138:14,15,18 |
| 180:11 | correctly 31:3 | 189:17 192:4 | | 142:23 143:16 |
| contribution 28:14 | correlated 177:2 | 200:7 | D | 154:17 156:10 |
| 77:23 102:21 | correlation 46:23 | criteria 16:14,16 | D 60:4 79:23 105:2 | 157:12 158:17 |
| contributions | 173:2,5 | 26:21 27:2,3 30:7 | 114:21 182:20 | 160:24 166:12 |
| 97:17 140:22 | correspond 15:7 | 36:2,13 43:18 | D-I-E-R-S 42:1 | 172:11,21 180:10 |
| control 1:1,7 22:1 | Corridor 79:2 | 112:22 113:4,20 | daily 75:18 | 180:12 181:21 |
| 97:12,16 98:4,9 | corrosion 85:4 | 114:5,7 117:7,9 | Dale 80:4 | 183:15,19 192:9 |
| 176:16 196:3 | Corsi 52:8 | 125:10 134:3 | Daniel 2:14 3:12 | 193:12 197:24 |
| 199:4,11 | cost 42:12,21 43:7 | 137:15 167:7,13 | daphnia 55:20 | 199:14 |
| controlled 19:8 | 43:8 53:3,12 | 182:7 | 61:16 62:7 63:1 | database 48:9 |
| 135:17,17 190:7 | 54:19 120:4 | criterion 13:15 | 182:17 | 114:10,16 121:16 |
| controlling 100:21 | 121:11 | 16:21 45:5 69:18 | daphnids 17:2 | databases 36:6 |
| 101:14 | cost-prohibitive | critical 147:7 | 60:21 | 37:4 117:15 |
| controls 200:10 | 176:12 | 161:22 179:17 | data 12:14 18:10 | dataset 22:15 |
| convenient 118:18 | costs 41:11,20 | crustaceans 137:1 | 18:20 19:18,22,23 | 104:20 113:5,11 |
| conversion 61:8,11 | 42:22 52:23 53:18 | CSR 1:7 207:20,23 | 20:10,13,14,18 | 113:14,15,15,21 |
| convert 197:22 | 54:8 | CSSC 47:11,17 | 21:6,12,16,18 | 114:11,17 115:20 |
| converted 61:4 | cough 29:11 | culture 186:14,15 | 29:5 31:4 35:15 35:16,17 36:9,20 | 117:11,13,16,18 |
| 68:7 198:3 | counsel 133:6 | current 32:10 | 37:6,13 38:3 | 120:13 122:17 |
| Cook 51:4 207:3,14 | counties 11:21,24 | 43:20 49:9 73:20 | 39:15,24 40:6,17 | 123:13 125:14 |
| cool 127:5 130:20 | 51:4 82:5 185:22 | 74:1,3 76:6 92:17 | 44:16 45:13,24 | 138:10 |
| 130:21,23 131:1 | 186:1 | 101:13 111:13 | | date 9:6 |
| | | l | | |

| | | | | ruge 210 |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Dave 15:9 | declining 192:11 | deposition 128:10 | 37:3 45:7,14,20 | 129:2,14 130:2,14 |
| David 2:10 4:20 8:9 | decrease 71:14 | 128:11 | 46:12,21 65:20 | 131:2,24 132:2,7 |
| 15:10 83:22 | decreased 170:7 | derivation 43:18 | 162:5 165:10 | 133:13 |
| 124:20 132:22 | decreases 144:14 | 47:4 71:16 113:22 | 182:10 191:1 | difference 13:4,8 |
| 184:23 185:16 | dedicated 5:22 | 116:13 118:23 | 193:6 | 62:14,16 63:11 |
| day 1:8 3:24 6:15 | 140:18 | 119:7 123:21 | developed 16:7 | 100:12 130:23 |
| 14:2 21:9 87:19 | default 31:22 67:5 | 124:15,22 | 39:5 46:19,23 | 158:2 169:18 |
| 134:12 189:19 | defined 92:20 | derivative 21:8 | 78:23 81:7 100:19 | 202:20 |
| 207:14 | 139:11 | derive 18:24 45:20 | 101:1 125:16 | differences 105:3 |
| days 17:18,23 18:4 | defines 154:22 | 53:18 54:9 92:1 | 129:17 135:22 | 134:21 162:23 |
| 18:5,11,17,17,22 | definition 137:16 | 124:6 144:4,9 | 136:1 156:6 | different 16:20 |
| 19:7 29:22 30:5 | 184:21 | 164:22 | developing 28:23 | 36:6 47:8,11 |
| 41:17 112:1,3 | definitive 20:24 | derived 15:8 19:14 | 105:24 123:11 | 56:10 60:13 64:15 |
| 134:12,14 185:7 | degrade 176:2 | 112:23 124:16,23 | 129:19 138:1 | 71:24 72:22 81:10 |
| 205:15 | degree 57:21 | | 129.19 138.1 | 95:17 117:9 156:5 |
| DCEO 4:3 | 172:16 | deriving 45:4 57:4 | development 17:24 | 167:22,23 168:15 |
| | | 71:19 113:12 | 1 | <i>´</i> |
| de-icing 12:3 48:24 50:10 77:24 81:8 | degrees 199:8 | 137:7 Dog 92:3 109:12 | 18:3 54:19 128:12 | 168:15 169:9,9,11 |
| | 201:8 204:4,6 | Des 82:3 108:12 | 146:9 158:17,19 | 171:15 172:17,18 |
| 87:9 88:9,17 92:6 | deionized 24:15 | describe 41:7 46:8 | dialogue 77:14 | 179:4 201:6 202:4 |
| 92:19 103:20 | delayed 18:1 19:5 | 49:12 55:16 60:12 | Dickson 17:20 | differently 172:18 |
| 105:8 110:22 | delaying 33:9 | 62:10 65:21 99:22 | die 22:16 201:16 | differing 147:4 |
| 112:8,16 127:21 | delineating 145:18 | 169:2 204:13,15 | died 20:18 | differs 12:24 147:6 |
| 134:18 135:2,14 | demonstrate 51:16 | described 19:2 | Diers 2:12 9:14 | difficult 74:14 |
| 141:23 148:12 | 89:10 161:15 | 38:10 54:21 71:18 | 10:16 25:21 41:23 | 77:11,21 120:3 |
| 149:7 151:4 154:6 | demonstrated | 92:4 186:7 | 41:24 42:9 90:5 | 168:17 171:11 |
| 176:5 183:16 | 123:2 161:21 | description 78:14 | 90:14,23,23 91:10 | diffuse 130:21 |
| 185:9 189:4,6 | 163:7 179:17 | Design 150:23 | 91:18 92:11 96:24 | digits 61:12 71:9 |
| de-icings 189:10 | denied 37:1,8 | designations | 97:1,9,14,18,22 | dilution 56:23 |
| dead 184:14 199:24 | denoted 19:20 | 120:11 | 98:6,17,21 99:4 | 106:22 156:14 |
| deadline 4:17 6:12 | Department 4:1 | desirable 113:17 | 99:12,22 100:11 | 168:9 169:12 |
| 6:12,23 | 5:3 11:18 12:21 | despite 12:20 | 100:23 103:3 | directed 4:14 86:1 |
| deadlines 7:5 | 85:14 88:14 133:7 | | 104:7,19 105:2,9 | 164:20 |
| deals 138:20 174:9 | 133:9,20 | detail 15:3 23:21 | 105:18 106:5,10 | direction 45:15 |
| death 25:23 26:6 | departments 11:20 | 36:4 65:22 176:20 | 106:20 107:6,16 | 207:12 |
| decade 12:19 81:15 | departure 13:12 | detailed 15:17,22 | 108:1,15 111:17 | directly 27:24 |
| 154:17 192:5 | dependent 33:24 | 16:3 | 111:19 112:17 | 155:22 |
| decapods 168:1 | 43:18 45:5,21 | determine 39:15 | 113:11,19 114:9 | director 81:12 |
| December 48:20 | 46:14 116:2 183:3 | 106:11 111:6 | 114:15,21 115:18 | disadvantage 203:9 |
| 49:15 95:4 103:7 | depending 16:24 | 138:3 172:10 | 116:11 117:1,21 | 203:12 |
| 103:14 104:24 | 61:11 62:15 81:10 | 181:16 | 118:1,11,20 119:4 | discharge 42:20 |
| 105:11 | 85:3 109:5 182:1 | determined 41:2 | 120:12 122:15 | 50:12 75:16 101:7 |
| decided 125:2 | depends 81:3 94:20 | 60:19 79:11 | 123:7,18 124:13 | 112:5,6,10,15 |
| 170:20 205:11 | 131:11,14 | determining | 125:7,23 126:6,16 | 180:5 189:19,21 |
| decision 5:18 120:6 | deposeth 132:24 | 107:19 164:15 | 126:21,24 127:9 | 190:9 |
| declines 104:3 | 188:6 194:7 | develop 5:17 36:5 | 128:1,6,11,14 | discharged 148:16 |
| | | - | | - |
| | | | | |

| r | | | | ر |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| discharger 75:13 | documents 6:22 | 12:16,16 51:4,5 | 26:2,8 29:2 31:19 | 23:11 37:5 40:12 |
| 75:18 176:1 | 26:16 34:18 51:24 | 73:21 81:13,18 | 44:23 56:17 57:8 | 54:23 57:18 59:23 |
| dischargers 42:11 | 130:12 176:20 | 82:6 83:2,6 98:10 | 62:16 69:2,7,16 | 63:7 77:7 179:10 |
| 42:17 50:9,11 | 177:22 185:2,3 | 142:21 143:1 | 69:21 93:24 | elaboration 78:9 |
| 102:17 176:7,10 | doing 27:2 43:6 | 154:15 177:1 | 102:14 120:10 | elected 72:10 |
| 179:2 | 61:11 65:11 67:18 | 179:20 192:3 | 123:17 130:21 | electrical 68:6 |
| discharges 101:24 | 70:22 87:21 99:5 | duplicative 191:19 | 144:1 157:19 | electronically 36:1 |
| 135:17 150:21 | 116:9 143:5 | duration 13:20 | 168:10 171:24 | 51:9 62:4 |
| 176:17 179:3,4 | 158:22 174:4 | 16:2 17:18 18:16 | 172:21 179:24 | elements 147:8 |
| 189:14,15,22 | 192:17 | 60:16,18 72:6 | 205:13 | elevated 19:7 68:1 |
| discharging 81:7 | dollars 28:9 | 111:22 143:12 | effective 33:23 | 72:9 94:24 112:1 |
| discuss 13:11 | dominated 100:22 | 183:21,23 | 34:14 82:20 85:3 | 120:4 127:23 |
| discussed 198:10 | dose 139:5 | durations 17:9 19:4 | 85:3 161:19 | 179:11,14 180:6 |
| 205:10 | downstate 101:5 | 60:13 112:8 | effectively 199:24 | 185:7 198:21 |
| discusses 52:15 | downtown 206:6 | | 201:16 | Eleven 100:11 |
| discussion 36:8 | Dr 7:9 27:22 28:3 | E | effectiveness 82:10 | Elgin-O'Hare 79:1 |
| 114:4 165:19 | 111:23 147:16 | E 2:1,1 4:19 27:6 | 86:12,22 | eliminate 49:5,22 |
| 174:13,15,15 | 153:8 155:16 | 80:9 105:9 | effects 9:8 19:3,5 | 162:22 |
| 178:10 198:10,19 | 158:11 166:16 | E2455-06 15:19 | 25:16 31:12 72:8 | Elphick 126:13 |
| discussions 175:5 | 187:19 189:1 | E729 60:16 | 100:17 118:9 | emergence 17:22 |
| dismissing 129:20 | 191:6 | E729-96 15:18 | 120:9 124:2,5 | 18:14 |
| distantly 167:19 | draft 14:21 | earlier 38:15,19 | 127:7 130:9 | emphasis 31:18 |
| distinct 169:7 | drafted 99:12 | 46:4 62:9 117:23 | 139:21 160:2 | emptied 135:16 |
| 186:3 | dragon 167:24 | 125:9 133:23 | 161:20 167:3 | encouraged 181:19 |
| distributions 138:1 | drainage 151:3 | 149:3 | 184:2,6 | encouragement |
| diversity 196:16,22 | 183:20 192:8 | early 17:3 121:17 | efficiencies 79:20 | 83:11 |
| divide 17:9 | draw 82:9 | 145:15 146:1,3 | efficient 11:1 86:1 | Endangered |
| dividing 64:23 | drive 119:6 | 198:21 | 88:19 192:18 | 139:12 |
| 65:12 66:22 | driveways 175:22 | easier 187:2 | effluent 32:21 | ended 124:5 |
| DNR 27:14 28:19 | drop 67:17 109:6 | easily 29:5 181:24 | 42:12,13,20 | endpoint 18:11 |
| 31:15 36:15 146:6 | 110:3 111:10 | east 12:14 79:6 | effort 57:20 | endpoints 18:8,13 |
| DNR's 136:6 | 184:13 | 83:6 | efforts 11:10 28:10 | 35:17 139:16,16 |
| 137:20 140:20 | dropping 13:18 | EC50 158:2 161:3 | 78:9 82:2 86:10 | England 22:6 |
| 142:14 | 82:18 143:11 | 161:4 199:4,5 | 153:19 | 38:13,16 39:1 |
| document 6:16,19 | drops 78:2 | 200:6,14,22,24 | egg 128:9 | 55:23 61:2,18 |
| 12:13 19:3,12 | dry 18:11 | 201:5,9,10,12,13 | eggs 145:24,24 | 64:21 |
| 31:10 47:3 51:7 | dubia 17:2 62:8 | EC50's 199:22 | eight 111:20 125:5 | ensure 60:18 |
| 58:12 61:4 66:6 | 63:2 84:3,12,16 | economic 3:24 4:1 | 125:5 202:8,9,10 | 138:23 139:21 |
| 66:18 68:22 71:4 | 184:8 | 4:9 73:4,8,11 74:9 | Eighty-seven 16:10 | enter 94:16 188:22 |
| 83:4 111:21 114:6 | due 70:11 86:11 | 77:8 | 16:11 | 195:19 |
| 117:7,10 124:9 | 120:4 121:10 | economy 74:10 | either 84:24 85:2 | entered 5:12 7:12 |
| 125:11 143:17 | 141:23 181:17 | 190:22 191:4 | 141:11 149:14 | 78:13 188:23 |
| 175:2,10,14 | duly 132:23 188:5 | Edgar 185:21 | 201:22 | entering 94:1 95:6 |
| 180:13 183:19 | 194:6 | editor 70:12 | either/or 101:23 | entire 48:9,10 |
| 184:16 192:10 | DuPage 5:6 12:15 | effect 20:6 22:17 | elaborate 19:18 | entirely 79:5 |
| | l | | | l |

