

1 BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

2 Volume II

3 IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
 4 WOOD FURNITURE COATING ) R97-31  
 AMENDMENTS TO 35 ILL. ADM. ) (Rulemaking-Air)  
 5 CODE PARTS 211, 218, AND 219 )  
 SUBPART F )

6

7

8 The following is the transcript of a  
 9 hearing held in the above-entitled matter, taken  
 10 stenographically by Caryl L. Hardy, CSR, a Notary  
 11 Public within and for the County of Cook and State  
 12 of Illinois, before Audrey Lozuk-Lawless, Hearing  
 13 Officer, at 100 West Randolph Street, Room 9-031,  
 14 Chicago, Illinois, on the 13th day of August 1997,  
 15 A.D. Commencing at the hour of 1:00 p.m.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2 HEARING TAKEN BEFORE:  
3 ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD,  
4 100 West Randolph Street  
5 Suite 11-500  
6 Chicago, Illinois 60601  
7 (312) 814-4925  
8 BY: MS. AUDREY LUZUK-LAWLESS

9  
10 ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

11 Ms. Kathleen M. Hennessey  
12  
13 Mr. Anad Rao

14  
15 ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY MEMBERS  
16 PRESENT:

17 Ms. Christina L. Archer  
18  
19 Mr. David E. Bloomberg  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1	I N D E X	
2		
3	GREETING BY HEARING OFFICER	4
4	GREETING BY MS. HENNESSEY	4
5	OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. ARCHER	6
6	TESTIMONY BY MR. BLOOMBERG	10
7	QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION	12
8	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY HEARING OFFICER	24
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Good morning and welcome.  
2 My name is Audrey Lozuk-Lawless, and I'm the hearing  
3 officer in this matter entitled Wood Furniture  
4 Coating, Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 211, 218,  
5 and 219 Subpart F. This proposal is docketed as  
6 R97-31. It's an air rulemaking, which was submitted  
7 to the board by the Illinois Environmental  
8 Protection Agency on June 3rd, 1997.

9 The board did conduct the first hearing in  
10 this matter on Tuesday, August 5th in Edwardsville,  
11 Illinois. At that time, there was one member of the  
12 public present. That would be Mark Homer from CICI,  
13 as well as the agency. At that time, the board  
14 member, Dr. Ronald Flemal, asked questions, as well  
15 as did Mr. Homer.

16 Today on behalf of the board is board  
17 member Kathleen Hennessey seated to my right.

18 MS. HENNESSEY: Good afternoon.

19 THE HEARING OFFICER: And seated to my left on  
20 behalf of the board is our environmental scientist,  
21 Anad Rao.

22 Today is the second and final hearing in  
23 this rulemaking, and what will happen today is the  
24 agency will go ahead and give an opening statement,

1 and that will be followed by a summary of the  
2 prefiled testimony of Mr. David Bloomberg.

3           Seeing that there is only one new member in  
4 the audience today who is already on service list,  
5 if there is anyone else that you know of that wants  
6 to be on the service list or the notice list, please  
7 contact me at the board, or you may sign their name  
8 up at the back of the room.

9           The service list persons receive copies of  
10 any orders that the board or I, as the hearing  
11 officer, put out in this matter, as well as any  
12 prefiled testimony. Considering that there would be  
13 no additional prefiled testimony, if there were any  
14 posthearing briefs, then you would also receive  
15 copies of those. Persons on the notice list only  
16 receive copies of the board's orders and the hearing  
17 officer orders.

18           Any information which is relevant and not  
19 repetitious will be admitted into the record today.  
20 This hearing will be conducted pursuant to the  
21 board's rulemaking procedures. If there is anyone  
22 in the audience who would like to ask a question of  
23 Mr. Bloomberg, please raise your hand, and I will  
24 call on you. You can stand and state your name for

1 the record, as well as any agency that you may  
2 represent.

