ORIGINAL

ILLINOIS POLLUTION	CONTROL BOARD
February 24	, 2005
IN THE MATTER OF:)
CITGO PETROLEUM CORPORATION and PDV MIDWEST REFINING, L.L.C.,)))
Petitioners,)
vs.) PCB 05-85
)
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL)
PROTECTION AGENCY,)
)
Respondent)

Report of proceedings had at the Illinois

Pollution Control Board Hearing, held at 100 West

Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois, on the 24th day of

February, A.D., 2005, commencing at the hour of

9:00 a.m.

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Mr. Bradley P. Halloran
3	Mr. Anana Rao Ms. Alisa Liu, P.E. (Illinois Dollution Control Boord)
4	100 West Randolph Street
5	Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 814-8917
6	(312) 814 8917
7	Mr. Jeffrey C. Fort Ms. Letissa Carver Reid (Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal, LLP)
8	233 South Wacker Drive Suite 8000
9	Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 876-2380
10	Mr. James A. Dav
11	Mr. Darin E. LeCrone Mr. Scott A. Twait
12	(Illinois Environmental Protection Agency)
13	Springfield, Illinois 62794 (217) 782-0610
14	ALCO DREGENT, Ma Brigitte Doctel
15	Mr. James E. Huff, P.E. Mr. Claude W. Harmon
16	Ms. Stacy Ford
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Page 2

1	INDEX	Page 3
2		
3	WITNESS	PAGE
4		
5	MR. CLAUDE W. HARMON	
6	Examination by Ms. Carver Reid	17
7		
8	MR. JAMES E. HUFF, P.E.	
9	Examination by Ms. Carver Reid	27
10		
11	EXHIBITS	
12		
13	PETITIONERS' EXHIBIT	PAGE
14	No. 1 through 15	18
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

 \bigcirc

Page 4 1 MR. HALLORAN: We're on the record. Good morning, everybody. My name is Bradley 2 3 Halloran. I'm a hearing officer with the Illinois Pollution Control Board, also 4 5 assigned to this matter. It's entitled --6 It's PCB 05-85, CITGO Petroleum Corporation and PDV Midwest Refining, L.L.C., are the 7 petitioners, vs. The Illinois Environmental 8 9 Protection Agency, the respondent. 10 Today is February 24th, 2005. It's approximately 9:05. I don't see any 11 12 members of the public here that are not affiliated with the parties, so we'll move 13 I do want to introduce Ms. Alisa Liu and 14 on. 15 Anand Rao from my technical unit. 16 MS. FORD: I'm not affiliated with a 17 party. MR. HALLORAN: And you're from Exxon? 18 19 MS. FORD: Mobil. 20 MR. HALLORAN: Mobil. But you're a 21 member -- Okay. Fine. And your name? 22 MS. FORD: Stacy Ford. 23 MR. HALLORAN: F-O-R-D? 24 Ms. FORD: F-O-R-D.

1	Page5 MR. HALLORAN: Do you wish to make any
2	kind of public comment or statement?
3	MS. FORD: No.
4	MR. HALLORAN: Thank you. We're going
5	to run this hearing pursuant to Section 104,
6	Subpart B, and Section 101, Subpart F, of the
7	Board's procedural provisions. I also want
8	to note for the record that this hearing was
9	properly noticed. This hearing is intended
10	to develop a record for the Pollution Control
11	Board. I will not be making the ultimate
12	decision in this case. I'm here to rule on
13	any evidentiary matters and make sure the
14	hearing goes without a hitch.
15	With that said But I do want to
16	note that this hearing has been changed from
17	Room 11-512. We are now in Room 5-85, and
18	it's been properly noticed all through the
19	hallway. And I apologize we had to change
20	rooms; I didn't realize this many people were
21	going to show. This is beyond my
22	expectations from the parties. But in any
23	event, here we are. I apologize for the
24	tight quarters.

Page 6 But with that said, would the 1 parties like to introduce themselves? 2 Ms. Carver Reid? 3 MS. CARVER REID: Letissa Carver Reid 4 5 and Jeffrey Fort of the law firm Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal, 8000 Sears 6 Tower, Chicago 60606, on behalf of the 7 petitioners, CITGO Petroleum Corp. and PDV 8 9 Midwest Refining, L.L.C. MR. HALLORAN: Thank you. Mr. Day? 10 MR. DAY: James Day. I'm from the 11 12 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, division of legal counsel, representing the 13 14 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. We 15 have here, also on behalf of the Agency, 16 Mr. Darin LeCrone and Mr. Scott Twait. MR. HALLORAN: Thank you very much. 17 18 We'll just proceed as a normal hearing in this matter. Mr. Fort has suggested he wants 19 to do an opening, and, Mr. Day, you have the 20 21 opportunity as well. 2.2 Mr. Fort? 23 MR. FORT: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer. CITGO -- Or the petitioners, CITGO 24

1	and PDV Midwest, appreciate the opportunity
2	to be before the Board and the Agency and
3	working with both agencies on this project.
4	The variance that we are seeking
5	is part of a significant project by CITGO for
6	environmental improvement. As the record
7	shows, CITGO has entered into a consent
8	agreement with U.S. EPA in four states,
9	including Illinois. The Lemont Refinery is
10	among three of the refineries covered by this
11	consent decree.
12	The consent decree calls for
13	significant emission reductions from these
14	sources owned and/or operated by CITGO and
15	related entities. A major part of the
16	substantial reduction in sulfur dioxide and
17	nitrous oxide emissions required in that
18	consent decree will come at the Lemont
19	Refinery. So this project, overall project,
20	has a significant environmental benefit to
21	the people of the State of Illinois, and
22	CITGO is firmly committed to meeting its
23	obligations under that consent decree.
24	This variance deals with total