| | | | | Taye 217 |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| entities 11:9,15 | equals 125:14 | 37:7,10 51:23 | 104:5,15 105:7,14 | expanded 117:18 |
| 12:6 81:6 111:13 | equation 39:5 | 52:3 58:17,19 | 133:24 134:21 | 150:24 |
| entitled 1:6 3:4 | 44:13 45:8,9,14 | 74:16,18,23 75:3 | 135:1 143:8,9,10 | expanding 137:16 |
| 52:9 70:1 | 46:13 54:18 66:20 | 75:6,21 76:4,16 | 143:13,15,15 | expansion 88:16 |
| entity 110:11,12,17 | 66:24 67:7 70:17 | 76:19 93:20,23 | 145:3,5 149:4,13 | expect 41:17 101:6 |
| 156:6 | 70:19 92:2,3 | 94:7,14,19 95:1 | 153:17 154:7,11 | 101:9 112:9,14 |
| ENVIRON 27:15 | equation-based | 96:14,22 131:11 | 162:16,18 178:24 | 127:20 141:15 |
| environment | 45:21 46:13 54:9 | 131:14 135:7,15 | 183:17 | 146:20 148:15 |
| 203:11 | equations 70:16 | 135:19 147:24 | evidence 127:2,10 | 153:15 190:8 |
| environmental 5:1 | - | 148:5 149:18 | evolve 123:12 | 205:15 |
| | 106:5,11 | | | |
| 27:24 28:2 35:21 | equipment 78:19 | 150:2,7,13 166:6 | exactly 202:14 | expected 101:2 |
| 77:4 98:14 108:17 | errors 178:3 | 168:20,24 169:22 | examined 67:24 | 104:5 127:16 |
| 155:23 180:19 | especially 57:3 | 170:8,17 173:20 | example 17:6 18:2 | 162:19 |
| 201:7 | essentially 24:18,19 | 173:24 174:2,11 | 51:2 56:19 84:3 | expensive 53:14 |
| EPA 13:15 15:4,8 | 86:9 | 174:22 175:4,12 | 95:7 126:18 | 85:7 |
| 15:23 16:5,14,19 | establish 43:12 | 175:17 176:14,19 | 135:15 189:17 | experience 141:18 |
| 16:23 17:19 23:9 | 44:21 96:11 | 177:7,12,18,24 | 199:21 | 172:4 175:16 |
| 26:21 27:1,1,7,15 | established 38:1 | 178:4,14 179:7 | examples 56:12 | experienced 56:15 |
| 27:23 28:22 30:6 | 44:5 57:15 63:4 | 180:4,14 181:13 | exceed 50:22 75:12 | experiencing 154:3 |
| 30:10,13 31:15 | 79:14,19 84:10 | 182:5,13,20 | 144:16 | 192:14 |
| 32:13,16,22 34:16 | 115:16 121:7 | 183:14,24 184:7 | exceedance 111:22 | experimental 16:1 |
| 34:18 37:9,10 | 161:12 165:7 | 184:12,20 185:5 | 142:9 | experiments 144:4 |
| 39:23 47:6,9 | establishing 39:21 | 185:10,13 186:12 | exceedances 51:8 | 144:8 171:11 |
| 52:19,19 54:1,3 | estimate 53:3,11,24 | 186:18 187:3,18 | 142:12,16,18 | expert 190:13 |
| 57:15 58:9 63:4 | 142:15 147:12 | 188:8,16 195:13 | exceeded 75:19 | explain 13:3 14:3 |
| 70:14 77:13 90:24 | 167:15 | Ettinger's 95:15 | 144:18 178:16 | 14:10 16:18 18:19 |
| 91:5,7,11,21 92:4 | estimated 60:20 | evaluate 33:1 86:22 | exceeding 75:16 | 22:11 24:9 47:10 |
| 97:10,19,20 98:1 | 197:23 | 139:20 142:17 | excellent 44:20 | 48:18 134:2 |
| 103:5 113:16 | estimates 54:6 | 146:7 147:14 | exception 17:1 | 183:24 195:10 |
| 114:6 117:18 | 147:14 | 183:11 | 113:6 | explained 89:19 |
| 118:4,6,12 155:8 | estimating 52:23 | evaluated 44:24 | excess 153:14 154:4 | explains 15:3 |
| 155:15 162:1 | 53:18 54:8 | 46:16,18 57:13 | excuse 25:1 51:23 | explanation 21:3 |
| 165:16 175:2,10 | estimation 22:14 | 88:18 105:12 | 74:16 84:16 | 72:21 |
| 175:13 185:1 | 22:21 | evaluating 18:7 | 108:24 168:20 | exploring 27:7 |
| 190:18 | et 16:4 17:5 52:8 | 0 | | 1 0 |
| | 82:19 84:6,7,14 | evaluation 139:15 140:21 144:22 | exhibit 6:20 exhibited 57:21 | exponential 64:24 65:5 66:22 |
| EPA's 144:17 | , , | | | |
| EPA's 13:14 | 156:21 161:14 | 151:2 | 136:21 137:21 | exposed 60:22,23 |
| episodic 92:20,21 | 171:4 185:24 | event 8:23 13:21 | exhibits 138:3 | 72:8 139:7 |
| 100:4,19 102:11 | 198:15 199:15 | 99:21 134:10,11 | exist 115:13 151:16 | exposure 60:17 |
| 103:21 105:7 | 200:1,2 201:2 | 135:10 | existed 195:10 | 112:1 124:3 184:1 |
| 133:24 134:9,11 | Ettinger 2:10 25:1 | events 13:18,18,22 | existing 65:3 83:8 | 184:3 198:20 |
| 135:1,10 145:3 | 25:8,13 26:1,6,12 | 49:2,2 51:2 83:1 | 112:13 141:20 | 203:13 |
| 149:4,13 179:3 | 29:19,20 30:2,9 | 92:20,21 100:4,13 | 176:6,10 | exposures 156:23 |
| 181:23 183:17 | 30:15 34:9,11,15 | 100:20 101:8 | exists 92:23 111:2 | express 190:18 |
| equal 6:9 49:4,22 | 34:20 36:17,22 | 102:11 103:21 | 122:20 | extant 136:24 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 2 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| extended 19:4 | fat 156:20 160:13 | find 77:21 88:6 | focused 27:20 30:3 | forwarded 51:9 |
| 72:10 124:2 130:8 | 161:22 163:7 | 130:9 158:9 | 44:8 78:23 87:14 | found 84:4,11,15 |
| 184:1 | 165:23 200:4,12 | 176:11,12 | 148:11 161:19 | 95:18 163:5 166:9 |
| extensive 78:11 | 201:3 | finding 166:20 | focuses 189:4 | 168:8 169:14 |
| 179:22 | fathead 125:12 | 179:19 | fold 56:21 | 173:2 176:9 177:4 |
| extent 12:11 29:6 | FAV 119:7,15 | findings 171:16 | folks 10:1 90:7 | 184:6 196:16,21 |
| 31:23 47:19 | FCV 130:15,16 | Findlay 198:24 | 133:12 | 199:5 |
| 140:10 145:19 | feasibility 73:4,7 | fine 65:24 122:14 | follow 40:8 97:15 | four 18:22 46:9,16 |
| 180:10 | 73:11 77:7 | 173:22 192:17 | 98:4 108:14 135:8 | 46:18 53:1 54:15 |
| extreme 82:18,21 | feasible 74:12 | 194:14 | 149:2 181:11 | 55:6 56:3 57:6,12 |
| 83:1 134:12 | 77:17 | fingernail 16:6 | follow-up 8:3 29:19 | 66:9 68:16 69:8 |
| 143:14 | February 94:16 | 19:17 59:19 61:20 | 91:7,12,16 93:20 | 69:16 71:23 119:6 |
| | 96:17 103:15 | 128:16 159:7,16 | 95:14 101:17 | 119:8,11,17,21 |
| F | 104:24 | 166:18,21 167:2 | 109:12 151:7 | 129:22 138:6,8 |
| F 80:16 | federal 28:9 152:3 | 167:20,22 168:3 | 168:21 180:15,17 | 140:3 146:16,18 |
| facility 79:5 176:4 | feeding 16:3 | 170:22,23 | followed 7:9 47:5 | 157:20 159:13,23 |
| fact 28:21 95:3 | feel 111:9 | finish 131:7 | 112:2 | 166:3 176:19 |
| 152:20 179:11 | felt 174:18 | finished 168:21 | following 50:23 | 177:21 196:15 |
| 184:13 199:19 | fens 150:23 151:1,3 | finishing 158:21 | 63:19 90:18 | four-day 16:16 |
| 202:1 | fertilizer 149:6,20 | first 3:23 4:4,11 | 131:19 144:10 | 73:15 |
| factor 44:10 55:21 | 150:9 | 7:22 16:8 64:23 | 156:20 187:14 | fourfold 161:3 |
| 55:24 56:18 95:16 | fewer 61:12 99:21 | 65:12 86:6 123:24 | 205:7 | fourth 120:1 142:8 |
| 164:15 179:17 | fields 149:12 | 131:24 132:23 | follows 7:10 132:24 | Fox 2:5 3:10 9:19 |
| factored 28:13 | 189:15 | 136:7,17 153:9 | 188:6 194:7 200:3 | Frankly 95:19 |
| 29:14 | Fifteen 106:20 | 166:16 187:19 | footnote 61:19 62:6 | free 188:12 |
| factors 29:7 202:21 | Fifth 143:24 | 188:5 194:6 206:7 | 62:24 | freezing 13:19 |
| failed 72:5 124:1 | figure 175:6 187:6 | fish 126:18 127:17 | forecasting 81:22 | 82:18 134:17 |
| failures 22:2 | figures 162:9 166:8 | 127:20 137:1 | 155:4 | 143:11 |
| fair 87:2 131:16 | file 4:14 | 145:24 | foregoing 207:8 | frequency 135:3 |
| fairly 78:11 134:10 | filed 3:16 5:11 6:21 | five 5:24 56:15 90:6 | forever 193:20 | 142:15 |
| fall 23:13 40:14 | 6:23 7:11 98:8 | 90:13 136:5 182:7 | form 25:4 44:13 | fresh 17:7 84:4 |
| 149:14 153:20 | 205:16 | 188:13 | 92:22 159:4 | 160:9 |
| familiar 151:20 | filing 6:14 26:17 | flashier 183:23 | 165:16 | freshwater 128:21 |
| 171:13 173:2,10 | 65:17 97:11,17 | flat 169:19 186:2,7 | formally 175:6,7 | front 6:4 108:20 |
| 173:11 | 98:1,5,23 205:24 | flea 159:15 | format 38:15 40:6 | full 78:14 137:21 |
| familiarity 99:2 | filings 7:1,4 | flies 167:24 | 66:24 70:12 | 156:7 |
| families 125:5 | final 19:23 20:14 | FMAVs 121:16 | 116:16 135:23 | full-life 18:13 |
| family 168:18,19 | 21:1,17 66:4,4 | focus 9:7,10,10 | formation 86:4 | fully 38:1 |
| far 12:19 89:15 | 69:18 71:11,17,19 | 10:7,12 29:1 | 93:1,11 | fund 156:4 183:7 |
| 102:8 153:20 | 72:1,3 92:2,3 | 31:12 57:20 79:3 | formed 111:23 | funded 27:17,22 |
| 192:19 205:18 | 123:17 165:16 | 79:15 82:12 99:10 | forms 147:4,18 | 28:2 81:2 98:15 |
| Fasciolaris 158:4,5 | finalized 181:3 | 100:4 104:11 | 148:15 | 155:10,14,21 |
| fashion 68:14 | finally 156:11 | 114:1 118:8,14 | formula 178:1 | 157:1 |
| 116:5 | financial 81:3 | 123:23 138:5 | forward 33:8 92:15 | funding 27:19 |
| faster 96:5 | 183:2,6 | 158:8 | 124:11 173:23 | 78:18 79:8,14 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 2 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 80:22 81:3 121:11 | generated 20:7 | 57:16,17 58:13,22 | 155:3 159:18 | guideline 58:10 |
| 155:9 157:3 | 44:17 56:16,20 | 58:23 59:12 60:1 | 160:10 173:23,24 | guidelines 15:16 |
| funds 27:23 155:22 | 57:24 124:10 | 60:7 63:5 69:5 | 174:8,19 175:8 | 17:5 70:15 71:21 |
| 156:3,4,6,13 | 138:15 140:5 | 115:22 117:12 | 178:2,4 183:13 | gun 23:15 |
| 171:19 172:1 | generations 186:21 | 119:13 | 184:12,13 192:14 | guys 64:9 90:3 |
| Funk 44:18 46:6,15 | genes 185:23 | GMAV's 56:3 | 194:9 195:13 | 131:24 |
| 46:20 56:22 59:9 | genetic 168:6 | 61:15 64:13 72:1 | 203:10 205:12 | |
| 64:22 65:8 67:24 | genetically 169:6 | GMAVs 113:7 | good 3:1 13:23,24 | H |
| 68:5,12,17,21 | 186:3 | 115:18,23 116:3 | 15:1 33:7 71:20 | habitats 148:20 |
| 69:3 97:5 | genuine 12:9 | 116:12,16 121:16 | 181:22 187:8 | half 100:13,14 |
| further 10:18 63:7 | genus 55:12 72:2 | GMCV 125:12,13 | 191:14,15 202:10 | 141:13 201:16,20 |
| 78:8 97:2,7 100:2 | 112:24 119:12 | 125:14 | governed 5:9 | Hall 87:17 |
| 140:21 152:16,24 | 159:13 | GMCVs 124:16,23 | government 195:22 | hand 8:4 25:7 |
| 168:4 176:1 205:2 | geology 95:22 | 130:15 | grab 43:4 182:1 | 203:12 |
| furthermore 18:9 | geometric 55:18,19 | go 17:13 25:10 | 197:1 | handed 188:10 |
| 56:18 172:17 | gill 128:19,22 | 29:17 34:10,23 | Grand 158:3 | happen 141:5 |
| future 45:16 | Gillis 89:16 157:12 | 64:5,10 65:14 | grant 155:24 156:2 | 172:24 |
| 104:17 174:16 | 157:23 159:21 | 74:18 75:15 87:13 | grant 155.24 150.2 156:12 | happy 92:9 |
| | 160:16 161:1 | | | hard 8:17 12:17 |
| 175:21 191:22 | | 90:3,21 91:2 | great 8:10 27:24 | 23:9,13 171:21 |
| G | 166:10 199:2,7,10 | 101:19 111:6 | 28:1 132:16 133:2 | 184:18,21 185:3 |
| g 14:19 80:21 | 199:15,24 200:1 | 124:13 125:9 | 155:22 156:3,12 | 200:5,13,16,19,21 |
| g/L 61:3,4 | 201:2 202:7,11 | 131:21 135:20 | 187:9 202:20 | 200:24 201:4,8,9 |
| gained 53:8 | Gillis's 160:3 | 136:4 146:11,12 | greater 22:9,12 | 200.24 201.4,8,9 |
| Gallatin 185:22 | give 7:15 135:24 | 151:9 152:15 | 50:15 56:21 161:5 | harder 164:4 |
| gallons 189:19 | 188:18 | 153:3 173:24 | 195:2,11 198:17 | 186:15 202:15,18 |
| 0 | given 6:9 28:18 | 174:8 175:17 | green 59:11 | hardness 22:24 |
| gas 190:3 gauge 41:5 | 50:2 74:1 83:7 | 178:8,12 186:21 | groundwater 78:1 | 23:1,4,7,12 24:3 |
| 8 8 | 126:17 139:1 | 187:7,16,19,22 | 94:1,11,16,23 | |
| genera 46:9 56:4 | 171:19 184:13 | 193:7 205:5 | 95:10,15 96:1,16 | 24:13,17,19 29:5 |
| 57:2 59:3,13 63:6 | gives 71:5 199:19 | goal 79:19 | 140:9,13,15,16,17 | 30:23 31:4 33:11 |
| 63:6 68:5,16 69:3 | giving 203:21 | goes 55:5 75:11 | 142:7 180:5,9,11 | 34:1 35:8 36:6 |
| 69:17 120:17 | glochidia 89:6,12 | 134:10 | 189:20 198:11,13 | 37:4,24 38:5,11 |
| general 1:4 3:4,19 | 89:13,22 120:3,4 | going 9:15,20,23 | 198:16,20 | 38:16,17 39:11,16 |
| 11:17 43:20 47:1 | 120:5 122:1 | 25:9 30:17 36:18 | groundwaters | 39:20,24 40:2,13 |
| 47:14 51:15 66:1 | 128:21 156:20 | 36:19 37:3,5 | 140:24 | 40:15,16,19,23 |
| 76:8 83:23 93:23 | 157:13,23 160:8 | 49:20 62:11 69:8 | Group 77:5 108:17 | 41:8,21 42:13 |
| 108:5,11 113:20 | 161:9,23 165:23 | 70:8,9,17 72:22 | 180:19 | 43:13 44:9,24 |
| 147:22 148:10 | 166:1,10 199:3,18 | 73:13 77:11 90:24 | groups 98:13 | 45:10,18,22 46:1 |
| 163:14 172:13 | 199:23,24 200:7 | 91:2,18 94:23 | grow 21:10 | 46:14,21 53:13 |
| 183:20 185:9,11 | 200:15 201:3,5,6 | 95:11 99:19 | growth 52:11 | 54:12,16 55:5 |
| generalizations | 201:24 202:3 | 110:23 114:2 | 175:21 176:10 | 56:23 64:7,14,24 |
| 172:20 | 203:20 | 117:22 118:20 | guess 95:1 118:17 | 65:2 66:22 67:6 |
| generally 15:16,21 | glochidial 121:11 | 124:13 125:7 | 174:2,15 175:4 | 67:11 68:10 89:20 |
| 111:22 150:22 | Glodcidia 53:13 | 135:20 136:4 | guessing 172:23 | 114:22,23 115:4,7 |
| generate 182:4 | GMAV 55:14,16 | 141:5,5 151:16,24 | guidance 92:4 | 115:12,16,20 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| r | | | | ر |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|
| 116:2,7,9,12,23 | 188:7,14,20 191:7 | hour 1:9 18:22 | 90:10,11 91:9,13 | 177:23 178:7,18 |
| 121:6 158:1 160:4 | 191:12,18 192:1 | hour-and-a-half | 92:5,14 94:2,10 | 179:6,16 180:8,22 |
| 161:4,5,21 165:4 | 194:1,8,15,17,22 | 63:15 | 94:18,20 95:9,19 | 181:2,6,11,19 |
| 165:11 171:23 | 205:1,4,9,11,12 | hours 6:22 52:1 | 96:4,9,19 97:4,13 | 182:10,15 183:2 |
| 172:2,6,14,22 | 205:13 206:4,7 | 60:23,24 61:5 | 97:15,21 98:3,10 | 183:18 184:4,11 |
| 173:7,9 193:11 | 207:7,10 | Huff 2:9 3:15,15,22 | 98:20,24 99:9,16 | 184:19,23 185:8 |
| 199:6 200:14 | hearings 4:7,9 7:2 | 4:19 5:1,1 6:15,15 | 100:1,16 101:6 | 185:12,16 188:15 |
| 201:19 | 14:24 25:3 118:4 | 7:1,1,7 8:8 9:3,5 | 102:3,10,15 103:1 | 188:21,23 189:1 |
| hardnesses 201:6 | 205:20 | 10:3,3,4,6 11:11 | 103:19 104:10,23 | 190:1,6,15 191:5 |
| heading 73:4 | held 1:6 6:18 | 11:17 12:9 13:8 | 105:5,12 106:4,7 | 191:14,15,23 |
| health 127:24 | help 5:17 58:15 | 13:16,23,24 14:8 | 106:19 107:5,15 | 192:2,3 193:3,5 |
| healthy 177:6 | Hi 108:16 | 14:15,17,23 15:13 | 107:24 108:10,21 | 193:22 194:22,24 |
| hear 9:12 10:15 | Hickory 82:2 98:13 | 15:13 18:23 22:14 | 109:2,18,21,23 | 196:1,14 199:1 |
| 25:19,21 29:11 | high 82:19 83:7 | 24:6 25:18,22 | 110:14,20 111:15 | 200:9 202:9 |
| 121:22 133:15 | 96:1 121:11 134:8 | 26:3,10,17,17,19 | 112:7 113:10,14 | 203:16,24 204:7 |
| 187:20 | 164:9 192:6 | 27:4,9,13,21 29:1 | 113:24 114:13,19 | 204:12,20 205:2 |
| heard 91:5 174:12 | high-degree 81:15 | 29:13,24 30:6,12 | 115:2 116:4,17 | 205:16 |
| hearing 1:6 3:1,3 | higher 39:10 40:21 | 30:16 31:2,17 | 118:8,14,24 | Huff's 3:22 7:7 |
| 4:4,6,12,13,15,16 | 50:12 66:10 73:15 | 32:5,16 33:7 34:7 | 121:21 122:10 | hundred 143:9 |
| 5:9,12,21 6:5,10 | 89:18 101:11 | 36:21 37:19 38:14 | 123:10,23 126:19 | hundreds 137:2 |
| 6:18,20,22,24 7:4 | 115:16 116:20 | 39:7,18 40:5,16 | 127:5,13 129:22 | hyalella 17:18 |
| 7:6 8:14,19 9:2,6 | 127:8,15 138:15 | 41:3,12 42:2,15 | 131:9 132:22 | 18:18 58:16,17,18 |
| 9:20 10:4,7,14,17 | 158:6 161:3,4 | 44:1,15 45:12,23 | 134:5,17,24 | 58:21,22,24 59:1 |
| 10:20,23 11:14 | 166:9 167:3 170:6 | 46:15 47:15 48:1 | 135:12,18 138:2 | 59:3 61:16 168:7 |
| 12:4 14:16 25:6 | 183:23 184:2,4 | 48:1,7,15,21 | 139:18 140:3 | 169:16 185:14,20 |
| 25:12 26:13 29:18 | 197:10 199:7 | 49:11,16 50:6,18 | 141:1 142:19 | 186:8,8 |
| 34:10 42:4 63:14 | highest 22:16 | 51:18 52:2,8,16 | 143:22 145:1 | |
| 63:21 64:9 65:18 | 201:19 | 53:1,22 54:14 | 146:11 147:16 | |
| 65:19 69:10 73:3 | highlighted 32:18 | 55:1,19 57:6,20 | 148:3,8 149:9,22 | I-290 79:6 |
| 74:17,21 76:17 | highway 11:20 | 59:4,16 60:15 | 150:5,11,21 | I-294 79:7 |
| 77:1 87:12 88:3 | 78:6,18 88:8,15 | 61:10,24 62:12 | 151:14,18,22 | I-90 79:6 |
| 90:2,9,12,15,20 | 92:19 105:8 189:4 | 63:9 65:6,14,23 | 152:1,5,8,12,22 | ice 79:20 86:4 |
| 93:22 95:13 96:23 | highway/pavement | 66:7 67:2,9,16 | 153:8,10,19 154:2 | 93:11 176:6 |
| 101:19 109:11,19 | 189:6 | 68:11,20 69:6,11 | 154:23 155:16 | idea 151:14 |
| 109:22 111:17 | highways 93:3 | 69:14,20 70:4,7 | 157:2,7,9,18 | ideally 17:3 |
| 122:4,11 131:3,10 | hills 104:3 | 70:19 71:7,12 | 158:5 159:24 | identical 18:16 56:23 |
| 131:13,16,21 | hiring 27:15 | 72:5 73:1,13 75:2 | 160:1,14,20,21 | identified 114:11 |
| 132:3,16 133:1,11 | historical 95:5 | 75:5,10 76:2,12 | 161:10,18 162:4 | |
| 133:16 136:8,11 | history 15:2,10 | 77:6,10,19 78:5 | 162:13 163:8,13 | 114:17 176:3 |
| 136:15 148:23 | 38:12 39:1 61:17 | 78:10,22 79:13 | 163:16,21,24 | identify 8:5 31:14 48:5 181:10 |
| 151:9 153:2 167:9 | 64:21 96:17 146:8 | 80:2,12,19,24 | 164:7,20 165:22 | IDNR 5:4,8 7:24 |
| 170:14 173:16,22 | 185:20 | 81:9 82:12 83:22 | 166:1,11 174:10 | 135:22 |
| 178:8,12 179:1 | hog 135:16 | 84:23 85:18,23 | 174:18 175:1,11 | IDNR's 133:4 |
| 180:16 181:9 | hold 115:17 146:21 | 86:24 87:13,17 | 175:15,24 176:18 | 139:14 140:18 |
| 187:4,11,16 188:1 | holds 121:9 | 88:5,12 89:3,13 | 176:24 177:10,16 | 137.17 170.10 |
| | I | | | I |