3 Ms. Hennessey, would you like to say  
4 anything for the record?

5 MS. HENNESSEY: Just thanks for being here, and  
6 let's get started.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

8 The counsel for the Illinois Environmental  
9 Protection Agency is Ms. Tina Archer.

10 Ms. Archer?

11 MS. ARCHER: Good afternoon. My name is  
12 Christina Archer, and I'm an assistant counsel the  
13 Bureau of Air Regulatory Unit with the Respondent,  
14 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. With me  
15 today is Mr. David Bloomberg of the Air Quality and  
16 Planning Section of the Illinois Environmental  
17 Protection Agency.

18 The purpose of this hearing today is to  
19 amend Illinois' air pollution control requirements  
20 at 35 Ill. Adm. Code Parts 218 and 219 Subpart F  
21 regarding wood furniture coating operations, as well  
22 as adding definitions related to wood furniture  
23 coating and 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 211.

24 As indicated by the hearing officer, this

1 is the second hearing. The first hearing was held  
2 in Edwardsville, Illinois, on August 5th, 1997.

3 This rulemaking proposal is being submitted  
4 to the Illinois Pollution Control Board pursuant to  
5 Section 27 of the Illinois Environmental Protection  
6 Act, as well as Federal Clean Act requirements.

7 Section 182(b)2 of the Clean Air Act as  
8 amended in 1990 requires Illinois to submit a  
9 revision to its state implementation plan to include  
10 provisions to require the implementation of  
11 reasonably available control technology, or RACT,  
12 for each category of volatile organic material, or  
13 VOM sources, covered by a controlled techniques  
14 guideline or CTG document.

15 Pursuant to Section 183 of the Clean Air  
16 Act, wood furniture coating operations are one of  
17 the 11 stationary source categories of VOM emissions  
18 for which a CTG must be issued by U.S. EPA.

19 On May 20th, 1996, U.S. EPA published its  
20 final CTG for wood furniture coating operations.  
21 This proposal is intended to satisfy Illinois'  
22 adoption of RACT rules required to be developed in  
23 response to the CTG.

24 In developing this rulemaking proposal, the

1 Illinois EPA sent outreach packages to potentially  
2 affected facilities, U.S. EPA, and trade  
3 associations and offered to meet with any entity to  
4 discuss this rulemaking. Illinois has not received  
5 any comments on the proposal to date.

6           The rulemaking itself affects both the  
7 Chicago and the metro east St. Louis ozone  
8 nonattainment areas. The Illinois EPA believes that  
9 approximately 27 facilities are affected in the  
10 Chicago nonattainment area and has not identified  
11 any affected sources in this metro east  
12 nonattainment area.

13           The compliance date for the rulemaking is  
14 March 15th, 1998. The rulemaking will change the  
15 limits for topcoats and sealers only, and those  
16 limits will be measured in pounds of VOM per pounds  
17 of solid. This is a different unit of measurement  
18 than what the current rule requires, which is pounds  
19 of VOM per gallon of coating.

20           Effective sources may also elect to use an  
21 averaging approach and still add on controls or may  
22 use a combination of these methods to achieve  
23 compliance. All other coatings may continue to be  
24 utilized at their current levels and in their



1 current units of measurement.

2 In addition, several work practice and  
3 recordkeeping reporting requirements have been added  
4 to the current rule pursuant to the CTG.

5 As stated earlier, Mr. David Bloomberg of  
6 our Air Quality and Planning Section is with me  
7 today. Mr. Bloomberg prepared the technical support  
8 document for this rulemaking proposal. The Illinois  
9 EPA has also prefiled Mr. Bloomberg's testimony in  
10 this matter, and the prefiled testimony has already  
11 been entered into the record at the first hearing as  
12 Exhibit 1, I believe.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: That's right.

14 MS. ARCHER: Mr. Bloomberg has also prepared a  
15 short summary he would like to read, and he will  
16 also respond to some questions raised at the first  
17 hearing.

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

19 Would you please swear in the witness?

20 (Witness sworn.)

21

22

23

24

1 WHEREUPON,

2                   DAVID E. BLOOMBERG,  
3 called as a witness herein, having been first duly  
4 sworn, was examined upon oral interrogatories, and  
5 testified as follows:

6           MR. BLOOMBERG: Good afternoon. My name is  
7 David Bloomberg. I'm employed by the Illinois  
8 Environmental Protection Agency as an environmental  
9 protection engineer in the ozone regulatory unit of  
10 the Air Quality Planning Section, Division of Air  
11 Quality, Bureau of Air.

12           I have been employed by the Illinois EPA in  
13 this capacity for over five and a half years. My  
14 responsibilities include development of the ozone  
15 precursor emissions inventory for stationary sources  
16 and preparation of technical support for proposed  
17 ozone regulations.

18           My academic credentials include a Bachelor  
19 of Science degree in ceramic engineering at the  
20 University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.

21           As part of the assignments in my current  
22 position, I prepared the technical support document,  
23 or TSD, for the proposed regulation regarding wood  
24 furniture coating operations.

1           The Illinois EPA is proposing that the  
2 board adopt changes in the wood furniture coating  
3 rules corresponding to requirements in U.S. EPA's  
4 control techniques guidelines, or CTG, for this  
5 category.

6           CTG was developed through a consensus  
7 process involving members of industry, environmental  
8 groups, states, and local agencies. My presubmitted  
9 written testimony summarizes the findings from the  
10 TSD.

11           During the previous hearing in  
12 Edwardsville, Mr. Homer of the Chemical Industries  
13 Council of Illinois asked about that assuming that  
14 the Illinois EPA used in evaluating the coatings  
15 being used by wood furniture coaters. I will answer  
16 that question now.

17           Illinois EPA relied on information provided  
18 by Paul Almodavar of U.S. EPA. Mr. Almodavar was  
19 the technical contact and main author for the wood  
20 furniture coating CTG.

21           He provided the information that some  
22 members of the reg-neg team had used while  
23 developing the CTG limits. This information relied  
24 on solvent densities ranging from 7.0 to 8.0 and

1 solid densities of 9.5 and 10.5.

2 This provided a range of VOM content  
3 volumes which Illinois EPA compared to coating VOM  
4 content information found in the CAP applications  
5 for wood furniture coating sources.

6 Also, during the previous hearing,  
7 Dr. Flemal asked about industry's agreement with the  
8 new units of measurement for VOM limits on topcoats  
9 and sealers. I discussed this further with  
10 Mr. Almodavar since that hearing, and he informed me  
11 that industry was the proponent for the new units to  
12 which U.S. EPA agreed.

13 I am now available to answer any additional  
14 questions regarding the TSD and my testimony.

15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,  
16 Mr. Bloomberg.

17 Are there any questions from any members of  
18 the audience for Mr. Bloomberg?

19 Yes. Could you please state your name for  
20 the record?

21 MR. DOLAN: Sure. Last name is Dolan. First  
22 name is David. That's D-o-l-a-n. I'm a coating  
23 manufacturer.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

1 MR. DOLAN: The 27 that was mentioned earlier,  
2 I don't think by yourself -- the 27 facilities  
3 affected in the metro Chicago ozone nonattainment  
4 area, what is the threshold limit of emissions that  
5 triggers them being affected?

6 MR. BLOOMBERG: It's 25 tons potential to emit,  
7 which is the same that is in the current rule, so  
8 there is no change of applicability here. If you  
9 are affected by the current rules, you will be  
10 affected by the new rules. If you are not, you  
11 won't.

12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any other questions?

13 MR. DOLAN: No.

14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

15 Mr. Homer?

16 MR. HOMER: I just have a couple of questions.  
17 My name is Mark Homer with the Chemical Industry  
18 Council of Illinois.

19 Is it true that during the reg-neg process  
20 that U.S. EPA and industry agree to regulate only  
21 topcoat and sealers?

22 MR. BLOOMBERG: That was the agreement for the  
23 CTG, yes.

24 MR. HOMER: In Illinois, opaque stain,

1 nontopcoat pigmented coat, repair coat,  
2 semi-transparent stain, and wash coat are all  
3 currently regulated; is that correct?

4 MR. BLOOMBERG: Yes, it is.

5 MR. HOMER: Can you give me Illinois EPA's  
6 perspective on whether or not it would be  
7 appropriate due to the fact that the reg-neg process  
8 did not indicate these types of coatings should be  
9 regulated, whether or not it would be appropriate to  
10 remove the current regulatory burden placed on those  
11 particular coatings?