| | | | | rage 221 |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| IEPA 5:2 7:24 40:5 | 152:18,19 157:13 | 29:6 104:16 | 123:8,15 124:14 | inflate 115:22 |
| 90:3,21 | 160:13 162:11,12 | 157:22 165:5 | 124:21 | influence 156:14 |
| IEPA's 122:8 | 163:2,3,11,12,20 | 176:22 177:5 | incorrectly 70:23 | 168:5,12 169:4 |
| ii 14:4,11 | 163:21 180:19 | 201:14 | increase 66:14 | 171:23 172:6 |
| III 13:1,13 43:21 | 185:7,15,22 186:2 | impossible 175:23 | 71:14 101:9 112:9 | information 5:13 |
| 106:17 140:16 | 186:11 189:7,11 | 176:11 | 141:3,15,18 | 34:22 39:8 40:2 |
| Illinois 1:1,7,8,8 | 189:13 190:22 | in-stream 42:13 | 170:10 | 42:6 48:4 53:20 |
| 5:1,3 11:18,19,21 | 191:2,4 195:7 | inadvertently | increased 78:20 | 78:12 89:5 124:12 |
| 11:22 12:3 15:2 | 196:2 207:1,14,22 | 14:18 | 112:11 140:8,11 | inhabit 150:19 |
| 15:10 28:8,10,20 | Illinois's 79:24 | include 7:2 14:18 | 144:2 176:17 | INHS 15:3,7 19:16 |
| 30:21 31:5 32:16 | 139:1 144:5 | 37:5 42:12 150:3 | increases 87:5 | 20:10 21:5,7 23:2 |
| 33:6 34:2 37:18 | 145:18 | 156:19 | 161:4 | 23:3,19,20 28:1 |
| 37:21 38:12 39:1 | illustrate 168:4 | included 6:20 | increasing 52:10 | 38:15,18,20 40:14 |
| 39:14,23 40:15 | immediately 182:3 | 11:10 19:24 20:15 | 79:19 81:23 82:1 | 56:6 61:23 62:1 |
| 41:8 45:15 47:20 | impact 3:24 37:23 | 20:24 21:18,20 | 140:14,23 172:13 | 68:19 69:4 |
| 48:1,2,13,19,23 | 74:9 88:16 96:7 | 30:22 31:22 35:11 | 197:12 | initial 26:16 106:22 |
| 49:14,14 50:5,17 | 99:7 142:13 144:5 | 44:19 51:6 54:1,4 | incremental 42:21 | 117:4 158:22 |
| 50:20 51:15 52:7 | 145:15 146:23 | 59:20 80:13 119:1 | 43:7 | initially 11:12 28:5 |
| 52:15,18 54:1 | 147:15 149:6 | 121:17 122:1 | incubate 128:18,21 | 117:13 |
| 61:17 64:20 67:6 | 151:1,5 152:10,21 | 125:11 181:5 | incurring 144:24 | Initiative 156:4,13 |
| 67:11 70:6 73:17 | 178:23 190:22 | 198:5 | independent 95:22 | initiatives 80:10 |
| 74:9 75:4 77:4,20 | 191:3 | includes 30:4 38:5 | 101:8,16 102:21 | input 31:4 |
| 78:6,17 85:19,24 | impacted 11:16 | 48:9 54:11,20 | 102:22 103:23 | insects 137:2 |
| 88:13 90:24 91:11 | 96:2 149:7 151:4 | including 19:23 | 109:3,24 184:10 | instance 151:21 |
| 91:21 95:18,23 | 179:13 199:4 | 20:14 21:17 32:2 | independently | insufficient 20:5 |
| 96:18 97:11,16 | impacting 73:17 | 35:12 36:8 39:3 | 102:7 | 142:10 183:6 |
| 98:1,9,18,23 | impacts 4:10 99:14 | 68:8 81:20 88:18 | Indiana 33:17,22 | intend 107:1,11,22 |
| 99:11,15,24 100:2 | 102:8 140:8,18 | 104:7 137:16 | 33:23 34:2,12,18 | intended 5:17 13:9 |
| 101:2 103:5,5 | 148:19 | 139:17 156:16 | indicate 15:6 103:4 | 70:13,18 92:21 |
| 105:4,4,10 108:17 | impaired 50:19,24 | 189:14 | 199:16 | 93:5 104:14 105:7 |
| 110:23 115:3 | 51:8,21 175:20 | inclusion 62:2 | indicated 14:17 | 145:2 |
| 116:8,24 128:7 | 176:2,3 178:24 | 103:17 104:13 | 18:10 37:23 38:15 | intense 13:17 143:8 |
| 133:7,9,10,19 | 181:17 | 113:7 | 91:15 166:20 | 178:20 192:16 |
| 134:23,23 135:22 | impairment 50:20 | incorporate 18:14 | indicates 189:3 | intensity 142:16 |
| 136:19,22,23 | implement 72:14 | 48:22 68:13 | indicators 184:9 | intent 13:16 48:21 |
| 137:22 138:13,21 | 110:7 | 113:17 116:2 | individual 21:23 | 49:18 50:8 70:7 |
| 139:12,22 140:1,9 | implementation | 137:20 | 59:12 99:20 | 103:19 104:11 |
| 140:12,14,19,24 | 12:17 81:14 142:2 | incorporated 37:20 | 104:21 | 108:10 112:7 |
| 141:14 142:6,10 | implemented 74:7 | 68:23 114:24 | individuals 139:7 | 116:1,6,20 134:2 |
| 142:16,17 143:21 | 81:1,8,10,19 | 138:9 | industrial 42:19 | 143:6 178:18 |
| 143:21 144:1,12 | 85:24 192:8 | incorporates 45:10 | 189:15 | intention 108:1,3,5 |
| 144:16,22,24 | implementing | incorporating 59:8 | industries 101:9,14 | interested 4:14 |
| 145:22 146:1 | 80:23 154:16 | 72:17 115:11 | industry 11:24 | 168:24 172:9 |
| 147:2,15 149:20 | 176:7 192:4 | 146:8 | 112:5,9,11 195:22 | interim 193:14 |
| 150:22,22 151:12 | important 28:14 | incorporation 29:8 | infiltration 189:20 | interrupting 148:6 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Idge 222 |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| introduce 55:4 | 59:9 64:22 65:8 | 25:2,6,12 26:13 | 53:8 76:11 81:17 | larvae 60:21 |
| 132:4,8 | 67:23 68:4,12,17 | 29:18 34:10 63:14 | 156:19,24 157:2 | 128:21 145:24 |
| Introducing 171:9 | 68:20 69:3 97:5 | 63:21 64:9 69:10 | Koch 2:13 117:24 | larval 18:3 |
| invariant 101:3 | 185:21 | 73:3 74:17,21 | 125:22 126:23 | late 52:12 |
| 128:2 | James 2:9 4:19 | 76:17 77:1 87:12 | 128:10 132:10,10 | Laura 2:11 4:21 |
| invertebrate 72:18 | 132:22 | 88:3 90:2,9,12,15 | 120.10 152.10,10 | 88:22 119:2 |
| 72:19 125:16 | January 1:1,8 4:5 | 90:20 93:22 95:13 | L | 121:13 153:5 |
| 126:7 127:13 | 4:15,17 62:4 95:5 | 96:23 101:19 | lab 24:15 27:7 43:8 | 191:8 194:5 196:7 |
| 129:7,17,20,24 | 95:7 96:17 103:14 | 109:11,19,22 | 43:14 127:15 | LC 169:17 |
| 130:1 | 104:24 | 111:17 122:4,11 | 169:8 185:19 | LC50 22:8,12,14,20 |
| invertebrates 126:3 | Jim 188:19 | 131:3,10,13,16,21 | 186:5 | 25:17 38:24 56:20 |
| 127:10 128:7 | job 192:17 | 132:3,16 133:1,11 | labor 43:13 | 60:12 61:5,6 68:7 |
| 129:4,9 137:3 | joined 63:23 | 133:16 136:8,11 | laboratories 56:10 | 89:17 168:10,11 |
| involved 183:12 | judgment 56:1 58:9 | 136:15 148:23 | 56:15 | 168:12 169:17,20 |
| involving 175:21 | 62:10 63:10 | 151:9 153:2 167:9 | laboratory 16:7 | LC50's 20:5 |
| 176:16 | juice 86:13 87:20 | 170:14 173:16,22 | 17:19 18:10 41:20 | LD50 139:4,5,16,20 |
| ion 156:15 171:24 | 88:1 | 178:8,12 179:1 | 42:22 47:23 89:18 | lead 116:13 |
| 172:12 | jumped 23:14 | 180:16 181:9 | 137:8 144:8 | leader 154:16 |
| Iowa 27:14,22 | 127:1 | 187:4,11,16 188:1 | 155:18 171:3 | leading 11:4 |
| 28:16,18,20,21 | June 3:21 94:4,12 | 188:7,10,14,20 | 186:16 | leads 198:21 |
| 29:3,14 30:11,13 | 197:17,24 | 191:7,12 192:1 | labs 120:5 | leave 8:23 |
| 31:15 33:14,17 | justification 129:18 | 194:1,8,15,17,22 | lack 89:10 | leaving 119:13 |
| 35:7 36:2 37:2,11 | 142:11 | 205:1,4,9 | Lackey 44:7 | left 3:8 64:4 |
| 45:9 66:24 113:6 | Justified 71:19 | Klocek 2:9 4:20 8:9 | lacking 35:15,17 | legal 133:6 195:14 |
| 113:12,16,22 | justify 103:16 | 9:24 10:17,18 | lagoon 135:17 | 196:7 |
| 114:11,17,21 | juvenile 122:2 | 33:23 34:8,13,17 | lagoons 135:16 | lenient 195:1 |
| 115:19 117:17 | 161:9 | 34:23 35:3 37:1,9 | Lake 82:4 | lesser 29:6 |
| 118:4,12,16,23 | juveniles 22:3 | 37:14 46:7 59:6 | Lakes 27:24 28:1 | let's 62:19 75:14 |
| 119:22 120:13 | 161:23 | 60:2,9 71:8 | 155:22 156:3,12 | 180:14 187:5,5 |
| 125:11 129:16 | | 117:11 119:20 | lamp 157:14 | 202:6 |
| 138:6,9,12 140:6 | <u> </u> | 120:19 121:19,24 | 160:12 200:18,20 | lethal 139:5,8,15 |
| 155:21 158:18 | К-О-С-Н 132:11 | 122:19 124:18 | lampsilis 84:3 | letter 4:2 91:16 |
| 160:22 166:3 | Kali 185:19 | 125:24 126:10 | 120:14 121:10 | level 20:6 60:19 |
| Iowa's 30:22 118:7 | Katie 2:4 63:23 | 128:4,13,16 129:6 | 122:1 156:23 | 78:24 81:2 153:21 |
| Iowa's 28:24 54:10 | keep 82:24 115:8 | 130:6,19 132:22 | 159:15 | 197:23 |
| issue 28:7 94:3 | 130:24 173:24 | 153:8 158:4 178:2 | lands 140:18 | levels 24:3 65:1 |
| 182:21 189:11 | Kelly 198:24 | 178:6 | landscape 28:19 | 134:8 143:1 159:5 |
| 198:9 205:13 | kill 139:6 | Klocek's 33:13 | language 12:22,23 | 167:15 172:2 |
| issued 35:9 | kills 127:20 | 44:19 119:2 | 12:24 13:6,12 | 179:12 184:10 |
| issues 30:21 85:4 | kind 87:7 135:13 | know 25:2 27:16 | 14:22 16:21 49:9 | 196:23 197:9,21 |
| 105:16 198:6 | 174:3 175:3 | 30:16 34:14,15 | 106:21 107:7,17 | 198:1,8,14 |
| | Klein 1:7 2:2 3:1,3 | 42:1 52:4 80:16 | large 31:23 109:7 | lies 84:15,17 |
| | 8:14,19 9:2,20 | 84:19 122:5,9 | 128:23 130:23 | lieu 102:1 124:16 |
| Jackson 44:18 46:6 | 10:4,14,17,20,23 | 204:10 | larger 178:22 | 124:24 |
| 46:15,20 56:22 | 11:14 12:4 14:16 | knowledge 45:2 | 183:20 192:13 | life 17:3 22:4 36:13 |
| | | | | |

| 1 | | | | 2 |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 47:24 83:21 84:1 | listed 35:9 51:21 | look 9:8 62:12 | 198:4 | 181:12 |
| 92:13 121:17 | 159:14 181:17 | 65:14 72:23 83:2 | macroinvertebra | materially 117:19 |
| 129:5 136:19,22 | listing 48:7 112:24 | 99:14 112:8 | 196:23 197:14,19 | materials 15:18 |
| 136:23 137:4,22 | 138:12 166:3 | 124:11 134:20 | magnesium 35:12 | 165:23 |
| 138:21 139:1,17 | literature 31:11,13 | 160:2 174:20 | 84:1,13,18,24 | mathematical |
| 139:23 142:10,13 | 35:18 115:24 | 192:9 196:19 | 85:5,6 147:19 | 46:12,18 70:12 |
| 142:18 144:1,6,13 | 119:1 123:12 | 199:14 | 172:19 | 177:20 |
| 144:23 145:15,17 | 160:16,17 | looked 57:6 100:17 | maintain 196:5 | mathematically |
| 145:18,21,22 | little 25:13 65:22 | 106:2 134:24 | maintaining 79:21 | 60:20 72:23 |
| 146:4,8 147:15 | 167:10 169:2 | 169:3,10 | 177:6 | mathematics 70:21 |
| 156:7 161:16 | 189:3 | looking 22:24 | Maitland 200:15 | mating 128:9 |
| 163:10 191:2 | Liu 2:4 3:9 13:23 | 28:17 92:6 96:7 | major 156:15 | matter 1:3 169:19 |
| 198:7 | 14:1 17:13 31:7 | 160:5 170:15 | 171:24 172:12 | 170:3 |
| lifecycles 128:8 | 31:24 35:1 38:2 | 201:2 | 185:19,24 189:10 | maximum 69:18 |
| lifted 190:3 | 38:22 43:17 44:11 | loses 186:22 | majority 31:14 | 75:18 83:5 196:20 |
| likelihood 139:9 | 45:3,17 46:3,24 | losses 86:11 | 49:1 138:14 | mayflies 16:6 44:20 |
| liken 193:13 | 49:8 58:11,18,21 | lot 8:13 77:11 87:1 | making 32:22 | 46:10,17 67:21 |
| limit 20:4 75:18 | 59:10,19 60:4,11 | 87:7 105:8 154:23 | 115:14 137:14 | 68:17 97:5 123:5 |
| 76:10 152:13 | 61:1,14 62:6,23 | 171:9 186:15 | 172:20 206:6 | 167:24 |
| 170:20 | 64:6,12 65:10,16 | 203:4 | manage 176:5 | mayfly 17:22 18:6 |
| limitations 70:11 | 66:1,16 67:4,17 | lots 12:1 82:24 93:4 | management 74:6 | 18:11 20:10,22 |
| limited 121:11 | 71:3,10,16 72:16 | 135:13 173:12 | 76:22 85:24 110:8 | 56:19 84:9,12 |
| 137:8,17 145:10 | 88:22 89:8 148:22 | 175:22 | 141:10 154:12,24 | 123:15 156:8 |
| 167:8,14 171:20 | 149:2,17 | loudly 7:21 | 176:8 192:5,9 | 158:20 159:7,14 |
| limits 20:7 32:21 | live 128:18 160:13 | low 169:5 170:3,5 | manager 132:14 | McCracken 142:20 |
| 32:23 33:24 42:12 | load 164:17 | 172:22 199:4,6,17 | manner 107:20 | 177:1,14 179:20 |
| 104:18 106:15 | loading 86:15 | 203:22 | manpower 28:10 | 180:20 |
| 165:19,20 179:5 | 102:18 | lower 22:19,21 | manual 17:7 60:16 | McCracken's |
| line 169:19 | loadings 78:24 | 25:16 82:3 96:2 | map 163:1 | 73:23 127:22 |
| linear 46:7 67:22 | local 78:16 81:2 | 108:12 112:2 | mapped 164:4 | 129:12 |
| lines 49:9 70:22 | located 44:13 64:2 | 120:8 128:9 143:2 | March 4:6 49:15 | McHenry 82:4 |
| 123:2 | 106:17 | 145:8 157:15 | 50:1 94:3 96:17 | 164:5 |
| liquid 81:22 86:18 | location 9:22 41:16 | 159:22 160:19 | 103:15,17 104:13 | mean 40:18,20 |
| 93:1 | 43:15 48:8 | 163:6 165:3 | 105:1,11 150:3 | 55:12,19 60:14 |
| liquids 82:20 155:4 | locations 48:5,13 | 166:22 167:1 | 205:12 | 67:9,12 71:6 72:2 |
| list 11:9,11,15 | 105:10 | 170:15 183:21 | marsupium 128:19 | 87:21 88:2 99:16 |
| 31:16 47:18,20 | logical 105:5 | 198:7,8 201:18,21 | 128:22 | 112:24 116:23 |
| 50:15,19 51:1,4,8 | long 68:21 82:6 | 204:1 | Martine 1:7 2:2 3:3 | 119:12 125:1 |
| 51:18,19,24 59:11 | 180:2 205:18 | lunch 122:12 131:4 | 191:10 | 131:11,14 147:24 |
| 60:5 89:4 117:5,6 | longer 13:20 18:8 | 131:7 | mass 18:11 61:8 | 149:19 159:13 |
| 117:8 119:12,16 | 19:10 27:10 30:13 | lunchtime 122:6 | 101:8 | 160:19 161:8 |
| 119:22 120:20,21 | 118:5,12 124:3 | M | masters 185:18 | 202:2 |
| 120:23 121:1 | 134:13 143:12 | ma'am 67:3 73:2 | match 117:6 | meaning 199:22 |
| 126:3 138:6,6 | 183:21 185:7 | | material 60:22 | means 20:17,20 |
| 140:5 178:23 | 193:20 | macroinvertebrate | 69:21 123:17 | 55:18 92:22 |
| | l | I | | Ι |

| T | | | | Idge 221 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| 137:22 167:1 | metal 44:5 | 197:10,11 199:6 | 184:18,21 185:3 | 191:17 |
| meant 13:4 148:7 | metals 39:22 44:9 | mic 9:16 | 200:5,13,16,19,21 | mortality 20:6 |
| measure 23:4,7,23 | method 15:5 29:3 | mice 168:1 | 200:23 201:4 | 22:19 138:22 |
| 24:11 | 47:9,11 64:14 | microphone 8:21 | modernizing | 139:1 |
| measured 24:1,3,12 | 72:4 158:19 185:1 | 9:17,21 69:12 | 137:15 | motoring 79:22 |
| | | 2 | | e e |
| 24:16,18,20 198:2 | methodology 67:13 | midges 60:21,21 | modest 154:19 | Mount 84:6,14 |
| measurement | 118:16 | migrating 94:12 | modification 113:7 | mouth 193:19 |
| 20:20 | methods 15:3,7,8 | migration 95:15 | modifications | move 9:21 66:12 |
| measures 79:12 | 15:23 16:5,7 | milligram 35:4 | 15:24 16:3 | 187:20 194:2 |
| measuring 73:8 | 23:10 137:16,23 | million 189:19 | modified 29:5 | moving 12:22 22:5 |
| mechanism 193:8 | 138:17 156:7 | mind 5:15 | 113:21 175:9 | 26:13,20,22 33:8 |
| median 139:5 | 203:20 | mine 188:17 189:18 | 205:16 | 33:11 37:15 39:12 |
| 197:9 | Meyers 2:11 | 189:21 190:2 | modify 123:8 | 42:10 55:11 67:20 |
| meet 50:9 82:11 | 101:17,21,21 | mines 101:4,7 | 160:24 | 69:23 70:10 153:3 |
| 94:11 95:21 | 102:6,12,23 103:2 | 189:16 190:13 | modifying 112:20 | 170:18 |
| 102:16 111:9 | 151:7,10,15,20,23 | minimal 93:9 | monetary 79:14 | mucket 160:13 |
| 141:6,8 195:22 | 152:2,6,9,15 | minnow 125:12 | money 92:9 | 161:23 163:7 |
| meeting 74:14 | 187:9 195:17 | minor 105:15 | monitored 40:24 | 165:23 200:4,12 |
| 154:1 | 196:6 204:23 | minus 24:22 | 41:4 | 201:3 |
| meetings 98:12 | mg 199:5 200:6,7 | minutes 63:16 90:6 | monitoring 39:15 | muckets 156:20 |
| meets 110:2 195:8 | 200:14,17,20,22 | 90:13 131:6 | 41:10,15 51:14 | Muddy 189:22 |
| Melissa 2:14 77:3 | 200:24 201:5,9,10 | mirror 14:6,12 | 52:5 81:21 180:10 | Muller 84:9 |
| 108:16 180:18 | 201:12,13,21 | 19:9 | 181:16,23 | multiple 45:18 |
| melt 43:3,4 50:8,23 | mg's/L 65:2 67:16 | mirrored 37:17 | monitors 51:5 | 55:17 102:13 |
| 74:2 92:24 104:12 | mg/L 12:10,19 23:7 | missed 37:7 181:24 | 181:20 | 147:4,5 171:5 |
| 134:8 145:3 | 23:23 24:22 36:14 | missing 75:9 | Monroe 207:21 | 172:2 |
| 162:16 181:21 | 36:15 38:16,17,18 | Missouri 33:15,21 | month 49:14,15 | multiplier 130:16 |
| 195:9 | 38:19 39:11 40:19 | 35:24 36:1,3,7,17 | 101:16 102:22 | multiplying 61:21 |
| member 2:2,3,4,6,6 | 40:20 44:7 50:23 | 37:11 | 103:24 104:22 | 62:8 65:4,13 |
| 3:11,13 8:19 | 51:16 61:5 65:2 | misspoke 38:18 | 149:21 | municipal 43:1 |
| 63:24 | 67:11,12 73:20 | mistake 114:19 | monthly 184:14 | 75:14 88:14 |
| members 3:7 6:7 | 74:24 75:16,19 | mitigated 97:2,7 | 197:1 | municipalities |
| 98:14 | 83:5,15 92:18 | mitigating 130:22 | months 47:17 | 11:21 81:6,16 |
| memorandums | 94:13 111:3 115:4 | mitigation 152:4 | 48:20 49:15,19 | municipality 192:7 |
| 78:12 | 115:7,21,21 | mixed 119:16 | 50:13 53:4,24 | musculium 59:21 |
| memory 95:3 | 125:12,15 126:12 | mixing 14:6 107:3 | 54:2,18,18 77:22 | 61:16 62:1,2 |
| mention 46:5 | 126:14 141:8,21 | 107:3,9,13,13 | 78:2 83:15 94:6 | mussel 35:15 84:4 |
| 129:15 | 143:2,3 147:20 | mixture 85:16,21 | 100:5 103:17,24 | 89:13 120:1,2 |
| mentioned 62:9 | 153:12,14,20 | 86:17 | 104:1,8 112:15 | 122:1 156:23 |
| 149:3 158:16 | 154:4,6,7 158:5 | mixtures 86:23 | 141:19 149:10,15 | 157:14 159:15 |
| merely 196:11 | 169:5,6,16 176:22 | 87:7,8 | 149:23 150:1,2 | 160:9,12 163:7 |
| merely 190.11 merits 4:9 | 177:5 180:3 | Mm-hmm 108:15 | 174:6,7 181:24 | 171:16,18 199:18 |
| met 190:8 195:24 | | model 46:18 | 197:6,17 198:1 | 199:24 200:18,20 |
| | 189:23,23 192:20 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 202:4 |
| metabolism 127:6 | 192:22,23 195:8 | moderately 23:9,13 171:21 179:13 | morning 3:2 13:23 13:24 15:1 133:23 | |
| 127:7 | 196:5,18,24 | 1/1.21 1/9.13 | 15.24 15.1 155.25 | mussels 17:7 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| | | | | rage 225 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 101.10 10 10 10 | 1(1.1(170.01 | 22.21.26.5.55.22 | 1(0.11.1(0.10 | 105.12.106.6 |
| 121:10,10,16,18 | 161:16 178:21 | 22:21 26:5 55:22 | 160:11 162:12 | 195:13 196:6 |
| 122:2 128:21,24 | need 34:4 45:24 | noise 8:13 | 163:3,12 200:22 | objection 101:15 |
| 128:24 137:1 | 82:23 110:3 111:8 | nominal 19:19 20:3 | 204:13 | 162:20 188:22 |
| 161:9,17 167:21 | 131:23 132:17 | 23:22 24:2,5,16 | not-to-be-exceeded | 204:23 |
| 167:21 168:3 | 176:5,8 182:2,21 | non-glochidia | 75:1 | objections 93:17 |
| 170:21,24 172:7 | 187:19 189:13 | 120:6 | not-to-exceed | 100:6 |
| 173:3 204:14,17 | 190:11 191:1 | non-mussel 166:19 | 12:10 73:14,20 | observable 25:15 |
| 204:22 | 193:7,10,11 | non-normalized | 75:17 82:17 | 26:2,8 62:16 |
| mute 8:12,20 64:10 | needed 111:7 | 66:19 115:23 | 153:12,21 192:20 | observed 19:4 20:6 |
| 90:4 133:12 | needs 89:1 206:4 | 116:16 120:13,23 | notable 17:1 | 21:4 56:8 72:8 |
| | negotiations 80:7 | 121:3 | note 5:5 53:11 | 124:5 140:23 |
| N | neocloeon 17:22 | non-renewal 15:15 | 63:22 127:22 | 172:13 184:2 |
| N 2:1 | 18:3,17 56:5,19 | non-storm 51:2 | 139:7 140:13 | obtain 120:3 |
| name 3:2 6:6 7:18 | 69:3 84:9,12 | Non-urban 141:16 | 182:11 183:11 | obtained 21:13 |
| 7:19 79:23 132:10 | 119:23 156:8 | non-winter 50:10 | 201:23 | 48:6 161:2 |
| 133:5 160:10 | network 39:24 | 73:18 141:12,17 | noted 45:12 71:12 | obtaining 120:7 |
| narrative 75:24 | 41:14,20 48:16 | 145:6,8 | 73:5 87:13 154:2 | occasions 171:5 |
| 76:9,10 | never 87:18 96:16 | nonapplicable | 157:23 199:2 | occur 51:2 96:20 |
| narrow 87:6 | 96:20 | 20:17 | 201:8 202:14 | 100:5 103:22 |
| National 113:4,20 | Nevermind 118:1 | normal 64:6 | 201.8 202.14 203:24 | 100.3 103.22 |
| 114:5 117:6,9 | new 3:18 22:6 27:3 | | notes 21:7 61:20 | 139:2 143:15 |
| 125:10 | | normalize 65:1 | | |
| nationally 137:14 | 29:5 32:1,24 | 66:13 116:18,21 | 203:8 207:11 | 150:17 172:16 |
| natural 5:3 15:2,10 | 33:14,17,20 38:13 | 123:6 | notice 3:23 4:7 | occurred 79:4 |
| 38:12 39:1 61:17 | 38:16 39:1 55:23 | normalized 39:4,9 | noting 51:3 | occurring 178:20 |
| | 57:17 61:2,18 | 39:9,11 64:13,19 | November 4:8 22:6 | 198:23 |
| 64:21 89:17,22 | 64:21 66:9 68:16 | 65:9 66:2,8,11,15 | 104:23 | occurs 19:9 48:23 |
| 133:7,9,20 140:19 | 78:18,23 79:5 | 66:19,21 68:9,14 | NPDES 104:17 | 50:8 92:19 104:1 |
| 152:11 157:24 | 110:2 111:5,8 | 69:22 115:20 | 178:17 | 127:21 |
| 158:2 161:2,3,6 | 114:24 119:15 | 116:5,6,12,19 | number 23:17 55:2 | offer 62:20 202:12 |
| 185:19 202:11,14 | 122:16,19,21 | 120:20,24 121:1 | 55:6 66:23 67:8 | offered 6:19 92:8 |
| 202:23 203:1,11 | 123:8,19 124:14 | 123:16 160:6 | 76:22 82:17 93:12 | 118:17 165:15,19 |
| 203:12 | 124:21 150:23 | 166:12 | 109:5,7 123:10 | offers 165:9 202:18 |
| Nature 133:10 | 151:11 166:2 | normalizing 59:7 | 137:8 145:13 | office 64:3 |
| 135:23 | 171:9 174:9 176:1 | 65:11,21 121:4 | 167:8,14 171:20 | officer 1:6 3:1,3 |
| NC 20:11,20 | 176:4,10,17,17 | north 48:13 79:6 | 171:23 197:3 | 4:13,16 8:14,19 |
| near 89:16 104:16 | 178:5 186:8 | 100:2 135:5 | 202:7 | 9:2,20 10:4,14,17 |
| 176:11 182:22 | newer 117:14 | northeast 11:20 | numbers 54:24 | 10:20,23 11:14 |
| nearly 28:7 53:7 | nice 175:5 | 99:11 | 77:12,15 116:20 | 12:4 14:16 25:6 |
| 81:1 86:9 144:19 | nicer 41:16 181:23 | northeastern | 141:3,7 159:22 | 25:12 26:13 29:18 |
| NEB 23:1,19 24:6 | nickel 18:12 | 134:22 151:12 | numeric 43:23 76:7 | 34:10 63:14,21 |
| 38:19 40:14 56:6 | nine-day 22:1 | 154.22 151.12 | numerical 76:13 | 64:9 69:10 73:3 |
| necessarily 203:9 | nitrate 168:6,10,12 | northern 28:8 | | 74:17,21 76:17 |
| necessary 4:12 | 169:1,13,21,24 | 49:14,17 99:23 | 0 | 77:1 87:12 88:3 |
| 17:11 54:17 83:14 | | 100:14 101:2 | O'Hare 79:6 | |
| 85:8 104:13 | 170:5,7,9,11 NOEC 22:10 11 16 | | object 183:14 | 90:2,9,12,15,20 |
| 05.0 107.15 | NOEC 22:10,11,16 | 105:4 157:14 | UDJUU 105.17 | 93:22 95:13 96:23 |
| | I | l | I | I I |