12 MR. BLOOMBERG: We did not feel it would be  
13 appropriate for several reasons. One is that it  
14 could be considered backsliding. We would have a  
15 regulation in place that it appears almost everybody  
16 or everybody is complying with, and removing that  
17 would allow for people to emit more VOM emissions.

18 Because it is in the current rule and we do  
19 not know of any serious problems complying with  
20 that -- with those rules, we see -- we saw no reason  
21 to remove it and, therefore, like I said, allow  
22 additional VOM emissions.

23 We believe that although we have not  
24 actually checked, Region 5 of U.S. EPA may also

1 consider it backsliding, and additionally, because  
2 of the increased VOM emissions, it would hurt the  
3 rate of progress, three percent that were going to  
4 have to continue to reduce and, of course,  
5 eventually coming into attainment.

6 MR. HOMER: Thank you. That's all I have.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,  
8 Mr. Homer.

9 Yes. Could you please state your name for  
10 the record?

11 MR. CASTANARES: My name is Rizalino  
12 Castanares.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Could you spell that?

14 MR. CASTANARES: Rizalino Castanares,  
15 C-a-s-t-a-n-a-r-e-s.

16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Castanares.

17 MR. CASTANARES: I have just one simple question  
18 maybe I can just follow-up on. Is there any  
19 difference between the CTG regulation and the NESHAP  
20 regulation, and if there is, can you tell us what  
21 the difference is?

22 MR. BLOOMBERG: I'm sorry.

23 Is there any difference between the NESHAP  
24 and the CTG, was that the question?

1 MR. CASTANARES: Yes.

2 MR. BLOOMBERG: Well, the NESHAP only covers  
3 HAPs, hazardous air pollutants, whereas the CTG  
4 covers all VOM.

5 So, for example, if you were -- and many  
6 wood furniture coaters will be affected by both, and  
7 they were developed together by U.S. EPA and the  
8 reg-neg.

9 So, for example, you won't find work  
10 practices in ones that aren't in the other in  
11 general. But -- actually, let me backtrack on that  
12 a little.

13 You will find some in the NESHAP that are  
14 not in our rules because we felt it would be  
15 redundant to put them in our rules when they were  
16 aimed at the NESHAP.

17 Because the NESHAP only covers hazardous  
18 air pollutants, it's possible for somebody to  
19 convert their coatings away from hazardous air  
20 pollutants, but still use VOM material, and so the  
21 CTG covers all VOM, whether they are HAPs or  
22 non-HAP.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you have any follow-up,  
24 Mr. Castanares?



1 MR. CASTANARES: The limits for NESHAP and CTG,  
2 are they the same, or are they different?

3 MR. BLOOMBERG: I'm not entirely sure. I would  
4 have to check, but again, the limits -- you really  
5 can't compare the limits because one is a limit on  
6 HAP content, and one is a limit on all VOM content.

7 So I'm not sure if, for example, they're  
8 both .8 or something like that, but once again, one  
9 covers only HAPs, and the other covers all VOM.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Dolan?

11 MR. DOLAN: One additional question, and I'm  
12 looking at Page 18 of the Illinois Register Notice  
13 of Proposed Amendments. There are several options  
14 that are listed.

15 MS. HENNESSEY: Do you have a section number?

16 MR. DOLAN: Actually, this might be a  
17 condensed. Maybe you can just answer the question  
18 without looking at the page. There are options for  
19 topcoats in terms of kilogram VOM per kilogram  
20 solids of .8.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: Excuse me, Mr. Dolan. Is  
22 it 218.204?

23 MS. ARCHER: Yes. It's Page 18 of our notice of  
24 proposed amendments 218.

1 MR. DOLAN: Just by way of clarification, Option  
2 A, which lists topcoat, I'm inferring from that that  
3 if the topcoat meets the .8 criterion that the  
4 subsequent coatings can meet the current reg, and  
5 that would include sealers at 5.6?

6 MR. BLOOMBERG: Actually, if the topcoat meets  
7 the .8, there is no limit for sealers. All of the  
8 others still have to meet the same requirements that  
9 are in the rules currently.