| | | 1 | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 101:19 109:11,19 | 175:12,17 178:4 | optimizing 86:10 | Р | partial 20:5 |
| 109:22 111:17 | 179:7 181:8 | options 86:20 | P 2:1,1 158:3 | participants 7:17 |
| 122:4,11 131:3,10 | 190:15 192:24 | oral 6:7 | page 15:12 16:9 | 93:14 |
| 131:13,16,21 | 193:23 194:1 | oranges 166:14 | 21:20 23:5,6 91:3 | participating 206:7 |
| 132:3,16 133:1,11 | 202:10 205:4,9 | order 4:13,16 7:10 | 91:20 103:3 | participation 81:16 |
| 133:16 136:8,11 | old 22:1 | 7:23 11:5 43:11 | 105:18 111:19 | 83:8 192:7 |
| 136:15 148:23 | older 21:8,13 | 54:19 58:14 60:7 | 112:17 113:3 | particular 15:8,24 |
| 151:9 153:2 167:9 | omitted 60:5 | 62:15 135:24 | 117:1,5 119:4 | 20:19 56:9 73:9 |
| 170:14 173:16,22 | once 13:11 39:8 | 138:19 153:17 | 153:18,21 175:19 | 76:7 171:1 |
| 178:8,12 179:1 | 142:9,12 143:6 | 167:21,22 168:18 | 176:19 178:14,14 | particularly 165:5 |
| 180:16 181:9 | 165:11 178:16 | 192:22 205:13 | 179:10 182:6 | 168:18 |
| 187:4,11,16 188:1 | 201:11,12 | organic 86:15 | 183:15 194:24 | partnered 80:3 |
| 188:7,14,20 191:7 | one-hour 16:15 | organics 88:18 | 196:14 204:12 | partnering 79:17 |
| 191:12 192:1 | ones 157:16 162:11 | organism 69:9 | paired 130:17 | 80:8 |
| 194:1,8,15,17,22 | 166:9 181:2 | 127:6,11 203:10 | pairing 130:17 | parts 171:15 |
| 205:1,4,9,13 | 182:10 198:2,8 | organisms 20:18 | Papadimitriu 2:4 | passed 156:5,13 |
| official 207:13 | ongoing 41:10 | 21:8,13,21 22:1 | 63:24 191:10,11 | Pauly 2:14 3:12 |
| offseason 174:14 | 81:15 82:5 143:20 | 22:16 43:24 44:22 | 191:13,16 192:24 | pavement 81:20 |
| offset 78:6,20 79:10 | online 34:3 35:22 | 53:9 58:8 62:18 | 191:15,10 192:24 | 85:1,8 86:7,8 93:7 |
| 80:1,4,17,20 | 35:23,24 36:9 | 89:15 113:8 | Papadimitriu's | 93:11 104:2 |
| 176:4 | 205:24 | 119:12 127:14 | 64:1 | 112:16 155:1 |
| offsets 76:23 79:4 | open 8:23 114:2 | 182:24 | paper 16:4 69:12 | peak 74:1 153:13 |
| 176:8,12 | 174:19 | organization 177:4 | 123:5 156:1,9,10 | 154:3,19 183:23 |
| offsetting 78:23 | opening 7:15 9:3 | organizations | 186:6 199:11,15 | 204:15 |
| offspring 128:12 | 10:1 194:12,18,21 | 11:11 26:7 99:2 | papers 171:23 | peer 181:5 |
| oh 185:12 191:9 | Openlands 4:22 | 137:12,13 | 199:15 | pending 108:18,24 |
| oil 189:15 190:2 | 5:4 8:1 101:22 | original 20:23 | paragraph 153:18 | 109:17,19 |
| Okay 9:1 17:15 | 121:14 153:6 | 155:20 182:17 | 153:22 188:10,11 | Pennsylvania |
| 24:8 26:6,20 | Openlands's 153:4 | originally 44:3 | 188:13 | 33:15,21 35:3,10 |
| 28:15 35:3 51:22 | operation 110:22 | 120:22 | parameters 29:8 | 35:19,23 |
| 52:17 55:10 70:8 | operational 79:20 | originated 158:13 | paraphrase 102:4 | people 25:3 99:6 |
| 74:23 75:6,21 | operations 80:12 | ought 174:20 | Pardon 167:5 | 195:22 |
| 76:16,21 78:3,4 | 190:13 | outcome 183:4,9 | parking 12:1 82:24 | people's 122:6 |
| 90:12 91:18 96:6 | opinion 28:11 88:8 | outfalls 43:2,5 | 93:3 105:8 135:13 | percent 20:4 22:15 |
| 96:23 97:1 125:7 | 88:12 161:13 | outpace 52:11 | 175:22 | 24:2,18,19 39:10 |
| 131:3 133:15 | 172:5 175:15 | output 70:20 | part 19:11 29:20 | 56:16 66:14 71:15 |
| 134:20 135:6,20 | opportunity 4:2 6:1 | outreach 11:10 | 41:19 44:8 49:17 | 79:16 86:17 |
| 136:6,10 143:24 | 141:10 194:11 | 54:1,3 98:7 99:1 | 51:24 72:11 79:15 | 101:13 139:7 |
| 149:1 150:7 153:2 | opposed 30:10 | overall 142:5 | 80:4,11 87:15 | 144:17,19 147:21 |
| 153:5 154:21 | 75:13 85:10 96:2 | 163:11 | 106:17 114:20 | 148:2,9 153:15 |
| 155:6 157:4,8 | 134:22 135:4 | overlap 25:9 | 124:8 126:19 | 154:10,14 199:3 |
| 159:9,10 162:24 | 145:11 146:19 | overnight 155:3 | 134:22 143:4 | 199:23 |
| 164:3 166:15 | 174:24 | overwinters 22:4 | 152:3 156:24 | percentile 48:2,18 |
| 170:8,18 173:13 | opposite 141:5 | Owned 42:18 | 160:16 168:22 | 103:8,16 104:9,21 |
| 173:16,23 174:11 | 170:4 | oxidase 185:23 | 174:16 202:17 | 105:21 106:15,16 |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | 1/7.10 202.17 | , |
| L | | | | |

| | | | | Taye 227 |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 106.17 | 102.00 120.10 | 28.22.20.20.22.1 | | 01.20 102.4 |
| 106:17 | 123:22 130:18 | 28:22 30:20 32:1 | position 118:4,6 | 91:20 103:4 |
| perfect 28:9 | 131:1 157:6,17 | 33:19 37:16 38:8 | 179:14 | 105:19 111:20 |
| performed 33:1 | 158:14 159:11 | 38:8,22 39:3 | positions 132:9 | 119:5 153:4,7 |
| 38:12,24 | 161:24 165:22 | 40:12 41:7 47:10 | positive 74:9 | 166:20 175:18 |
| period 43:12 44:2 | 175:2 189:3 | 48:17 49:12 50:15 | possibility 52:20 | 189:2 |
| 48:21,22 53:9 | 196:11 | 52:22 53:17 54:7 | 155:9 | pre-filing 4:17 |
| 95:12 104:14 | petitioner 136:20 | 55:16 56:7 57:1 | possible 11:1 17:6 | pre-treating 81:23 |
| 112:3 134:7 144:9 | 137:10,20 138:23 | 57:14,18 59:23 | 33:2 45:7,17 | pre-trial 15:13 |
| 144:17 145:20,23 | 139:13 142:15 | 60:12 61:7 63:3,7 | 60:17 124:19 | pre-wetting 81:24 |
| 146:2 162:14 | 144:8 145:16,17 | 64:18 65:11 66:2 | 152:22 154:12 | 85:1 86:2,16 |
| periodic 143:18 | 146:7 148:21 | 66:16 67:4,14 | Possibly 130:19 | preamble 11:2,4 |
| periods 16:19,21 | 150:16 | 68:3,8,15 69:1,11 | post-exposure 23:6 | predicates 76:5 |
| 43:5 50:23 101:1 | petitioner's 140:20 | 69:15 70:15 71:22 | potable 35:5 | predict 167:18 |
| 145:8 195:9 | 144:21 146:2 | 73:10 77:6 78:8 | potassium 35:13 | 168:17 203:9 |
| permanent 193:2 | petitions 108:24 | 81:5 83:18 88:7 | 84:1,5,8 147:19 | predicted 72:2,20 |
| permeabilities | pH 105:22 106:6,7 | 88:24 89:9 93:21 | 149:5,11,23,24 | 86:8 155:2 |
| 95:17 | 106:8,12,17 | 99:22 110:10,16 | 150:11,13 156:22 | predominantly |
| permeability 96:3 | phantom 60:21 | 132:4,19 176:19 | 172:19 | 103:22 148:12 |
| permeable 96:5 | phone 91:14 207:22 | 183:24 188:2 | potential 75:12,16 | 164:11 |
| permit 43:6 75:7,11 | phone 91:14 207.22 phrase 29:11 | plowing 86:6 | 162:15 167:18 | prefer 93:15 128:8 |
| 75:23,24 76:8 | phrase 29:11 physa 120:15 | plug 116:5 160:23 | potentially 125:5 | preferable 57:11 |
| - | 1 0 | 1 0 | 149:12 205:19 | - |
| 80:14 106:14 | picked 180:12 | plus 24:21 65:8 | | preferred 151:3 |
| 178:17 179:5 | pimephales 125:12 | 182:16 | power 122:7,10,11 | prehearing 205:14 |
| 203:7 | 125:22,23 126:9 | Pocketbook 200:16 | practical 18:9 | 205:20 |
| permits 6:2 80:11 | 126:11 | point 22:21 37:22 | practice 135:14 | prejudgment 5:19 |
| 104:17 | placed 6:4 23:8 | 40:9 42:17 44:15 | 154:24 | preliminary 19:22 |
| permitted 42:11 | 92:15 | 75:13 83:12 87:6 | practiced 81:24 | 19:22 20:13,13,23 |
| 195:20,23 | places 151:12 164:4 | 89:4 102:20 | practices 50:11 | 21:16,17 56:13 |
| perpetuity 193:4 | Plain 200:15 | 150:21 166:4 | 74:6 76:22 85:24 | premature 82:9 |
| Perry 185:21 | Plaines 82:3 108:12 | 175:3 182:11 | 88:9,17 92:6,19 | premised 162:4 |
| persistence 139:10 | plan 91:17 | pointed 35:19 | 100:22 103:21 | prepared 40:18 |
| person 6:2 8:2 | planned 35:16 | points 159:4 | 110:8,22,22 | preproduction |
| 118:2 | plans 91:4,8,11 | pollutant 193:6 | 112:16 141:10,23 | 18:14 |
| personal 176:24 | 119:8 182:23 | pollution 1:1,7 3:17 | 148:12 149:8 | prescribed 57:18 |
| 183:11 207:11 | plant 35:17 | 73:9 97:11,16 | 150:23 154:6,12 | 84:20 |
| persons 4:14 | plants 101:5,7 | 98:4,9 176:16 | 176:8 185:9 189:5 | prescribes 63:5 |
| pesticides 150:9 | 137:3 | 189:12 195:2,11 | 192:5,9 | present 2:8 3:6 |
| petition 10:8 30:4 | plays 165:5 | 196:3 | pre-filed 4:15,18 | 47:17,19 145:23 |
| 53:6,23 97:11 | please 5:15 6:6 | Pond 189:17 | 4:24 5:22 6:16,21 | 145:24 152:20 |
| 98:2 104:20 | 7:18,20 8:4 11:15 | poor 199:2 201:24 | 7:3 14:17 15:14 | 157:13 162:15 |
| 110:13,19 112:18 | 12:5 13:3,11 14:3 | population 139:9 | 17:10 19:24 20:15 | 163:2 164:2 |
| 113:9 114:12,18 | 14:9,21 15:6 | porosity 96:1 | 21:1,18,21 23:21 | 179:12 185:14 |
| 115:1 117:2,5 | 16:18 17:13 18:19 | portion 49:24 | 26:17 32:17 33:13 | 203:14 |
| | | | 20.17 52.17 55.15 | -0 |
| - | | 86.18 | 12.1 10 10.6 | nresented 12.14 |
| 118:13 121:2 | 19:18 21:12 22:11 | 86:18 nosed 5:16 | 42:4 44:19 49:6 70:16 88:23 91:3 | presented 12:14 |
| - | | 86:18 posed 5:16 | 42:4 44:19 49:6 70:16 88:23 91:3 | presented 12:14 66:5,17 98:10 |

| r | | | | ruge 220 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 121:17 123:3 | 98:4 117:17 | 58:16 | 150:19 151:5 | 68:4 133:8 196:11 |
| 143:16 157:16 | procedures 45:4 | property 176:6 | 150:19 151:5 | provision 178:19 |
| 158:13 163:1 | 97:16 | proponent's 7:8 | 162:1,14 165:18 | provisions 14:6,13 |
| 180:12 183:19 | proceed 7:16 8:8 | proposal 3:16,22 | 190:7,17 195:3,6 | 30:23 54:11 |
| 199:14 | 45:16 109:8 110:6 | 4:10,21 20:23 | 196:3 202:5 204:1 | prudent 167:16 |
| presenting 10:8 | 133:4,17 188:24 | 29:21 30:5 32:9 | 204:8 | 172:21 |
| presently 36:14 | 194:23 | 35:10,20 36:9 | proposing 49:8 | public 3:22 5:6 6:3 |
| 152:21 | proceeding 4:5 | 49:10,18,20 73:12 | 189:18,21 | 6:8,9,10 12:21 |
| presents 112:23 | 47:21 142:21 | 89:1 92:14,16 | proposition 174:7 | 79:22 81:12 98:12 |
| 157:12 | 174:19 183:13 | 96:8 97:10 98:1,8 | proprietary 87:8 | publication 17:20 |
| Preservation | proceedings 1:6 | 98:19,23 99:7,13 | protect 83:14 129:8 | 168:5 |
| 140:19 | 44:4 63:20 90:19 | 108:23 109:21 | 142:10 161:16 | |
| | | | 142.10 101.10 | publications 181:5 200:3 |
| Preserve 133:10 | 108:20 114:3 | 110:11,18,18,21 | | |
| 135:23 | 120:22 127:23 | 111:11 145:13 | protected 139:10 | Publicly 42:18 |
| presumably 195:5 | 131:20 155:8 | 148:17 159:2,24 | 139:17 140:1,18 | published 4:7 |
| 201:17 | 183:4,9 187:15 | 160:20 162:4 | 163:10 201:17 | 44:18 52:8 56:13 |
| presume 48:10 | 205:8 207:7,9 | 164:19 174:9,16 | protecting 37:17 | 77:13 112:19 |
| 177:7 | process 33:16 | 174:23 175:1,8,9 | protection 5:2 | 114:6 119:14 |
| pretty 86:15 186:24 | 62:11 158:12,21 | 182:24 190:24 | 43:24 89:11 | 123:5 156:1,9,11 |
| prevalence 147:13 | 167:6,12 | 195:11 201:22 | 138:21 139:12 | 156:17 161:14 |
| prevent 86:3 | produce 139:3 | 205:16 | 166:7 202:12,18 | 171:22 181:10 |
| previous 35:7 | produced 56:21 | propose 27:3 77:13 | 203:1 | 185:23 186:6 |
| 45:12 57:16 71:13 | 177:21 | 190:20 | protective 92:12 | publishes 50:18 |
| 159:4 | Production 6:16 | proposed 3:19 | 125:17 126:8 | pull 181:12 |
| previously 37:23 | professional 55:24 | 11:16 12:23,24 | 129:3 138:24 | purchase 78:18 |
| 171:2 197:22 | 58:9 62:10 63:10 | 13:6 14:4,10,22 | 139:22 191:2 | 176:13 |
| primarily 93:10 | 137:11 | 19:13 33:21 35:7 | 196:12 | purpose 48:9 138:3 |
| 99:11 | professionals | 36:2 47:4 49:3 | protocol 47:6 56:16 | 160:1 162:13 |
| primary 9:7 10:7 | 137:14 | 50:10 74:11,14 | 57:15 63:4 105:20 | purposes 82:23 |
| 10:11 28:4 79:3 | Professor 44:7 | 77:8 89:11 92:3 | 162:2 | pushed 32:22 |
| 99:9 189:7 | program 78:6,15 | 94:5,13 97:19 | protocols 137:18 | put 32:6 38:14 55:7 |
| printed 206:1 | 78:22 79:3,15,16 | 100:5,18,20 | provide 6:3,7 9:3 | 64:10 70:21 75:18 |
| prior 5:12 14:23 | 80:4 87:15 | 101:12 102:16 | 11:8,15 12:5 | 87:21 99:1 116:18 |
| 21:10 65:19 86:3 | programs 80:20 | 105:6 106:20 | 13:22 14:21 21:13 | 143:3 179:8 |
| private 12:2 | progress 82:14 | 107:6,17 108:4,6 | 26:18 33:3,19 | 180:24 193:18 |
| privileged 5:14 | 98:16 | 112:12 113:20 | 36:7 39:7 51:19 | putting 99:19 |
| probable 152:17 | progressive 81:12 | 114:24 115:5 | 56:11 68:11 70:9 | |
| probably 40:11 | prohibited 139:11 | 116:20 123:9,21 | 78:8 142:1 180:24 | Q |
| 151:16 179:9 | project 27:21 79:4 | 129:2,8 138:24 | 194:10 196:7 | quality 1:4 3:5,20 |
| problem 58:20 | 98:12 152:4 | 139:21 140:10,22 | 203:4 | 19:1 28:16,21,23 |
| 82:15 90:10 | 155:20 156:9 | 141:12,22 142:4 | provided 14:7,13 | 30:7 31:8 32:10 |
| 199:11 | projected 55:2 | 142:12 144:5 | 21:6 29:4 68:19 | 32:14,18,21 33:3 |
| procedural 5:10 | projects 88:15 | 145:2,5,9 146:2 | 83:4 103:5 147:16 | 35:21 36:11 37:21 |
| 35:18 | prolongs 198:20 | 146:10,24 147:20 | 188:15 | 39:21 41:1,10 |
| procedure 72:24 | pronunciation | 147:23 148:1,8,11 | providing 40:1 | 42:11 43:18,19,21 |
| | - | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | ruge 225 |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 43:23 44:4,12 | 63:17 64:4,7,12 | 147:17 153:1,4,7 | ranked 58:13,22,24 | realistic 153:15 |
| 45:8 47:1,5 49:20 | 65:21 66:16 67:4 | 159:17 163:3 | 59:14,14,16 113:1 | really 9:9 109:23 |
| 53:19 54:9 57:5 | 67:18,23 69:24 | 166:16,24 173:19 | ranking 69:22 | 114:1 134:12 |
| 73:14,16,19 74:3 | 70:10 71:3,13,17 | 174:6 175:18 | ranks 60:8 66:3 | 177:19,24 190:15 |
| 74:5 75:12 92:12 | 73:5 76:3 77:2 | 191:5,8,11,17 | Rao 2:5 3:8 9:17 | 193:10 196:9 |
| 93:15 95:20 99:5 | 82:17 83:18 85:12 | 194:23 205:3 | 12:22 13:10 14:9 | 199:16 201:23 |
| 99:13 100:18 | 88:22 89:8 90:24 | quick 205:5 | 16:13 18:19 19:16 | 202:19 204:7 |
| 101:11 105:22 | 91:2,19 93:24 | Quintin 151:21 | 20:9 21:5 22:5 | reason 28:5 44:11 |
| 106:3,23,24 107:2 | 95:1 97:1,9,23 | 152:14 | 33:11 34:5,21 | 50:11 112:14 |
| 107:4,8,10,12,14 | 98:6 99:12 101:18 | quite 27:10 174:2 | 35:2 37:15 39:12 | 141:17 148:14 |
| 107.4,8,10,12,14 | 103:3,13 105:18 | 180:8 | | 175:13 198:5 |
| · · · · | 109:13,14 110:9 | quote 17:11,15 | 40:1,12,23 41:7 | 202:18 |
| 109:16 110:1,7,13 | , | | 42:7,10 43:16 | |
| 110:19,24 111:1 | 111:19 112:17 | 18:18 20:2 198:18 | 47:22 48:12 49:7 | reasonable 75:12 |
| 111:14 112:11,12 | 114:14,15 122:15 | quoted 42:22 | 49:12 50:2 55:11 | 75:15 177:16 |
| 112:13,20,22 | 128:5 129:14 | quoting 36:23 | 56:2 57:1,14 | reasonableness |
| 114:7 115:12 | 135:24 136:1,3,14 | R | 67:20 68:15 69:1 | 73:5,8,11 77:8 |
| 117:3 123:11,14 | 136:20 138:20,23 | R 2:1 | 69:15,23 70:5,8 | reasoning 13:14 |
| 132:11,14 137:7 | 139:8 140:10 | | 71:2 83:18 84:19 | reasons 52:18 73:6 |
| 137:15 138:16 | 141:1 142:11 | R08-9 47:8 | 85:12,19 86:19 | 178:21 179:8,8 |
| 141:14 142:5 | 144:3,20 145:14 | R08-9(d) 76:23 | 87:11 88:7 89:24 | 182:6 |
| 146:12 147:22 | 146:15,22,24 | 78:5 | rapidly 134:10 | reassess 27:2 |
| 148:10,19 150:17 | 148:18,20,24 | R18-32 1:3 | rate 52:11 81:3 | recalculating 66:17 |
| 154:18 162:2,20 | 149:3 150:15,16 | R70-8 44:4 | 83:8 86:7,11 96:5 | Recalculation |
| 164:14,23 167:6 | 151:8 153:9,23 | Rabczak 2:3 64:2 | 192:7 | 69:24 70:2 |
| 167:13 168:16 | 155:6,13 159:10 | 109:11,12,13 | rates 81:10 99:19 | recalculations |
| 177:3,3 180:1 | 159:10 162:7 | 110:9,16 111:11 | ratio 19:15 55:22 | 67:18 |
| 182:7 190:17 | 168:22 170:19 | rain 13:19 82:18 | 61:8,21,22 62:14 | receive 11:23 50:21 |
| 193:9 199:3 | 177:10 183:19 | 134:17 143:9 | 71:4,5 72:12,19 | 91:12 |
| 201:24 | 189:1 190:10,16 | rains 143:11 | 130:3 | received 4:2,18 5:6 |
| quantities 178:22 | 190:16 191:9,23 | raise 8:4 25:7 | ratios 72:18 | 6:14 7:5,24 39:23 |
| question 5:16 8:3,3 | 193:1 195:14 | 182:20 | re-evaluated | 40:17 67:10 91:14 |
| 8:6,24 11:6,7,8,14 | 196:1,14 199:1 | raised 49:5 | 137:10 | 93:13 120:23 |
| 12:4,23 14:2,9,16 | 202:7 204:12 | raises 189:11 198:6 | reached 11:12 28:5 | 155:24 156:2,11 |
| 15:2,11 16:13 | questioning 5:23 | 198:9 | 155:7 | receives 149:20 |
| 19:16,21 20:1,9 | questions 4:18,24 | raising 198:13 | read 5:13 7:13 11:2 | receiving 44:9 |
| 20:12,16 21:5,15 | 5:11,20 6:1,17 | ran 138:7 139:20 | 11:3,3 17:11,14 | 73:24 104:6 |
| 22:5,23 25:11 | 7:17,22,23 8:7 | 139:23 | 34:4 51:12 70:17 | 106:11 134:9 |
| 26:14 30:1 31:3,7 | 10:24 11:2,4 25:4 | Randolph 1:8 | 136:9,12,13 | 162:18 178:23 |
| 31:24 32:7,17,20 | 25:4,7,10 32:17 | range 46:10 50:2 | 159:19 160:15 | recipe 23:21 24:13 |
| 33:12 38:2 39:12 | 42:1 49:6 55:11 | 52:24 53:3,21 | 199:21 | 24:16 |
| 39:18 41:13 42:16 | 65:20 70:16 74:20 | 136:18,21 137:21 | readily 50:22 | recognize 95:24 |
| 43:17 45:3 46:3 | 74:22 90:1,3,8,22 | 170:12 185:4 | reading 11:7 | 101:22 102:4 |
| 47:2,22 54:21 | 93:12 122:9 | ranges 144:23 | readings 48:6 | 165:4,16 |
| 55:15 56:2 58:12 | 131:22 133:4,19 | rank 59:3 60:5 66:9 | ready 64:5 | Recognizing 47:18 |
| 60:11 61:1,14 | 133:21 135:21 | 130:15 | real 205:5 | recommend 16:23 |
| 00.11 01.1,17 | 1 | | 1041200.0 | |
| | | | | l |

| | | | | 2 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 33:9 37:19 | 32:3 34:1 73:22 | regulations 3:18 | 30:1 67:14 110:15 | request 109:6 |
| recommendation | 104:20 130:11 | 28:13 176:1,16 | 114:14 | requested 3:24 |
| 136:6 137:20 | 158:11 160:17 | regulatory 77:4 | repeated 21:24 | 6:16 39:22 59:7 |
| 139:14 140:21 | 163:4 | 97:10,24 98:5 | 199:19 203:19,21 | require 6:19 13:20 |
| 142:15 165:15 | references 31:21 | 106:21 107:7,17 | repeatedly 30:3 | 43:4 53:4 107:1 |
| recommendations | referencing 180:21 | 108:17 112:18 | 202:4 | 107:11 128:8 |
| 15:22 | 200:8 | 142:21 180:19 | repetitive 5:14 | 138:18 143:12 |
| recommends 17:8 | referred 85:13 | reject 196:3 | replace 32:9 108:6 | required 53:6 73:6 |
| recompute 119:15 | 177:13 | related 167:19 | 108:11 | 139:3,6 153:16 |
| reconstituted 89:19 | referring 19:22 | 197:20 | replaced 178:3 | requirement |
| 158:7 200:5,13,16 | 20:13 21:16 | relation 40:14 | report 1:6 15:3,7 | 107:23 |
| 200:19,21,23 | 106:14 139:19 | relationship 44:21 | 19:17,23,23 20:10 | requirements |
| 201:4 202:13,15 | 182:8 | 46:1,8,12,22 | 20:14,14 21:1,2,6 | 140:16 |
| 203:3,5 | refers 20:2 184:5 | 95:17 115:15 | 21:7,17,17 22:7 | requires 106:21,23 |
| reconvene 122:7 | 195:5 | 121:6,8 146:20 | 35:9,14,16 46:6 | 107:7 |
| 187:6 | refined 29:7 193:16 | 165:6 | 61:23 62:1 87:16 | requiring 121:8 |
| record 3:2 5:12,15 | reflect 5:19 59:17 | relative 146:9 | 87:22 110:8 | research 10:10 |
| 5:18 6:24 7:12 | 161:8 162:14 | 147:9,17 | 116:15 159:21 | 12:12 33:10 40:21 |
| 11:3 26:18 63:22 | reflecting 117:13 | relatively 94:17 | 160:17 197:9 | 53:5 54:18 57:23 |
| 88:1 90:16,21 | reflective 30:7 44:2 | 95:8 164:17 166:2 | reported 23:4 61:3 | 89:6,21 98:16 |
| 131:22 136:12 | regard 115:4 182:5 | 167:8,14 169:5 | 89:17 115:22,24 | 100:12,16 112:22 |
| 178:7,9,11,13 | regarding 35:6 | 171:8,19 | 199:5 200:2 201:2 | 118:15 155:19 |
| 180:21 181:1 | 78:5 89:10 93:13 | release 128:19,22 | 207:6 | 157:18,21 160:2 |
| 187:12,17 188:23 | 127:23 144:21 | released 198:12,13 | reporter 7:19,21 | 161:18 166:2,5 |
| 205:5 | 146:7 147:12 | relevance 180:9 | 121:22 132:6,19 | 173:10 179:16 |
| recorded 204:16 | 155:14 184:7 | relevant 5:14 76:8 | 187:20,23 188:2 | 183:7 201:7 |
| records 144:17,19 | regenerated 164:8 | 95:20 96:10 | 194:3 207:6 | researchers 116:8 |
| reduce 78:19 81:8 | regeneration 164:9 | 105:13 165:1 | reports 61:2 98:16 | reservations |
| 82:11,13 85:9,21 | regimes 16:3 | 202:6 | represent 7:20 | 115:11,13 |
| 86:2 139:9 141:6 | region 27:23 28:2,4 | reliable 20:8 | 170:24 | resides 81:11 |
| 152:12,13 154:22 | 30:13 135:3 | relied 72:12 | representation | resources 5:3 133:7 |
| 170:9 | 155:21 156:3,5,13 | | 170:21 | 133:9,20 140:17 |
| reduced 146:18 | 197:3 | remaining 119:13 | representative 43:5 | respect 89:6,20,21 |
| 202:22 | regionally 147:6 | remember 201:14 | 47:24 48:10,19 | 100:3 143:22 |
| reduces 86:14 | regions 36:6 40:7 | remind 6:7 7:11,14 | 50:4,7 107:21 | 165:14 179:18 |
| reducing 73:8 | regression 45:18 | removal 79:20 | 112:4 115:23 | 181:21 |
| 82:15 86:11 | 46:7 67:22 | 100:22 | 137:9 144:11 | respond 8:24 15:11 |
| reduction 79:17,18 | regressions 197:21 | remove 69:11 | represented 119:21 | 16:22 42:3 172:18 |
| 142:6 153:16 | regularly 120:3,5 | removed 47:18,20 | 136:24 197:6 | 203:10 |
| 154:19 | regulated 11:9,15 | 62:3 | represents 120:20 | response 4:3 45:13 |
| refer 5:2,4 128:4 | 12:7,11 82:22 | removing 49:19 | reproduce 186:20 | 128:5 |
| 129:11 142:19 | 110:11,12,17 | 60:2 | reproduction 17:4 | responses 68:1 |
| reference 53:5 | 111:12 154:9,13 | renumbered 60:8 | 22:18 198:22 | 138:22 139:2,8 |
| 159:4 | 183:3,6 | reopen 178:21 | reproductive 18:7 | 142:17 167:18,19 |
| referenced 26:16 | regulating 82:13 | repeat 9:24 29:10 | 129:10 | 168:16 |
| | | 1 | | - |
| | • | - | • | • |

| | 90.1 | D = === 2:0 4 20 0 0 | 104.7 | and ask 05 16 21 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| rest 182:18 | 89:1 | Roger 2:9 4:20 8:9 | 194:7 | sand-salt 85:16,21 |
| Restoration 156:3 | revising 64:19 | 119:2 132:22 | Saline 185:21 | 86:23 |
| 156:13 | revision 71:12 | role 165:5 | salinization 197:13 | Sanitary 47:7,12 |
| restrictive 73:19 | revisions 64:17 | room 6:5 | salt 5:7 12:14,16 | 47:15 70:2 108:9 |
| 92:17 141:7 | revisit 193:7 | round 14:24 19:6 | 13:20 24:15 50:23 | 108:13 |
| 190:19 195:4 | revisited 165:13 | 124:1 198:14 | 51:3,5 73:21 | Santos 2:3 3:7,12 |
| resubmit 7:1 62:5 | riffleshell 157:15 | rounding 71:15 | 78:19,20,23 81:8 | 67:14 122:14 |
| 116:21 | 160:12 200:23 | routine 41:14 | 81:13,18 82:6,11 | saw 28:13 63:10 |
| result 29:7 65:9 | 204:14 | 181:22 | 82:13,15,24 83:3 | saying 37:3 132:6 |
| 66:13 92:24 104:9 | right 3:10 9:1 | routinely 41:19 | 83:5 85:17,21 | says 144:7 |
| 126:7 142:5 | 10:20,23 37:14 | 105:11 | 86:1,6,7,10,14,18 | scale 23:12 40:13 |
| 148:16 153:12,24 | 70:17 77:22 90:14 | rule 12:23,24 47:7 | 86:20 87:8 88:20 | scenarios 93:6,10 |
| 163:5 167:17 | 90:20,21 94:21 | 98:5 | 92:24 93:4,9,10 | schedule 205:14,19 |
| 168:3 195:2,11 | 102:2 131:6,17 | rulemaking 1:4 3:4 | 94:21,22 95:6 | 205:19 |
| resulted 22:1 92:15 | 133:1 135:13 | 3:16 4:21 11:16 | 98:11 99:15,17,17 | scheduled 4:4,6 |
| 116:19 | 136:17 152:2 | 47:13,14,14 | 99:19 100:4 101:1 | schools 11:24 |
| resulting 80:10 | 165:21 175:7 | 109:17,20 189:14 | 102:1,5,7,7,8,18 | science 71:20 193:7 |
| results 19:10,13 | 187:5,23 188:7,20 | 191:1 | 102:20,24 104:2 | science-based |
| 23:22 35:13 38:24 | 191:8 200:9 202:8 | rules 5:10 6:19 | 104:12,14 105:7 | 137:11 |
| 55:22 56:8 58:2,6 | rising 64:6 | 45:4 | 105:13 134:6,18 | scientists 137:11 |
| 59:7,9 60:13 | river 5:7 12:15,16 | run 22:17 31:20 | 135:2,11 142:21 | scope 110:10,17,20 |
| 61:22 62:8,13 | 12:16 51:5 52:9 | 92:9 111:24 | 143:12 152:7,10 | 111:12 |
| 63:1 65:9 103:10 | 73:21 81:13,18 | 166:12 178:1 | 153:16 154:9,14 | Scott 2:13 91:14,15 |
| 112:21 116:18 | 82:6 83:3,6 98:11 | 197:21 | 154:15,22 155:1 | 91:21 92:8 132:13 |
| 119:11,14 120:14 | 142:21 143:1 | running 55:6,9 | 157:24 172:14,22 | script 174:3 |
| 121:5 123:5 124:7 | 144:16 154:15 | 139:18 | 176:5 177:2 | search 31:18 |
| 130:1,13 138:8 | 158:3 177:2 | runoff 11:23 43:3 | 178:21 179:20 | season 32:15 33:4 |
| 156:17 158:9 | 179:20 189:22 | 48:23 50:22 93:3 | 192:3,15,18 | 49:19 112:10 |
| 159:1 160:23 | 192:3 200:15 | 112:8 127:21 | salts 12:3 48:24 | 145:16 |
| 164:22,24 167:7 | 202:11,15 204:14 | 145:3,3 151:4 | 84:13,14,18,21 | seasonal 32:23 |
| 167:14 182:18 | rivers 50:16 197:13 | 153:17 162:15 | 85:10 156:16 | 105:22 144:23 |
| 185:24 199:8,16 | 198:12 | 181:21 182:4 | 172:18 | 145:11 146:12 |
| retention 77:24 | road 99:15 101:1 | S | sample 41:21 | 148:13 162:2,9 |
| 198:19 retire 183:13 | 102:7,8 135:11 | $\frac{3}{82:170:23}$ | 106:13 107:21 | 164:13 190:2,5 |
| | 151:21,23 152:14 | S-O-U-C-E-K | 197:1 | 196:19 |
| retired 27:9 | roads 82:24 102:2 | 15:10 | sampled 197:14,19 | seasons 32:12 |
| returning 112:2 reverse 109:13 | 135:13 151:11,16 | S-T-E-F-A-N-I-E | sampler 41:17 samplers 42:20 | 52:12 93:16 |
| | 151:17 152:9,17 178:21 | 41:24 | 43:3 | second 4:6 7:3 |
| review 119:1 | roadway 85:19 | safe 24:4,9 83:1 | | 20:24 70:22 92:7 125:13 188:18 |
| 160:16,18 193:9 reviewed 181:5 | 86:3 88:10,15 | 167:15 | samples 43:4,11,14 107:19 182:1 | 125:13 188:18 |
| reviewing 159:12 | 104:4 151:2 | safely 24:20 | 107.19 182.1 197:3,4,7 | section 3:16,18 |
| revise 49:9 65:6 | | safety 79:22 82:23 | sampling 41:18 | , |
| revised 44:12 62:3 | roadways 12:2 150:24 175:21 | 178:20 | 42:13 43:9 51:1 | 5:10 14:7,13,19 |
| 62:20 63:13 70:9 | robust 22:3 | saith 132:24 188:6 | 106:9 197:1 198:4 | 14:20 19:2,12 45:6 60:16,17 |
| 02.20 05.15 /0.9 | 1 UUUSI 22.J | | 100.7 177.1 170.4 | +5.0 00.10,17 |
| 1 | I | I | I | I |