10 We are changing the topcoat and sealer  
11 limits. Those are the only ones that are being  
12 changed, and pursuant to the CTG, they basically  
13 said either you can do a topcoat that has very low  
14 VOM and not worry at all about the sealer, or you  
15 can use one of these combinations, topcoat sealer  
16 combinations. They apparently believe those were  
17 equivalent.

18 MR. DOLAN: So if you elected to comply with  
19 Option A, it's virtually carte blanche with sealer  
20 except that you would still comply with the  
21 NESHAP?

22 MR. BLOOMBERG: Correct.

23 MR. DOLAN: And one additional question  
24 regarding Option Top B, there is small Roman

1 numerals I through -- or 1 through 4. The nonacid  
2 curette versus the acid currette, I presume, implies  
3 some degree of heat so that if you are using the  
4 force dry system --

5 MR. BLOOMBERG: To be honest, I'm not entirely  
6 sure.

7 MR. DOLAN: Because these are the same products,  
8 and I'm wondering why you are so graceful with  
9 limits on some and not others.

10 MR. BLOOMBERG: Basically, those are directly  
11 out of the CTG, which are directly out of the  
12 reg-neg. So I would have to check and see if there  
13 was a heat involved in those.

14 MR. DOLAN: Thank you.

15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

16 Mr. Bloomberg, is that something that you  
17 would want to put into the record after the  
18 hearing?

19 MS. ARCHER: We will address that at comments.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

21 Mr. Castanares?

22 MR. CASTANARES: I see all the limits like  
23 for -- specific limits for opaque stain, topcoats,  
24 repair coats, and wash coats, but under the Illinois

1 rules, would averaging be still applicable to these  
2 limits?

3           If I meet some and I don't meet the others,  
4 could I average out all the --

5           MR. BLOOMBERG: When you say still, actually,  
6 averaging -- except for specific cross line  
7 averaging, which is a separate section of this rule,  
8 of the overall coating rules, the only thing you can  
9 do right now really is in line averaging.

10           But this rule does have an averaging  
11 provision. 218, 215 does have an equation --  
12 actually, several equations regarding averaging, and  
13 it does allow for averaging of the different  
14 coatings.

15           In return for the averaging, you have to  
16 meet .9 of the overall standards. So it's not a  
17 direct average. It's a 90 percent of everything,  
18 and that also is directly out of the CTG, which is  
19 out of regulatory negotiation.

20           THE HEARING OFFICER: And I might add,  
21 Mr. Castanares, that if you would like a copy of  
22 the agency's proposal, you can obtain that from the  
23 board in a disk form if you wanted to look  
24 specifically at all of those equations as well.

1 You can just contact the board's office.

2 MS. ARCHER: We have actually got additional  
3 copies here today we would be happy to provide you  
4 with.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Are there any further  
6 questions from anyone in the audience of  
7 Mr. Bloomberg?

8 Mr. Rao?

9 MR. RAO: I have just one question. Actually,  
10 Dr. Flemal may have asked you this question, but he  
11 asked me to ask you one more time. This question  
12 deals the U.S. EPA deadline for this rulemaking. I  
13 think in their Federal Register announcement that  
14 said that these RACT follow must be adopted by May  
15 20th, 1997, and we wanted the agency to comment on  
16 the implications of adopting this rule after the  
17 date set by the federal U.S. EPA.

18 MR. BLOOMBERG: After the -- well, obviously we  
19 have already passed that.

20 MR. RAO: Yes. We are passed the date, so is  
21 there any other --

22 MR. BLOOMBERG: It was a very short time period  
23 because they were -- the reg-neg took somewhat  
24 longer than they expected, and it was a short time

1 period, and that was complicated by the fact that  
2 the date did not appear in the first Federal  
3 Register notice.

4           The notice that it appeared in was in  
5 September. The overage notice, I believe, appeared  
6 in May 20th of '96. So we didn't even know we had  
7 this deadline until the end of September.

8           There shouldn't be any implications if the  
9 rule is adopted. U.S. EPA Region 5 is aware that we  
10 were in the board hearing process now, and so I  
11 don't foresee any implications if the rule is  
12 adopted. It has the necessary parts, and it has the  
13 proper compliance date.

14         MS. ARCHER: And our compliance date, if I may  
15 add, will be before the compliance date as specified  
16 in the Federal Register.

17         MR. RAO: That's the May 28th, 1998, date?

18         MS. ARCHER: Right. We are asking that the rule  
19 have an effective date of March 15th, 1998.  
20 Compliance date, I'm sorry.

21         THE HEARING OFFICER: The Federal Register that  
22 they are referring was admitted as Exhibit Number 2  
23 in the first hearing in Edwardsville. That's the  
24 Federal Register, Volume 61, Number 189 of Friday,

1 September 27th, 1996, Page 50823.

2 MR. RAO: Thank you.

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Mr. Castanares?

4 MR. CASTANARES: What are the implications of  
5 this rulemaking relative to the Title 5 applications  
6 that are already in the agency's hands?

7 MR. BLOOMBERG: As I understand it -- and I will  
8 preface this by saying I do not work in the permit  
9 sections.

10 As I understand it, what will be necessary  
11 is that you submit simply a change form. There are  
12 forms that you submit to say that this has changed  
13 or that has changed. So once the rule becomes  
14 effective, as I understand, you will have to submit  
15 such a form to our permit section saying that you  
16 are subject to the new limits. So I don't -- I hope  
17 that won't be too big of an effort.

18 MR. CASTANARES: Who is going to initiate the  
19 amendment process? You said the agency?

20 MR. BLOOMBERG: No. I believe you are  
21 responsible. As I understand it, you are  
22 responsible for that, and certainly what would  
23 happen if you didn't is since the permit section is  
24 in the process of reviewing those Title 5

1 applications now, they are aware of this rule, and  
2 if they open up the permit application and see that  
3 your information still is focused on the older rule,  
4 then, certainly they will contact you.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any further questions for  
6 Mr. Bloomberg?

7 Thank you, Mr. Bloomberg.

8 Is there anyone in the audience that would  
9 like to give testimony on the record today with  
10 regard to this proposal?

11 If you would like to in the future provide  
12 comments to the board on this proposal, I believe  
13 that the record will close at approximately  
14 September 20th.

15 If you would like to provide public  
16 comment, please address those comments to the clerk  
17 of the board noting that this is Rulemaking R97-31.  
18 The address for the board is James R. Thompson  
19 Center, 100 West Randolph, Suite 11-500, Chicago,  
20 60601.

21 If you could, please contact me before you  
22 submit those to the board so that I could give you  
23 an updated service list. All comments need to be  
24 filed on those persons listed on the service list.



1 I believe there are approximately five people on the  
2 service list right now, so I don't think that will  
3 be too onerous.

4           If you would like to sign up for the  
5 service list and you haven't done so since some  
6 people did arrive after my introductory statements,  
7 the lists are on the back of the table right there.  
8 Please just sign your name and address.

9           As I mentioned, this is the last hearing in  
10 this matter. If you would like to request any  
11 additional hearings, please consult the board's  
12 procedural rules and file any motion with the board  
13 stating the reasons why you would like to do so.  
14 And if you need any copies of the proposal, please  
15 see Ms. Archer today.

16           When the board does, if they do go to first  
17 notice on this proposal, it would be put on the  
18 board's Web page, and you could down load that free  
19 of charge. If you want any copies of any of the  
20 filings from the board, it's 75 cents per page after  
21 the first filing.

22           Are there any other comments from anyone  
23 today?

24           Seeing none, then I would like to thank

1 everyone for coming, and this hearing is adjourned.

2 (Whereupon, the hearing was  
3 adjourned at 1:25 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 )  
2 COUNTY OF C O O K )

3

4 I, CARYL L. HARDY, CSR, do hereby state  
5 that I am a court reporter doing business in the  
6 City of Chicago, County of Cook, and State of  
7 Illinois; that I reported by means of machine  
8 shorthand the proceedings held in the foregoing  
9 cause, and that the foregoing is a true and correct  
10 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as  
11 aforesaid.

12

13

14

15

\_\_\_\_\_  
CARYL L. HARDY, CSR  
Notary Public, Cook County, IL.

16

17

18

19

20 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
before me this \_\_\_\_\_day  
21 of \_\_\_\_\_, A.D., 1997

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

22

23

24