| r | | | | Taye 232 |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 106:3,21 107:7,17 | 146:4,8,17 157:20 | 53:10 | 105:21,24 119:11 | slightly 72:22 92:13 |
| 107:23 108:7,7 | 157:24 159:14,23 | shorter 16:2 183:23 | 127:17 138:13 | slipperiness 87:20 |
| 132:12,15 182:6,9 | 163:17 166:4,8 | 193:20 | 162:5 172:6 | slippery 87:4 |
| 182:20 183:18 | 171:2,8 | shorthand 207:5,7 | similarities 28:19 | slope 45:20 92:2 |
| 185:5 | sensitivities 144:22 | shortly 3:8 | similarity 58:8 | slope 43.20 72.2 slow 127:5,6 |
| sections 14:4,10 | sensitivity 19:11 | show 18:2 65:8 | 62:18 63:12 | 167:10 |
| sections 14.4,10 sediment 15:23 | 72:11 89:22 124:8 | 70:21 72:6 120:8 | similarly 44:23 | |
| see 8:8 9:21 19:4 | 127:3 130:10 | 122:24 124:2 | 149:6 | slow-going 192:12 slowly 7:20 |
| 40:9 50:11 57:21 | 136:18,21 137:4 | 122.24 124.2 | simile 128:17 171:1 | slowly 7.20 smaller 11:22 |
| 66:14 72:21 86:15 | 137:21,24 139:15 | 136:2 143:18 | simple 115:9 | 25:23 50:21 |
| 88:5 91:22 95:6 | 144:13 171:16 | 146:17 154:17 | simply 19:5 77:13 | 153:13 183:22 |
| 97:19 99:7 102:3 | | 183:15 184:9 | 88:9 89:20 172:1 | SMAV 55:14 58:21 |
| | sent 91:8,11 98:15 | | | |
| 127:20 131:7 | 155:22 | showed 157:21 | 178:19 182:11 | 58:23 60:1 69:5 |
| 172:5 174:3 | sentence 182:8 | 198:15 | 196:4 | 88:24 |
| 177:19,24 178:5 | separate 65:7 131:1 | showing 68:5 | single 32:10 44:1,4 | SMAV's 55:17 56:2 |
| 179:18 187:5 | separately 59:14 | 157:12 | 56:15 57:17 67:7 | 59:12 61:15 64:13 |
| 192:11 199:16 | 68:12 | shown 60:7 64:22 | 167:17,17 | snow 13:18 43:2,4 |
| 202:6 205:16 | September 197:17 | 70:23 88:20 89:14 | single-value 43:22 | 50:8,23 74:2 |
| seeing 124:11 | 198:1 | 171:2 173:12 | sir 52:2 175:11 | 79:19 92:21,23 |
| 142:24 202:20 | sequenced 185:22 | 179:23 | 177:17 | 100:2,20,22 104:4 |
| seeking 193:2 | series 54:15 87:19 | shows 51:7 57:23 | site 30:23 31:4 | 104:12,15 105:14 |
| seen 51:3 56:12 | 111:24 | 69:22 118:15 | 108:8,12 198:4 | 134:7 143:10 |
| 96:20 109:4 167:3 | servicing 81:22 | 126:13 | site-specific 41:2 | 145:3 162:16 |
| 172:7,11 | serving 100:21 | sidewalks 83:1 | 45:10 47:6,13,16 | 176:5 181:21 |
| seepage 198:11 | set 4:16 6:12,13 | Sierra 4:23 5:4 | 54:11 | 195:9 |
| segments 51:20 | 33:24 36:12 | 7:24 173:18 | sites 197:2,15,20 | snow-affected |
| select 47:22 | 177:15 | sign 6:6 | situation 75:22 | 52:10 |
| selected 103:11 | setting 9:6 10:7 | sign-up 6:4 | 101:23 | snowfall 48:22,23 |
| 119:8 120:18 | 66:11 177:9 | signature 207:13 | situations 95:2,3 | 49:19 100:13 |
| 123:14 125:24 | seven 6:17 19:7 | significant 61:12 | six 15:2 41:15 54:2 | 101:8 103:20 |
| 138:5 146:16 | 21:24 72:9 112:1 | 69:7 92:18 165:17 | 103:4 136:5 | 104:1,1 133:24 |
| 166:2 | 134:12,14 | 179:24 | 183:15 190:16 | 134:16 162:15 |
| semi-aquatic | seven-day 56:14 | significantly 85:9 | 196:14 | snowstorms 95:4 |
| 148:19 150:17 | Seventeen 107:16 | 104:3 157:15,23 | Sixteen 107:6 | snowy 14:2 |
| sending 3:23 | sewer 43:1 | 159:22 197:10 | Sixth 145:14 | Society 15:17 |
| sense 189:3 | sewers 75:14 | 199:7 | size 182:2 | sodium 19:17 35:11 |
| sensitive 18:12,13 | share 97:10,24 | signs 165:10 | skip 70:8 118:21 | 38:4 56:14 61:3,4 |
| 56:4 57:3,7 69:8 | 188:17 | silent 35:5 | 184:12 | 61:9 68:1 83:19 |
| 71:23 84:5,13 | sheet 6:4 | siliquoidea 84:4 | Skrukrud 4:22 7:9 | 83:24 84:6,7,14 |
| 89:14 119:6,9,18 | shifts 198:7 | 156:23 | 187:19 188:4,17 | 84:17 85:2,7,10 |
| 119:22,23 120:15 | Ship 47:7,12,16 | similar 24:5 27:18 | 189:1,9 190:4,10 | 134:8 141:24 |
| 125:13 126:1 | 70:3 108:9,13 | 28:24 29:13 30:22 | 190:23 191:6 | 147:14 148:13,14 |
| 127:11,14 128:3 | 120:21 | 33:16 38:20 45:9 | 194:10,14,16 | 156:16,21 160:8 |
| 129:8,22 138:7 | short 96:9 153:20 | 52:7 54:10 56:24 | Skyway 11:19 | 162:16 164:8,11 |
| 140:4 145:17,22 | shortened 17:17 | 68:4 80:17 82:2 | 88:13 | 171:2 172:14,19 |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Taye 200 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| softener 189:14 | 170:23 171:4,17 | 117:5,6,8 119:6,8 | spike 72:10 104:5 | 31:20 32:11 33:9 |
| softeners 164:5,7 | 170:23 171:4,17 | 119:11,13,17,22 | 124:3 | 34:12,19 35:4,7 |
| 165:1 190:3 | | 119.11,13,17,22 | spikes 143:18 | · · · |
| | 185:1,18 186:14 186:20 | 129:23 136:19,22 | 148:13 181:24 | 36:3,4 37:2,11,11 37:21 43:21 44:2 |
| softer 163:2,5,12 | | , | | |
| 163:18 164:2 | sound 69:13 187:8 | 136:24 137:4,9,24 | 183:16,21 | 44:6 45:8,9,21 |
| 165:1 171:15 | sounds 187:9 | 138:7,8,11,13 | spiking 192:22 | 46:13 49:3,21 |
| soil 198:11 | 193:19 | 139:11,12,17 | splash 152:7,10 | 50:3,10 54:10,10 |
| soils 95:17 96:1,2,5 | source 27:19 42:17 | 140:1,4 146:17,21 | split 32:11 | 57:5 67:1 72:7 |
| 198:20 | 59:24 61:24 75:13 | 155:12,20 157:13 | spoke 91:21 | 73:14,16,19,20 |
| sole 178:23 | 117:4 149:23 | 157:20 159:13,14 | spoken 6:10 | 74:4,10 75:1,4,8,9 |
| solely 5:17 129:17 | 150:21 164:12,14 | 159:15,22,23 | spray 152:7,10,13 | 75:13,17,23 76:1 |
| 170:22 | 189:7,10 | 160:18,19 161:2 | spring 77:22 78:2 | 76:7,10,13 77:9 |
| solid 92:22 | sources 80:22 | 166:3,8,19 167:8 | 103:15 146:1 | 77:11,14,18,19 |
| somewhat 17:17 | 83:19 101:4 102:5 | 167:15,17,19 | 149:14 182:21 | 82:11,16,16 83:16 |
| 109:2 123:14 | 102:6,13 146:23 | 168:7,14,17 171:1 | 198:21 | 89:11 92:18,20 |
| sorry 10:5 23:14,16 | 147:1,5 148:16 | 171:4,5,7,12,16 | Springfield 6:6 | 93:5,15,18 94:5,5 |
| 29:18,24 34:9 | 149:4 189:12,15 | 171:20,22 172:15 | 8:10,12,21,22 | 94:13 95:21,21 |
| 36:24 60:5 69:14 | south 48:14 79:7 | 172:17 173:12 | 9:13 10:2,15 | 99:5,14 100:7,19 |
| 77:1 87:12 94:9 | 135:4 | 177:21 182:16 | 25:20 41:23 64:3 | 100:20,21 101:11 |
| 108:2 110:14 | southern 49:14,23 | 186:8,9 191:2 | 64:10 77:2 90:4 | 101:12,13,15 |
| 114:13 126:22,24 | 50:5,7 98:18 | 202:4 203:8 | 132:1 133:12 | 102:16,23 103:18 |
| 128:12 131:13 | 99:15,24 100:13 | specific 15:4 20:1 | springs 198:16 | 103:20 105:6,16 |
| 132:2 133:16 | 105:4 134:23 | 30:23 31:4 45:4 | square 55:6 | 106:23,24 107:2,4 |
| 135:7 148:4,5,6 | 143:21 162:11 | 105:23 108:8,13 | squared 70:23 | 107:9,10,12,14 |
| 148:23 149:18 | 163:2,11,19,21 | 111:2 114:7 | SS 137:24 207:2 | 108:8,19 110:2 |
| 160:9 167:9 173:7 | 185:14 186:1,10 | 146:13 162:3,10 | SSD's 137:24 | 111:3,5,8,10 |
| 177:11 194:17 | 186:19 | 167:16,18 197:2 | Stacy 2:11 101:21 | 112:11,12,13 |
| 200:1 203:16 | spatial 147:12 | 197:19,22 198:2 | staff 5:17 | 113:6,22 115:3,5 |
| sort 25:8 40:7,10 | speak 6:3 7:18,20 | specifically 75:21 | stage 17:3 18:4 | 115:12 117:20 |
| 172:11 203:19 | 9:15,24 | 80:13 94:10 | 22:4 | 118:5,7,12,19 |
| Soucek 2:10 4:20 | special 140:17 | 140:15 150:24 | stages 121:17 | 119:24 121:2 |
| 8:9 10:21,22 15:9 | species 16:24 18:1 | specified 48:22 | 136:19,22 137:4 | 124:6,8 125:11,16 |
| 15:9 16:4,10,22 | 18:17 22:4 35:6 | specimens 185:20 | 145:15,18,22 | 126:8 129:8,16,19 |
| 17:10,15,20 19:21 | 45:1 46:16,18,20 | 185:24 | 146:4,8,9 161:17 | 130:5,8 138:1,16 |
| 20:12 21:15 23:3 | 47:16,18,19,20 | speculating 190:14 | 191:3 | 141:14,17,21 |
| 23:14,20 24:11 | 53:2,10 54:15 | speed 86:5 152:13 | stain 186:4 | 142:1,5 145:1,6,8 |
| 27:22 28:3 56:11 | 55:12,20 56:9,15 | speedy 11:5 | stakeholders 98:7 | 145:9 146:12,14 |
| 83:23 84:10 | 56:22 57:2,4,7,12 | spell 7:18 | 98:14 | 147:20,21,22,23 |
| 111:23 125:1 | 58:3,5,11,13 | spelled 21:2 132:11 | stand 20:11 | 148:1,3,9,10,11 |
| 132:22 147:16 | 59:22 60:6,14,23 | 133:6 | standard 9:11 | 149:16 151:5 |
| 155:16,18 158:11 | 62:22 63:1,11 | spending 28:10 | 10:12 12:8,20 | 153:13 154:18 |
| 158:15 159:3 | 64:20 66:9 68:5 | sphaerium 18:18 | 16:19 17:17 18:23 | 155:21 158:18 |
| 166:16 167:5,10 | 69:9 71:23 72:13 | 56:4 61:16,22 | 27:22 28:22,23 | 159:11 162:1,20 |
| 167:11 168:23 | 84:2 89:3 112:21 | 119:20 128:17 | 29:21 30:8,10,11 | 164:23 165:11,13 |
| 169:3 170:2,12,16 | 112:24 113:2 | 129:6 171:1 | 30:14,22 31:3,5 | 165:14 175:14 |
| , , | | | | |
| | - | - | - | |

| 1 | | | | - |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 177:15 178:15 | started 158:22 | 90:23 | 141:16 142:23 | 33:1 35:12 38:7 |
| 182:11,21 183:1,5 | starting 7:7,24 89:4 | stenographic | 144:16 145:5,6,10 | 38:24 40:14 52:24 |
| 182:11,21 185:1,5 | 175:3 | 207:10 | 144:10 145:5,0,10 | 53:12 54:20 57:11 |
| 191:21 193:2,14 | state 1:8 7:18,19 | step 83:12 132:18 | 154:17 176:2 | 86:21,24 89:2,10 |
| 193:16,19 195:4,5 | 33:6 35:22 36:7 | Stephan 17:5 26:22 | 179:19 180:12 | 89:15 118:23 |
| 195:6,8,23,23 | 40:3,7,19 48:11 | 27:6,9 31:16 32:2 | 181:22 182:2 | 119:1 138:8 |
| 195.0,8,25,25 | 48:13 49:17,24 | 38:3,10 39:5 | 195:7 197:13 | 143:20,23 155:14 |
| 204:9 | 88:11 91:4,10,19 | 59:10,21 64:8,12 | streams 11:22 41:1 | 145.20,25 155.14 |
| standards 1:4 3:5 | 91:20 95:22 98:22 | 64:23 65:3,12 | 48:24 50:15,16,17 | 158:13,15 159:1 |
| 3:20 13:1,13 14:5 | 99:7 100:14,15 | 66:20 68:9 71:18 | 50:19,21,22 51:14 | 160:3,3 161:14 |
| 14:12 18:21 19:1 | 103:6 110:23 | 118:17 | 51:20 52:5 67:11 | 163:4 168:3 |
| 19:14 28:16 29:7 | 111:20 117:2 | Stephan's 113:16 | 73:16,18,24 74:2 | 172:10 176:20 |
| 30:4 32:14,18,21 | 119:5 134:22 | steps 205:10 | 74:5,12 77:12,20 | 177:8,13 180:20 |
| 33:3,14,17,18,20 | 151:13 153:10 | Steve 142:20 | 83:14,15 94:1,12 | 180:24 181:4 |
| 36:11 37:16 39:21 | 154:1 155:7 161:8 | Steven 1:7 73:22 | 101:24 104:6 | 199:19 203:6,7 |
| 43:22,23 44:12 | 162:8,23 171:15 | 177:1 179:20 | 134:9,13 142:3 | study 3:24 38:12,18 |
| 47:2,5 53:19 58:3 | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| <i>,</i> | 195:1 207:1 | 207:5,20 | 143:23 145:4 | 38:20 57:2,8 |
| 74:3,6,11,15 92:4 | stated 15:12 21:20 | stopped 87:23 | 149:6,7 150:22 | 84:10 85:14,15 |
| 92:12 95:5 100:24 | 33:14 183:17 | storm 13:17,21 | 153:13 154:3,5 | 87:16 96:8,13 |
| 105:22 106:1,3 | statement 7:16 9:3 | 43:1 75:14 86:3 | 162:18 164:2,12 | 126:12,20 143:20 |
| 108:4,5,6,6 109:1 | 10:1 12:6 28:18 | 99:17,20 143:8,13 | 164:17 178:24 | 156:14 157:5,12 |
| 109:16 110:24 | 32:22 36:23 52:18 | 154:11 | 180:10 181:16 | 158:23 159:4 |
| 111:14 113:13,21 | 63:13 73:6 107:18 | storms 134:6 | 183:22 185:7 | 160:10 161:1 |
| 113:23 114:22,24 | 175:20 179:7,8 | 178:20 192:13,16 | 189:8 192:19 | 169:1 171:11,18 |
| 116:14 123:9,11 | 182:6 184:1 | 192:23 | 195:12 198:12 | 186:4 195:1 |
| 123:15,21 124:15 | 194:12,18,21 | stormwater 50:21 | Street 1:8 207:21 | 196:15,19,21,24 |
| 124:23 129:3 | 195:5 199:10 | straight 87:3 | strength 81:4 | 197:8 198:6,10,15 |
| 132:12,14 137:7 | states 28:8 34:22 | straightforward | stress 9:23 83:10 | 198:19,24 |
| 138:24 139:22 | 34:24 37:22 47:4 | 29:4 | strictly 42:21 92:6 | stuff 132:6 |
| 140:11,22 141:13 | 52:6,15,18 62:7 | strain 59:2 168:10 | 92:7 102:10 118:9 | subcontract 155:23 |
| 141:22 142:13 | 80:18,20 105:19 | 168:13 169:8,8,16 | 135:12 141:23 | subcontractor 28:1 |
| 144:5,9 145:19 | 112:18 162:4 | 169:18 170:4 | strike 90:24 125:8 | sublethal 138:22 |
| 146:10 147:1 | statewide 29:21 | 185:13 186:3,5,6 | stringent 116:13 | 139:2,8,16,21 |
| 150:20 154:1 | 36:5 39:16,24 | 186:7,13 187:1 | 161:15 | submit 34:6,7 65:7 |
| 162:3,6 164:14,16 | 46:24 67:5 99:5 | strains 168:6 169:7 | striving 12:7 83:12 | 68:24 78:10 80:5 |
| 165:3,14 167:6,13 | 99:13 147:6 | 169:9,23 186:16 | 95:21 | 88:4 |
| 174:14 177:9 | static 15:14 | stream 19:9 41:5 | strong 168:10 | submittal 78:11 |
| 190:8,12,17,21,24 | stating 153:24 | 43:9,12 44:9 48:2 | stronger 21:10 | 182:17 |
| 191:1 193:9 196:4 | statistical 22:17 | 49:3,21 50:7 51:1 | Stroud 35:9,14 | submitted 5:1 6:11 |
| 202:6 | statistically 26:3,8 | 51:20 73:21 93:6 | structure 28:24 | 11:12 51:24 52:13 |
| start 21:9 44:20 | statistics 26:4 | 93:19 95:7 100:3 | student 185:19 | 62:3 91:5 142:20 |
| 63:17,22 77:14 | 197:8 | 100:7,9 101:16 | studied 53:2,10 | 192:10 |
| 90:7 131:22 | status 14:13 205:17 | 102:21 103:5,22 | 135:16 166:19 | submitting 34:22 |
| 133:18 148:6 | steams 74:13 | 104:11 105:3,17 | 196:13 204:19 | 71:1 |
| 167:12 173:18 | Stefanie 2:12 41:24 | 106:8,12 129:13 | studies 31:15 32:4 | Subpart 26:23 |
| | | <u> </u> | l | l |

| | | | | raye 200 |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 28:17 32:13,24 | 65:1,3 66:23 | 61:4 66:6,18 | 32:1,2,5 38:2,9,10 | talks 145:21 |
| subparts 26:22 | 67:12,15 68:10 | 68:22 71:4 83:4 | 38:14,23 48:5 | Tanya 64:1 109:13 |
| Subjection's 13:2 | 114:23 115:4,11 | 111:21 113:8 | 58.14,25 48.5 55:12 56:5 58:2 | target 83:13 142:1 |
| | - | | | 0 |
| subsequent 205:19 | 115:15,21 116:2,7 | 118:13 124:9 | 58:12,13 59:6,13 | taxa 117:12,13 |
| subsequently 119:7 | 116:10,12,24 | 130:12,18 143:4 | 59:17,20 60:3,10 | 119:22 120:7,10 |
| substance 139:6 | 121:7 189:24 | 143:17 179:13 | 61:15 62:3,20 | 120:16,19 123:2 |
| 196:2 | 193:11 | 180:13 183:2,6,10 | 64:19 65:4,6,7 | 127:13 128:2,15 |
| substantially | sulfate-dependent | 183:19 184:15 | 66:5,18 68:4,4,13 | 129:24 |
| 151:19 | 114:23 | 192:10 | 68:18,23 69:5,23 | taxon 119:23 120:1 |
| substitute 119:10 | sulfates 35:8 39:22 | supported 12:12 | 70:1,5,10,13,20 | technical 2:4,5 3:9 |
| substituting 57:16 | 55:7 115:8 | 155:19 179:19 | 70:24 71:5,24 | 12:13 19:2,12 |
| 58:2 | sulphate 23:17 67:6 | supporting 176:23 | 112:23 113:3 | 31:9 47:3 51:7 |
| substitution 58:7 | sum 203:15,18 | supposed 75:7 76:9 | 115:19 116:4,12 | 58:12 61:3 66:6 |
| success 52:21 | summaries 33:20 | sure 25:12 35:1,2 | 116:18,21 121:17 | 66:18 68:21 71:4 |
| successful 154:8 | 34:24 | 40:6 53:15 65:11 | 159:12,23 160:5 | 73:4,7,11 77:7 |
| suddenly 102:18 | summary 35:20 | 69:12 80:14 148:8 | 160:20,22 161:8 | 83:4 90:7 111:21 |
| 112:14 | 38:3 142:4 197:7 | 166:11 180:8 | 174:8,12 177:23 | 118:1 124:9 |
| suffice 152:16 | summer 14:5,11 | 194:15 202:13 | 177:23 | 130:11 132:4,12 |
| sufficient 39:14 | 30:8,11 77:8,10 | surface 86:4 140:9 | tables 19:19 22:7 | 141:17 143:16 |
| 44:16 45:13 53:2 | 77:14,15,18,19 | 140:12,14,24 | 34:1 64:17 123:4 | 180:13 183:18 |
| 57:3,10 60:18 | 92:16 94:5 100:20 | 142:7 | tail 78:1 134:11 | 184:15 192:10 |
| 120:9 125:3 130:7 | 101:12 102:16 | surmised 22:2 | tailored 37:17 | technically 74:11 |
| 171:19 181:15 | 112:12 113:24 | surrounding 20:4 | 86:10 | 77:17 |
| 182:4 183:10 | 114:4,8 141:3,7 | survey 15:2,11 | tailoring 86:6 | tell 132:8 202:7 |
| 192:15 | 143:3 147:20 | 31:11,13 38:13 | take 37:12 44:13 | temperature 9:8 |
| suggest 96:21 | 148:9 149:16 | 39:1 61:17 64:21 | 63:16 73:7 83:12 | 21:11 27:7,20 |
| 127:10 | 164:13 165:14,19 | 185:20 | 122:4,6,12 124:20 | 28:6,12 29:15 |
| suggested 19:1 | 165:20 174:20 | survival 22:8,9,18 | 131:4 139:11 | 30:24 31:9,12,19 |
| suggesting 196:10 | 175:9 176:21 | 22:22 199:3 | 173:17,21 184:14 | 32:3,8,15 33:4 |
| suggests 127:3 | 177:4,9,15 179:23 | susceptible 164:1 | 187:5 201:18 | 37:20 39:2 44:16 |
| 154:13 | 180:2 190:7,8,12 | suspect 41:16 | taken 1:7 62:21 | 44:22 45:11,19,22 |
| suit 15:24 | 190:17,21,24 | Sustained 205:1 | 63:13,18 90:17 | 45:24 46:8,14 |
| suitable 103:17 | 195:3 196:20 | swear 5:23 132:20 | 131:18 187:13 | 47:23 48:1,2 |
| Suite 207:21 | 198:22 201:22 | 188:2 194:3 | 197:1,3,4 203:23 | 49:13,21 50:3 |
| sulfate 23:18,22,24 | 202:5 | Sweeney 18:2 | 205:6 207:11 | 52:20 53:12 54:13 |
| 24:4,12,16,21 | summer/winter | sweeping 172:20 | takes 97:22 | 54:20 55:4 57:8 |
| 29:6 30:23 33:12 | 196:4 | sweeping 172.20 sworn 132:24 188:6 | talk 90:6 98:17,21 | 63:11 66:10 81:21 |
| 34:1 36:5 37:23 | sunfish 59:11 | 194:7 | 99:6 121:21 | 85:4 86:7,8 89:5 |
| 34.1 30.3 37.23 | | system 75:14 82:4 | 173:23 203:2 | 92:23 93:8,16 |
| | supplementing 120:13 | 206:1 | | , |
| 40:2,17,20,24 | | 200.1 | talked 86:19 97:18 | 95:11 99:10,23 |
| 41:9,22 42:14 | supplied 36:1 | T | 117:22 118:21 | 100:3,7,8,12,17 |
| 43:13 44:24 45:11 | supplies 35:5 | T 106:6,7 | 125:8 136:18 | 100:24 101:16 |
| 45:19,22 46:1,14 | support 12:5,13 | T-W-A-I-T 132:13 | 166:17 | 102:22 103:6,8,11 |
| 46:21 53:12 54:12 | 19:2,12 31:10 | table 21:1,20 23:21 | talking 75:11 | 103:12,16 104:8 |
| 54:17 64:7,14 | 47:3 51:7 58:12 | LADIC 21.1,20 23.21 | 172:19 185:8,10 | 105:21 106:7,12 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 2 |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 106:16 113:13,23 | 127:12,15,18 | 137:17 144:11 | 121:12 124:1,3 | 173:1,13,14,15 |
| 114:10,16 118:9 | 128:3,8,17 129:4 | 159:6 161:21 | 125:20 126:17 | 181:13 187:9 |
| , | | | | |
| 119:14,16 120:8 | 129:9 138:4,15 | 167:7,13,17 | 130:8,24 147:9 | 191:13 193:23,24 |
| 120:14,18 121:2 | 143:11 144:3,12 | 182:18,23 201:16 | 155:10,11,15 | 194:24 195:17 |
| 123:24 125:3,15 | 144:16,24 145:6 | 203:2 | 156:7 157:1 | 199:1 205:3 206:5 |
| 126:8 127:4 128:2 | 145:10 146:3 | tested 24:10 41:8 | 158:19 166:1 | 206:8 |
| 129:3 130:17,17 | 159:5 162:8,10,17 | 41:19 63:12 64:20 | 170:21 171:6,22 | Thanks 83:17 |
| 130:20,21,23 | 164:21 165:4,7,12 | 92:1 97:5 113:8 | 172:1 184:8 185:2 | theirs 38:21 |
| 131:1 138:7,18 | 165:18 167:4 | 119:18 120:2 | 185:3 186:13 | Theoretically |
| 144:2,14 145:4 | 172:8 173:4,9 | 121:3 126:5 | 193:11 202:17 | 152:22 |
| 146:13,19,19 | 182:3,22 193:10 | 128:24 129:1,22 | 203:20 | thereabouts 24:21 |
| 150:6 155:2,2,9 | 204:3 | 138:11 161:1 | tests 15:15,21 16:1 | they'd 163:17 |
| 157:19,21 158:23 | temporal 145:19 | 165:24 170:13 | 16:23,24 17:2,3 | thing 135:10 188:9 |
| 160:2 161:19,20 | 147:12 | 182:16 186:6 | 17:17 18:8,13,15 | things 42:5 131:23 |
| 162:21,23 165:9 | temporary 193:19 | 200:5,12,16,19,21 | 18:20,21,23 23:2 | 149:21 155:5 |
| 166:23 167:1 | ten 99:22 197:16 | 200:23 201:6 | 23:3,4,6,19 24:14 | 199:13 |
| 171:10 174:14 | ten-minute 173:18 | 202:4,12,23 | 27:16,20 31:20 | think 8:21,22 12:9 |
| 179:17 182:16,24 | 173:21 187:5 | 204:11 | 47:23 50:3 54:16 | 27:18 37:19 38:15 |
| 193:12 | tend 83:20 87:4 | testified 78:5 | 55:7,8 56:14 | 41:12 51:11 54:17 |
| temperature-based | 183:22 | testify 6:1 | 57:17 89:23 92:10 | 63:14 64:15 69:6 |
| 32:19 93:18 | tendered 188:9 | testimony 4:15,19 | 119:20 122:23 | 69:21 70:9 72:16 |
| temperature-dep | tends 51:1 83:24 | 5:11,20,22 6:21 | 130:18 137:8 | 77:10,16,20 85:15 |
| 125:20 | tenfold 168:11 | 7:3,7,10,12 9:10 | 139:19,20,23 | 89:24 94:20 95:19 |
| temperatures 10:9 | 169:18 | 14:17 15:13,14 | 140:2 169:10 | 96:10,20 109:2,3 |
| 13:19 16:2 18:16 | term 64:24 65:5 | 16:9 17:10 20:1 | 171:3,18,20 | 115:2 116:6,20 |
| 29:2 31:14,22 | 66:22 124:3 | 20:16 21:1,19,21 | 184:17 201:1,3 | 121:24 122:2 |
| 32:6 33:2,5 37:24 | terminology 133:22 | 23:22 26:17 33:13 | 202:2 203:3,4,6 | 125:1 132:5 138:2 |
| 45:1 46:2,10,17 | terms 11:17 13:6 | 42:4 44:7,19 | 203:19,21 204:2,5 | 141:1 146:11 |
| 46:23 49:1,4,23 | 23:13 70:12 | 85:13 88:23 91:4 | TETYANA 2:3 | 151:15 157:11 |
| 50:7 52:24 53:3,8 | 133:23 166:21 | 91:20 96:15 103:4 | text 70:12 | 166:13 167:1 |
| 53:21 54:16 57:10 | 190:12 | 105:19 111:20 | thank 9:5 10:6,12 | 168:16 173:14 |
| 57:22,24 59:8 | test 15:3,6 16:2,2 | 119:2,3,5 150:8 | 10:16 14:1 16:11 | 176:10 185:2 |
| 67:22 68:6 82:19 | 16:19 17:8,9,18 | 153:10,19 154:2 | 20:9 24:23 26:12 | 187:3 190:4,11 |
| 85:2,8,11 91:23 | 19:4,10 20:6,19 | 155:7 166:17,20 | 28:15 34:20 42:8 | 196:12 199:12,16 |
| 92:1,13 93:1,4,7 | 20:22,23,24 21:9 | 172:22 188:9,22 | 42:9 43:16 52:3 | 200:8 201:14,23 |
| 93:13 95:8,9 | 21:19,22,23 22:24 | 189:2 196:2,11 | 55:10 62:23 64:11 | 202:1,6 203:18 |
| 96:12 97:3,6,8 | 23:1,5,8,12,17,19 | 198:6 | 71:2 78:3 80:9 | 202:1,0 205:10 |
| 99:18 100:8 | 23:20,24 38:6 | testing 15:17,20,23 | 88:7 90:1,2,5,14 | thinking 64:16 |
| 103:23 104:2,15 | 39:2 40:13 56:5 | 16:5 17:16,21 | 96:22 103:2 | 136:2 153:3 |
| 103:23 104:2,13 | 57:17 58:6 60:16 | 18:9 19:6 21:11 | 109:10 122:3 | 199:18 |
| 105:15,17 115:14 | 60:22 62:15 65:1 | 36:9 52:21 53:13 | 132:17 133:2,5 | third 19:6 70:22 |
| 115:17,17 119:19 | 67:24 72:6,7 97:3 | 56:9 67:21 72:5 | 135:19 149:17 | 111:24 140:7 |
| 119:24 122:22,24 | 119:24 120:5,6,14 | 72:10,11 91:22 | 150:14 156:18 | 158:20 |
| 123:1 124:11 | 121:10 122:2 | 103:12 111:24 | 157:4 158:10 | Thirty-three |
| 125.1 124.11 126:5,18 127:5,8 | 121:10 122.2 | 119:9 120:2,5,18 | 159:9 170:17 | 126:21 128:6 |
| 120.3,10 127.3,0 | 124.0 120.1 130.1 | 117.7 120.2,3,10 | 137.7 1/0.1/ | 120.21 120.0 |
| | | | 1 | 1 |

| Thirty-two 126:16 | today 4:5,11 5:16 | 45:5 46:9,16 | translate 18:21 | Twenty-eight |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| thought 63:12 | 6:20 8:9 41:17 | 52:21 53:21 56:9 | 60:14 | 123:7 |
| 114:2 171:12 | 65:18 87:10 131:8 | 56:14 57:9,22 | translocated | Twenty-five 118:20 |
| 195:18 202:19,21 | 151:17 192:14 | 58:4 60:19 62:13 | 204:17,21 | 118:22 |
| 203:17 | today's 5:9,21 7:2,6 | 66:12 67:21,24 | translocation | Twenty-nine |
| three 13:11 18:17 | 205:22 | 72:6,7 84:8,15,17 | 204:13 | 123:18 |
| 53:24 55:20 56:3 | told 91:22 | 84:21 97:2,6,7 | Transportation | Twenty-one 115:18 |
| 62:24 91:3,19 | tolerance 127:16 | 100:18 103:12 | 11:18 85:14 88:14 | Twenty-six 119:4 |
| 132:20 143:6 | tolerances 157:16 | 111:24 112:19 | transposed 71:9 | Twenty-three |
| 153:21 158:6 | tolerant 113:1,2,2 | 113:17 116:3 | treatment 42:18 | 117:21 |
| 171:7,20,22 | Toll 78:6,17 | 117:4 118:10 | 101:5,7 159:5 | Twenty-two 117:1 |
| 175:19 178:16 | tollway 11:19 78:13 | 119:9 120:9 | trend 21:3 170:4 | twice 98:11 |
| 182:17 193:20 | 78:14,21 79:13,15 | 122:16,23 123:1,8 | 192:11 | two 8:8 14:18 15:14 |
| three-year 142:9 | 80:3,7 88:13 | 123:19 124:10,14 | trends 52:9 83:2 | 17:10,15 19:24 |
| 142:12 | tollways 78:22 | 124:22 126:1,3,4 | 140:23 167:18 | 20:15 29:8 32:12 |
| threshold 160:18 | tollways' 80:14 | 127:7,8,18 128:15 | 168:2,15 | 50:19 53:7 56:18 |
| 196:16,22 198:18 | tomorrow 4:12 | 128:17,23 129:23 | triangulifer 18:3 | 62:6,24 71:8 |
| thresholds 161:16 | Tomorrow's | 130:22 137:8,17 | 84:9,13 156:8 | 78:13 80:2 91:2 |
| Tim 3:10 | 205:21 | 138:4,6,14 139:19 | Tribune 4:8 | 94:6 119:21 |
| time 6:2,11 16:20 | toolkit 154:24 | 140:4 144:8 | tried 27:5,11 87:5 | 144:12 153:18,18 |
| 17:24 44:2,15 | tools 154:24 | 146:18 147:9,13 | 97:15 98:3 160:22 | 153:22 157:13 |
| 45:14 52:23 53:9 | topic 31:8 140:7 | 147:18 155:10,11 | 186:14,16 | 158:16 161:14 |
| 53:18 54:9 58:1 | 142:8 143:24 | 155:15,19 156:7 | triennial 193:8 | 163:4 166:19 |
| 74:14 78:2 87:6 | Toronto 197:3,16 | 156:10,15,21 | trip 206:6 | 169:9,9 179:10 |
| 95:11 102:12 | 198:17 | 157:1,19,22 | triple 102:18 | 187:1 190:16 |
| 106:8,13 111:13 | total 85:9 197:3 | 158:19 160:3,8 | Trotter 5:7 | 191:16 196:1 |
| 134:7 145:9 | touched 46:4 | 161:22 164:21 | true 199:13 207:8 | 197:7 199:15 |
| 151:13 162:14 | toxic 10:9 19:5 | 165:3,6,18 166:4 | try 7:20 11:1,5 | two-year 43:12 |
| 173:17 186:17 | 57:23 83:20,24 | 166:10,18 167:7 | 65:15 67:2 72:24 | twofold 92:5 |
| 197:2,11,18 | 96:12 118:16 | 167:13 168:6 | 131:7 160:24 | 125:17 |
| 205:15 206:4 | 169:24 | 169:10,13 170:5,7 | trying 13:21 76:4 | type 73:9 |
| time-independent | toxicities 138:10 | 170:9,11 171:6,24 | 96:10 115:8 | types 79:24 148:20 |
| 60:19 | 147:5 159:21 | 172:14,23 173:8,8 | 143:13 169:22 | 155:5 |
| time-limited | 163:6 166:22 | 179:18 182:19 | 175:6 | typical 13:21 |
| 108:19 109:9,16 | 172:7,12 173:3 | 184:8 185:2 | TSD 55:12 56:5 | 143:13 |
| 110:1,6,12,19 | 200:18 203:22 | 199:17,17 202:3 | 61:14 64:19 68:18 | typically 24:2 |
| 111:1 | toxicity 9:9 15:15 | 202:22 203:14 | 69:5,23 70:1 | 40:24 41:9 78:1 |
| timely 4:18,24 | 15:20,23 16:5 | 204:1 | 71:24 | 84:24 85:5 |
| times 41:15 51:17 | 17:8,16,21 18:12 | toxicologist 172:4 | TSD's 69:17 | |
| 55:7 62:8 89:18 | 21:19 27:8,16,19 | tracking 82:20 | turn 8:16,17 67:7 | |
| 158:6 | 28:3,7,12 29:3 | training 81:20 | 179:19 | U-JUNG 2:6 |
| timing 109:1 146:7 | 31:9,11,18 35:11 | 82:20 | turned 37:10 | UAA 155:8 |
| TIMOTHY 2:5 | 35:13,15,16 36:8 | transcribed 207:11 | Twait 2:13 91:14 | ultimate 109:5 |
| title 70:3 | 36:13,20 37:6,13 | transcript 205:22 | 91:21 132:13,13 | ultimately 113:12 |
| titled 6:15 | 38:4 44:17,21 | 207:9 | Twelve 100:23 | 113:15 195:2 |
| | | | | |

| r | | | | raye 200 |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| unaccounted | 81:8 82:11,13 | 23:4,7 32:3,11 | versus 62:13 72:2 | warmer 49:23,24 |
| | , | | | |
| 122:17 123:20 | 85:21 99:15,17,17 | 39:4,8,9,16 41:2 | 110:11,18 172:19 | 122:22 165:18 |
| unachievable 12:8 | 101:2 153:16 | 44:5 55:13 56:17 | 172:19 184:5 | 172:7 173:3,9 |
| unaware 80:19 | 192:15 | 58:4 59:24 61:1,6 | vertebrae 72:18 | warranted 89:21 |
| 124:9 127:21 | use 1:4 3:4,20 | 64:7,20,23 65:4 | vertebras 126:9 | wasn't 26:4 157:9 |
| unclear 202:24 | 12:20 16:6 21:8 | 66:3,8,19 67:5,12 | vertebrate 125:18 | 202:13 204:24 |
| underground | 21:24 30:9 43:20 | 68:7,9,16,18 | 126:10 127:3 | wasting 154:14 |
| 189:20 | 47:1,14 51:15 | 69:24 70:2,6 72:3 | 129:20 | water 1:4,4 3:5,17 |
| underlie 70:20 | 55:17,23 56:16 | 72:21 89:17 113:1 | vertebrates 126:2 | 3:20 17:7 19:1 |
| understand 6:5 | 64:19 66:20 72:10 | 115:22,24 119:13 | 126:11,17 128:2 | 23:13 24:14,15 |
| 65:16 76:5 147:8 | 75:24 79:17 80:22 | 121:18 123:17 | viable 88:20 | 28:16,21,23 30:7 |
| 169:23 174:5 | 81:22 85:16 89:3 | 130:24 131:1 | video 6:18 | 31:8 32:10,14,18 |
| 175:24 | 103:16 108:5,11 | 159:13 161:7,9 | VIDEOGRAPH | 32:21 33:3 35:4,5 |
| understanding | 113:20 116:4,11 | 176:21 | 48:17 | 35:21 36:11,13 |
| 30:12 41:4,6,14 | 120:24 124:6 | Vannote 18:2 | view 166:5 | 37:21 39:15,21 |
| 42:17 43:10 48:15 | 129:9 130:3 | variability 33:5 | viewed 206:1 | 41:1,10 42:11 |
| 74:24 75:8 76:15 | 133:23 147:14,22 | 56:8 | villosa 120:1 | 43:18,19,21,23 |
| 80:24 108:23 | 148:10 155:4 | variable 27:8,20 | violations 154:18 | 44:4,12 45:6,8 |
| 135:9 176:15 | 167:16 169:11 | 55:4 92:18 157:22 | | 47:1,5 49:13,20 |
| 193:1 | | | Virginia 2:12 133:6 | , , , |
| | 180:6 196:10 | 161:22 162:8 | virtually 122:21 | 49:24 53:19 54:9 |
| understood 31:2 | uses 12:2 41:5 46:7 | 164:16 171:10 | 175:22 | 56:24 57:4 73:14 |
| undertakes 177:15 | 106:12 167:7,13 | variables 55:3 | vitality 186:22 | 73:15,18 74:3,5 |
| unimpaired 181:18 | USGS 156:5,14 | 164:19,24 | | 75:12 81:21 84:4 |
| unionidae 167:21 | 163:1 | variance 109:6,9 | | 89:19 92:12,22 |
| unique 123:14 | usually 202:16 | 110:3,7 111:7,10 | wait 74:19 147:24 | 93:15 95:20 99:5 |
| unit 2:4,5 3:9 | utilize 65:18 129:4 | variances 28:11 | waiting 25:9 | 99:13 100:18,24 |
| 156:22 | 157:11 | 110:1 111:1 | Waive 133:14 | 101:4,7,11 105:10 |
| United 80:20 | utilized 29:3 39:20 | variant 127:4 | Wallace 196:15 | 105:22 106:2,23 |
| unmute 132:1 | 53:23,23 54:15 | varied 56:17 | Wang 156:21 | 106:24 107:2,4,8 |
| unnecessary | 61:13 72:20 | 146:23 173:9 | 161:14,19,21 | 107:10,12,14 |
| 205:22 | 117:17 | varies 49:13 172:16 | 163:5 166:10 | 108:4,19 109:1,9 |
| unpublished 18:10 | utilizing 137:22 | variety 44:5 49:5 | 173:2 199:5,15 | 109:16 110:1,6,12 |
| unreliable 19:20 | | various 46:17 | 200:2 201:2 | 110:19,24 111:1 |
| 20:2 | V | 67:21 87:8 155:20 | want 9:5 10:6 25:2 | 111:13 112:11,12 |
| update 21:14 59:6 | valid 26:4,9 | vary 40:4 46:20 | 59:4 63:22 74:18 | 112:13,20,22 |
| updated 31:16 | value 32:10 38:23 | 84:2 99:24 137:4 | 83:10 148:6 | 114:7,10 115:12 |
| updates 26:22 | 39:4,11 44:1 56:6 | 162:11 | 173:17 174:3 | 117:3 123:11,14 |
| urban 50:17 51:14 | 60:14 62:10 66:4 | varying 54:16 | 187:7,7,22 193:18 | 132:11,14 137:7 |
| 52:5,10,11 73:16 | 66:5,12,15 67:7,9 | 147:1 168:8 | 196:8 | 137:15 138:16 |
| | 69:18 71:11,14,17 | | wanted 174:13 | |
| 74:2,5,12,13 81:7 | 71:19 72:2,4 | vast 49:1 | 194:13 | 140:9,12,24 |
| 83:13 85:21 99:10 | 121:1 126:12,14 | vehicle 86:5 | warm 94:15,17,18 | 141:14 142:4,13 |
| 100:22 141:8,20 | 160:5,19 201:19 | vendors 87:9 | 94:22 95:5,8 | 144:2,3,11 146:2 |
| 149:7 151:12 | , | Veneroida 167:23 | , | 146:2,12 147:22 |
| 154:3 195:7,12 | 201:20 | Vermilion 204:19 | 130:17,20,23 | 148:10,19,21 |
| usage 78:19,20 | values 19:19 22:7,9 | Vermillion 204:14 | 182:3 | 150:16 154:18 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 156:15,23 158:2,7 | 115:6 118:3 176:2 | went 98:24 115:6 | 153:13 162:5,14 | 81:14,19 82:6 |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 158:13 159:15 | waterways 37:18 | weren't 65:18 | 162:20 164:15,23 | 83:3 98:11 142:22 |
| 160:9 161:2,3 | 41:8 51:9 81:7 | west 1:8 12:15 79:1 | 165:11 174:20 | 154:15 177:2 |
| 162:2,20 163:15 | 102:9 108:12 | 142:24 207:21 | 175:8 179:11,14 | 179:21 192:4 |
| 163:17,18,18 | 179:12 195:19 | wet 185:3 | 180:1,7 181:24 | working 157:5 |
| 164:2,4,5,7,13,23 | wavy-rayed 157:14 | wetland 152:4 | 183:4,8 189:7,9 | 185:19 186:24 |
| 164:24 165:1 | 160:12 200:18,20 | wetlands 150:18,23 | 190:9 195:6 | works 12:21 42:18 |
| 167:6,12 168:9,16 | way 40:11 54:23 | 151:1,4 152:3,11 | 198:21 201:22 | 81:12 136:16 |
| 169:12,15 171:21 | 64:22 65:12 72:22 | 152:20,21 | 202:5 204:1,8 | world 28:9 |
| 177:3 182:7,22 | 97:6 98:16 110:5 | whatsoever 168:12 | winters 94:15 | worldwide 137:14 |
| 184:18,21 185:3 | 118:18 149:7 | wide 20:8 | 144:12 | worst 153:17 |
| 189:14 190:3 | 175:15 199:18 | widely 162:11 | Wisconsin 33:15,22 | wouldn't 141:15 |
| 193:9 199:6 200:5 | ways 203:19 | widened 151:11,24 | 36:12,14,15 | write 75:24 76:9,9 |
| 200:13,17,19,21 | we'll 10:24 34:7 | 152:10,17 | wish 6:6 7:16 9:4 | writer 75:7,11,23 |
| 200:24 201:4,8 | 38:14 62:4 65:6,7 | widespread 12:20 | wishes 8:23 | writing 34:6 104:17 |
| 202:12,13,15,16 | 65:14 68:13 70:24 | 186:10 187:1 | wishing 6:3 | 178:17 |
| 202:18,21,23 | 122:12 174:15 | wild 186:18 | withdrawn 35:9 | written 5:6 6:8 |
| 203:1,3,13 | 187:6 193:15 | wildly 81:24 | witness 132:23 | 73:23 77:22 |
| waterbodies 28:20 | we're 3:2 60:2,9 | Williams 198:15 | 188:2,5 194:6 | 127:22 129:12 |
| 50:5 180:5 | 63:15 66:11 70:8 | Williamson 189:18 | 207:13 | |
| waterbody 105:23 | 76:21 115:14 | wind 82:19 | witnesses 5:23,24 | X |
| 162:3,10,21 | 122:8 141:5 143:5 | winter 9:11 10:12 | 7:8 8:22 132:20 | |
| waters 22:24 23:1,8 | 143:7 151:18 | 14:5,11 33:9 | wondering 8:12 | $\frac{\mathbf{Y}}{\mathbf{W} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{G} + \mathbf{O} \mathbf{G}}$ |
| 23:12,17,19 24:1 | 170:15 172:18 | 47:17,24 49:3 | 72:23 | Y-A-N-G 133:6 |
| 38:6 40:3,13,15 | 174:4 175:5 178:4 | 50:13 52:6 58:3 | Wong 84:7 | Yang 2:12 95:13,14 |
| | 1/4.4 1/3.3 1/0.4 | 50.15 52.0 50.5 | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 05 04 06 6 100 0 |
| 47:14 51:15 65:1 | 184:22 186:17 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 | Wood 80:4 | 95:24 96:6 133:3 |
| 47:14 51:15 65:1 70:6 89:17,23 | | | 0 | 133:5,6,17,18 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 118:16,18 127:23 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 118:16,18 127:23 128:20,20,22 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 118:16,18 127:23 128:20,20,22 133:24 134:6,16 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 118:16,18 127:23 128:20,20,22 133:24 134:6,16 141:2,8,19,22,24 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 52:10 78:21 109:4 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 weeks 72:9 | 73:14,15 74:4,10 79:19 80:12 83:15 92:6,20 93:5,13 94:17,18 100:8,18 101:10,11,15 102:11,19 103:12 103:14,20 104:8 105:6,24 109:5 110:2,5 111:5,8,9 112:10,15,22 114:1 117:20 118:16,18 127:23 128:20,20,22 133:24 134:6,16 141:2,8,19,22,24 143:2 144:9,17 | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 worked 12:17 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 year 29:22 30:5 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 52:10 78:21 109:4 109:7 110:4 111:2 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 weeks 72:9 weight 6:10 20:17 | $\begin{array}{c} 73:14,15\ 74:4,10\\ 79:19\ 80:12\ 83:15\\ 92:6,20\ 93:5,13\\ 94:17,18\ 100:8,18\\ 101:10,11,15\\ 102:11,19\ 103:12\\ 103:14,20\ 104:8\\ 105:6,24\ 109:5\\ 110:2,5\ 111:5,8,9\\ 112:10,15,22\\ 114:1\ 117:20\\ 118:16,18\ 127:23\\ 128:20,20,22\\ 133:24\ 134:6,16\\ 141:2,8,19,22,24\\ 143:2\ 144:9,17\\ 145:1,9,16,19,23\end{array}$ | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 worked 12:17 27:15 88:13 171:9 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 year 29:22 30:5 33:5 41:15 51:17 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 52:10 78:21 109:4 109:7 110:4 111:2 111:5 141:9 142:1 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 weeks 72:9 weight 6:10 20:17 20:19,19 21:3 | $\begin{array}{c} 73:14,15\ 74:4,10\\ 79:19\ 80:12\ 83:15\\ 92:6,20\ 93:5,13\\ 94:17,18\ 100:8,18\\ 101:10,11,15\\ 102:11,19\ 103:12\\ 103:14,20\ 104:8\\ 105:6,24\ 109:5\\ 110:2,5\ 111:5,8,9\\ 112:10,15,22\\ 114:1\ 117:20\\ 118:16,18\ 127:23\\ 128:20,20,22\\ 133:24\ 134:6,16\\ 141:2,8,19,22,24\\ 143:2\ 144:9,17\\ 145:1,9,16,19,23\\ 146:14\ 147:23\\ \end{array}$ | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 worked 12:17 27:15 88:13 171:9 172:12 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 year 29:22 30:5 33:5 41:15 51:17 81:23 95:12 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 52:10 78:21 109:4 109:7 110:4 111:2 111:5 141:9 142:1 143:17 197:16 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 weeks 72:9 weight 6:10 20:17 20:19,19 21:3 well-aware 171:24 | $\begin{array}{c} 73:14,15\ 74:4,10\\ 79:19\ 80:12\ 83:15\\ 92:6,20\ 93:5,13\\ 94:17,18\ 100:8,18\\ 101:10,11,15\\ 102:11,19\ 103:12\\ 103:14,20\ 104:8\\ 105:6,24\ 109:5\\ 110:2,5\ 111:5,8,9\\ 112:10,15,22\\ 114:1\ 117:20\\ 118:16,18\ 127:23\\ 128:20,20,22\\ 133:24\ 134:6,16\\ 141:2,8,19,22,24\\ 143:2\ 144:9,17\\ 145:1,9,16,19,23\\ 146:14\ 147:23\\ 148:11,12\ 149:10\\ \end{array}$ | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 worked 12:17 27:15 88:13 171:9 172:12 Workgroup 5:7 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 year 29:22 30:5 33:5 41:15 51:17 81:23 95:12 102:22 143:9,10 |
| 70:6 89:17,23 140:14 142:16 144:24 146:1 157:14,24 160:13 161:6 163:2,5,12 171:15 175:20 189:11,13 195:3 203:5 watershed 28:11 40:10 41:6 48:16 78:24 81:11,19 98:13 110:2 142:24 204:16 watersheds 12:18 52:10 78:21 109:4 109:7 110:4 111:2 111:5 141:9 142:1 | 184:22 186:17 187:3 192:13 198:8 we've 25:3 94:14 125:2,2 174:14 weaknesses 35:10 35:18 weather 30:3 41:17 82:20 94:22 99:23 133:24 155:4 181:23 206:6 website 6:9 34:18 36:15 163:1 181:3 week 111:22 205:23 weeks 72:9 weight 6:10 20:17 20:19,19 21:3 | $\begin{array}{c} 73:14,15\ 74:4,10\\ 79:19\ 80:12\ 83:15\\ 92:6,20\ 93:5,13\\ 94:17,18\ 100:8,18\\ 101:10,11,15\\ 102:11,19\ 103:12\\ 103:14,20\ 104:8\\ 105:6,24\ 109:5\\ 110:2,5\ 111:5,8,9\\ 112:10,15,22\\ 114:1\ 117:20\\ 118:16,18\ 127:23\\ 128:20,20,22\\ 133:24\ 134:6,16\\ 141:2,8,19,22,24\\ 143:2\ 144:9,17\\ 145:1,9,16,19,23\\ 146:14\ 147:23\\ \end{array}$ | Wood 80:4 words 167:23 193:18 work 9:7 27:1,17 28:14 68:12 73:21 87:1,22 91:4,8,11 91:17 97:4 119:8 122:13 131:5 132:11 153:4 158:22 161:10 164:20 165:8,9,12 165:17 171:12 179:19,22 181:6 187:2 193:14 195:22 worked 12:17 27:15 88:13 171:9 172:12 | 133:5,6,17,18 134:15,20 135:6 135:20 136:8,10 136:13,17 138:20 139:24 140:7 142:8 143:19,24 145:14 146:22 148:18,22 149:1 150:15 152:24 yeah 25:6,18 34:8 36:21 40:8 90:9 100:16 108:10 169:3 173:23 196:9 204:5 year 29:22 30:5 33:5 41:15 51:17 81:23 95:12 |

| | | | | Idge 210 |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| years 13:11 27:10 | 1 23:21 32:5 39:6 | 100:10 103:11,18 | 16 28:16 55:8 | 200:1 204:3,6 |
| 50:19 53:7 54:4 | 55:12 56:5 58:2 | 103:23 105:11,15 | 168 199:5 200:7 | 200 154:6 176:22 |
| 88:15 143:7 | 58:12 59:6,13,17 | 112:22 116:5 | 16B 30:17 | 177:5 180:3 |
| 144:18 178:16 | 60:3,10 61:15 | 121:3,4,7,9 123:5 | 16th 4:17 | 192:22 201:11 |
| 192:6 193:20 | 62:3,20 64:19 | 123:24 124:1 | 17 31:7 | 2000 15:23 17:19 |
| 192:0199:20 | 65:7 68:14,18,23 | 127:16 128:9,18 | 179 18:4 | 40:18 |
| yesterday 6:15 | 69:5 71:24 112:23 | 129:1 130:7,9 | 17A 31:13 | 2002 103:6 197:4 |
| 39:23 40:18 65:17 | 113:3 115:19 | 144:9,16 145:4,7 | 18 32:7 53:4 54:17 | 197:11,15 |
| 67:10 | 116:4,12,18,21 | 145:11 146:13,19 | 108:2 | 2003 172:12 |
| yield 123:14 | 121:17 123:4 | 150:6,10 158:9 | 19 26:15 33:12 | 2007 207:21 |
| yielded 103:8 | 159:12,23 160:5 | 160:23 161:10 | 111:19 | 2008 155:24 200:4 |
| 130:13 | 160:20,22 177:23 | 162:17,19,22 | 1972 44:3 | 200:18 |
| young 21:9 128:19 | 185:23 | 165:24 166:13,23 | 1984 18:2 | 2009 26:22 27:15 |
| Yup 136:15 | 1,288 201:12 | 170:21 172:5 | 1985 17:4,5 47:6 | 31:21 33:15 36:3 |
| | 1,300 154:7 | 174:9 184:5,8 | 70:14 71:20 | 64:8 65:4,12 |
| Z | 1,430 200:14 | 204:11 | 126:13 | 68:10 89:3 113:6 |
| Zalewski 2:2 3:7 | 1,500 153:14 154:4 | 100 1:8 19:20 23:7 | 1988 13:15 16:13 | 113:14,21 114:11 |
| 8:11,16,20 9:1,12 | 192:23 | 24:2,18,19 39:10 | 26:21 27:2 30:6 | 114:17,21 115:19 |
| 15:1 16:8,11 | 1,597 201:13 | 169:6,16 170:7 | 30:10 112:19 | 117:12,15,16 |
| 22:23 23:11,16 | 1,940 189:23 | 201:9 | 113:4,18,19 114:4 | 118:17,23 122:1 |
| 24:8,23 25:19 | 1.3 55:21,24 62:9,9 | 100,000 53:6 54:5 | 117:2,6,9,11,14 | 125:11 129:16,24 |
| 26:20 27:5,11,14 | 62:16,17,19 | 55:2 | 125:10 175:2,9,14 | 138:9 166:3 |
| 28:15 29:10,16 | 1.75 61:21,22 | 102.424(f) 5:11 | 19A 33:19 | 200:12,20 |
| 30:17 32:7,24 | 1.9 62:15 | 11 21:2 22:5 25:11 | 19B 37:15 | 2009a 59:10,21 |
| 50:14 51:11,22 | 1/19/19 34:3 | 144:18 | 1A 11:6,8 | 64:13 66:20 71:18 |
| 52:4,14,17 53:15 | 1/19/2019 35:22 | 11.7 60:16 | 1B 11:14 | 2009c 31:16 32:2 |
| 54:7,22 55:10 | 36:10 | 11.7.1 60:17 | 1C 12:4 | 38:3,11 39:5 |
| 76:21 78:4,16 | 1:10 122:5 | 113 200:20 | 1st 103:7 | 64:23 |
| 79:8,23 80:9,16 | 1:20 131:4 | 115 160:5 200:6,13 | | 2010 35:7 |
| 80:21 81:5 82:8 | 10 21:5 40:21 55:23 | 12 22:7,23 117:12 | 2 | 2011 120:22,23 |
| 83:17 87:24 | 68:2 86:17 130:8 | 192:6 | 2 12:23 34:3 66:5 | 126:13 156:1 |
| 133:14 | 144:19 | 12.5 68:2 | 66:18 68:4 69:23 | 159:20 160:16 |
| ZID 106:22,23 | 10.8°C 104:23 | 120 185:4 | 70:1,13 71:5,24 | 171:4 198:24 |
| 107:2,8,11 | 10:00 4:13 | 13 21:20 22:6,7 | 123:4 155:6 | 200:1 |
| zinc 18:12 | 10:06 1:9 | 23:17 103:3 | 177:23 | 2012 33:18 35:9 |
| zone 14:6 106:22 | 10°C 18:1,4,9 19:3 | 178:15 | 2,237 189:23 | 156:4 197:5,10,15 |
| 107:3,13 | 20:22,24 21:7,20 | 14 18:11,17,20 21:8 | 2.0 62:15 | 2013 156:12 185:24 |
| | 22:2 33:2 49:1,4 | 26:14 32:17 | 2.7 189:19 | 2014 15:18,19 |
| $\frac{0}{0.27114}$ | 49:22 50:4 55:21 | 105:18 204:12 | 2:00 122:7 | 52:12 |
| 0.2 71:14 | 58:1 59:8 61:20 | 14th 4:8 | 2:05 131:9,10,17 | 2015 17:20 33:24 |
| 0.60662 61:13 | 62:7,13 66:11,11 | 15 26:21 63:16 68:2 | 2:20 131:5 | 34:12 156:11 |
| 0°C 92:23 93:2 | 69:2,16 72:13 | 15.7°C 105:1 | 20 38:2 41:21 56:16 | 168:5 186:7 |
| 104:2,16 | 89:4,7,23 92:11 | 15°C 144:18 146:3 | 58:22 68:2 79:16 | 2016 16:4 40:18 |
| 084-004675 207:23 | 92:13 93:5,7,8,19 | 182:22 183:11 | 86:17 112:17 | 84:6,14 103:6 |
| 1 | 95:10 97:3,8 | 159 197:10 | 170:6 197:2 199:8 | 2017 22:6 69:4 |
| I | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Idge ZII |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2018 3:15,21 4:8 | 126:15 128:18,24 | 302.212(b) 106:3 | 37A 68:3 | 155:22 156:3,5,13 |
| 84:7,10 156:17,21 | 146:20 156:10 | 302.214 3:18 | 37B 68:15 | 169:5,15 |
| 200:2 | 182:19 184:6 | 302.214(a) 106:21 | 37C 69:1 | 5,000 43:15 |
| 2019 1:1,9 4:5,6,16 | 250,000 53:4 | 302.214(a)(2) | 37D 69:15 | 5.1 185:5 |
| 46:6 56:22 62:4 | 26 47:22 | 107:23 | 38 69:24 | 5.5 56:20 |
| 67:24 68:5,17 | 26(4) 22 26(a) 48:4 | 302.214(a)(ii) 14:4 | 39 70:9 | 5.7°C 104:24 |
| 69:3 207:15 | 26B 48:12 | 14:10 | 395 36:14 | 5.8 126:14 |
| 20A 38:8 | 26C 48:17 | 302.214(b) 107:7 | | 5°C 97:6 |
| 20B 38:22 | 26D 49:7,12 | 302.214(b)(2) | 4 | 50 22:15 43:11,14 |
| 20th 33:24 | 26E 50:2 | 107:18 | 4 14:9 43:1,6 80:11 | 66:14 101:12 |
| 20 cm 33:21 21 39:12 42:2 | 27 18:4 122:15 | 302.407(g)(2) 14:19 | 80:14 91:20 97:9 | 139:6 147:21 |
| 21-day 18:21 | 27A 50:14 | 108:7 | 183:18 | 148:1,9 196:17,24 |
| 21°C 89:16 158:8 | 28 18:17 52:17 | 302.618 45:6 | 4.3°C 104:24 | 199:23 201:8 |
| 160:4 | 144:17 | 303(d) 51:18 | 40 70:10 195:10 | 50,000 54:3 |
| 217 136:24 | 28-day 17:8 20:5 | 303.449 14:20 | 40,000 53:11 | 50°F 95:10 96:16 |
| 21 A 39:13 | 285 200:22 | 108:7 | 404 113:4 | 500 12:10,19 44:6 |
| 21R 3 9 :15 21B 40:4 | 286.8 40:19 67:11 | 30A 56:7 | 41 71:3 | 50:22 51:16 73:20 |
| 21D 40:4 21C 40:12 | 28A 54:21 | 30B 57:1 | 413 126:12 | 74:24 75:16,19 |
| 210 40:12 21D 40:23 | 29 55:15 117:13 | 30D 57:14 | 419 125:15 | 83:5,15 92:17 |
| 21D 40:23 21E 41:7 | 120:19 | 30th 103:8 | 419-9292 207:22 | 111:3 115:3,7 |
| 21E 41:7 21F 42:10 | 29B 124:17 | 31 51:20 58:12 | 41B 71:10 | 141:8,20 143:2 |
| 21st 3:15,21 | 27D 124.17 2A 13:3 | 125:9 | 42 17:18 71:17 | 147:20 153:12,20 |
| 21 st 5.15,21 22 43:17 | 2B 13:10 | 312 207:22 | 42A 71:22 | 192:20 195:8 |
| 22 43:17 22A 43:19 | 2nd 4:16 | 31A 58:15 | 43 73:5 | 192:20 195:8 |
| 22B 44:11 | 2110 4.10 | 31B 59:10 | 433 125:12 | 500,000 54:19 |
| 22nd 62:4 | 3 | 31C 59:19 60:4 | 44 76:22 78:4 | 50th 106:16 |
| 23 1:1 31:23 45:3 | 3 14:2,19 54:18 | 32 60:11 137:1 | 441 199:6 201:9 | 51 197:15 |
| 118:2 182:19 | 65:7 89:17 140:16 | 321 197:4 | 45 131:5 | 544 201:10 |
| 23°C 161:20 | 140:17 | 32A 126:23,24 | 45-minute 131:6 | 58 24:21 |
| 230 35:4 94:13 | 3,416 158:5 | 32B 128:5 | 45A 81:5 | 58.5 23:23 38:18 |
| 233 143:3 | 3.1°C 104:24 | 33 61:1 | 46A 83:18 | 50.5 25.25 50.10 |
| 23A 45:7 | 3.178 71:5 | 33A 128:15 | 46B 84:19 | 6 |
| 23B 45:17 | 3.187 71:6 129:15 | 34 61:14 129:14 | 47 51:20 85:12 | 6 19:2 58:23 105:18 |
| 23rd 1:8 4:5 | 3:20 187:5 | 34A 61:19 | 47A 85:15 | 60603 207:22 |
| 24 6:21 46:3 52:1 | 30 17:23 56:2 125:8 | 34B 62:6 | 47C 87:11 88:7 | 62.230 140:17 |
| 60:5 118:21 | 140:16 205:15 | 34C 62:23 | 48 16:23 18:20 | 65 38:19 65:2 66:23 |
| 24-hour 7:5 | 300 39:11 65:2 | 35 13:1,13 43:21 | 60:22 88:22 | 115:21 137:1 |
| 244 200:24 | 66:22 115:20 | 63:17 64:4,8,12 | 48-hour 18:24 | 67 153:15 |
| 25 41:21 47:2 | 201:13,19 | 106:17 185:7 | 60:12 | 6th 4:6 205:12 |
| 25,000 53:24 | 302.208(a) 13:2,13 | 355 106:18 | 49 89:8 | |
| 25°C 18:5 19:18 | 302.208(b) 14:7,14 | 35B 66:1 | | 7 |
| 31:23 40:22 55:23 | 302.208(e) 43:23 | 365 29:22,22 30:5 | 5 | 7 16:13 18:20 19:12 |
| 56:20 58:5 62:13 | 44:8,14 | 36A 66:16 | 5 14:16 27:23 28:2 | 98:6 204:12 |
| 62:21 68:2 97:7 | 302.208(g) 3:17 | 36B 67:4 | 28:4 30:13 68:2 | 7.308 129:21 |
| 119:24 121:9 | 43:22 | 37 67:23 | 97:23 119:4 | 7.5 68:2 |
| | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | | | 10190 111 |
|----------------------------|---|---|-----------|
| | 1 | I | I |
| 704 126:14 | | | |
| 728 201:5 | | | |
| 757 36:14 | | | |
| 75th 48:1,18 103:8 | | | |
| 103:16 104:9,21 | | | |
| 105:20 106:15,16 | | | |
| 77.4 199:3 | | | |
| 798.5 201:21 | | | |
| | | | |
| 7A 16:18 | | | |
| 7B 18:19 | | | |
| | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 8 19:16 199:1 | | | |
| 207:21 | | | |
| 8.8°C 105:1 | | | |
| 80 185:4 | | | |
| 817 200:17 | | | |
| 84 38:17 154:10,14 | | | |
| 86 16:9 | | | |
| 86.8 40:20 67:12,16 | | | |
| | | | |
| 87 15:12 | | | |
| 89 21:21 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| | | | |
| 9 20:9 99:12 | | | |
| 9.3°C 103:9 | | | |
| 90 196:18,24 | | | |
| 91 23:5 | | | |
| 92 23:6 197:11 | | | |
| 94 112:17 117:1 | | | |
| 95 20:3 113:3 117:5 | | | |
| 160:5 200:6,13 | | | |
| 96 60:24 | | | |
| 96-hour 15:15 | | | |
| | | | |
| 16:23 17:2 18:20 | | | |
| 18:24 20:4 56:20 | | | |
| 60:12 68:7 183:17 | | | |
| 184:8 | | | |
| 97 23:7 38:16 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 1 | • | |