Page 8 dissolved solids in the wastewater and is required only because of additions of total dissolved solids to the Chicago Ship Canal and Illinois River that arise completely separate from and independent of the present or future discharges of TDS by the CITGO Lemont Refinery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

CITGO has included a substantial 8 9 amount of equipment in its design and 10 adjusted its design to minimize the environmental effects of its wastewater 11 12 discharges from the wet gas scrubber, which 13 is the principal air emission reduction 14 technology being employed under the consent decree. CITGO has been able to modify the 15 16 design and to achieve compliance with all 17 other wastewater parameters except for total dissolved solids. And the TDS issue is not 18 19 caused by CITGO or the consent decree, but by the snowmelt from road deicing activities. 20

As the Board knows, the test for variance relief is whether or not the burden on the petitioner outweighs the adverse effect on the public. Here we believe the

1	Page9 record will show that there is no adverse
2	effect on the public as a result of grant of
3	this variance, yet there would be a
4	substantial burden on the petitioner if this
5	variance is not granted.
6	There is no adverse effect from
7	the sulfate or TDS levels that are projected
8	to result from the wet gas scrubber. IEPA,
9	in fact, is evaluating doing a water quality
10	rule change in light of these findings, which
11	we've included as Exhibit 10 to our evidence
12	here.
13	The relative effect of the TDS
14	discharge here is within the sampling
15	sensitivity of the instrumentation to sample
16	for TDS. We can do a mass balance
17	calculation, and we know that due to
18	snowmelt, there had been elevated levels of
19	TDS in the Illinois River. One cannot model
20	and verify it just because of the variability
21	in the sampling instruments. And Jim Huff's
22	testimony will address that further.
23	Most importantly, there's no
24	practical alternative to avoid the TDS and

Page 10 1 the discharge from the wet gas scrubber. We approached IEPA about doing a deep well 2 3 injection, and that was rejected. CITGO investigated sewering the discharge either to 4 the MSD, who told us they did not have the 5 capacity to handle the discharge, and the 6 existing wastewater treatment plant at the 7 refinery also does not have the capability of 8 handling this discharge from the wet gas 9 10 scrubber. Existing tankage at the refinery 11 12 is not adequate nor available during the 13 runoff conditions, the very time that there may be an issue in the Illinois River; and 14 that is, in part, due to upgrading of runoff 15 16 patterns in residential developments. Again, 17 Jim Huff's testimony and Exhibit 5 are going 18 to go to those factors. 19 CITGO is under a very tight compliance schedule for the Lemont Refinery 20 and subject to stipulated penalties by 21 U.S. EPA in Illinois under the consent decree 22 23 if we do not make that schedule, and the schedule is included as Exhibit 2. 24 Time is

Page 11 lacking to do a refiling of the variance petition with all the details requested even though most of those details have been discussed with the air division and the water permitting division of Illinois EPA before we filed this variance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

We requested a hearing in order to expedite the Board ruling on this request and to stay on schedule under the consent decree. And we do appreciate the Agency and the Board working on this tight schedule with us. We've worked closely with IEPA and believe they will issue a favorable recommendation based upon the additional information and additions provided in this record with respect to this variance petition.

17 All the information that has been 18 provided informally to the Agency is included 19 in our exhibits and testimony today, and I 20 would particularly call your attention to Exhibits 2 through 6. We had several 21 2.2 discussions with the Agency about the 23 conditions for this variance. The language 24 in Exhibit 7 was modified from that presented

in a petition to address the Agency comments. 1 The Board questions anticipated 2 many of the facts that we were going to 3 present. We revised our presentation to be 4 responsive to the specific questions raised 5 by the Board and to the questions raised by 6 the Agency's recommendation. And that comes 7 in the testimony of Mr. Harmon and Mr. Huff. 8 The revised compliance plan 9 10 focuses on a continued monitoring and fine-tuning of the extent of TDS issues in 11 the Illinois River. This provides data that 12 is not otherwise routinely collected by IEPA 13 and we believe will enhance the understanding 14 of the snowmelt conditions. We believe this 15 will provide information that the Agency 16 might not otherwise have the funding to 17 undertake and could lead to better 18 19 understanding of the snowmelt phenomenon and perhaps yield ideas on how to reduce that 20 21 impact. During this time, CITGO will be 22

evaluating ways to restrict its discharge during those events. We project being in

23

24

compliance, through whatever method becomes necessary, within the five-year period of this variance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

To answer a couple of the questions of the Board, the relief is just for TDS, total dissolved solids, not for sulfates. The refinery address is 135th Street and New Avenue in Lemont. Before the site-specific rule change was adopted, the refinery, then owned by Unical (phonetic), underwent a series of variances relating to ammonia nitrogen. Those variances led to and were resolved by the site-specific effluent standard at 35 Illinois Administrative Code 304.213 for ammonia nitrogen, which were adopted in rule-making proceedings, R84-13, R93-8, and R98-14.

Last of all, we would ask the Agency to confirm that they support the variance and the conditions being presented today based on this record.

22MR. HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Fort.23Mr. Day?24MR. DAY: I would like to take this

opportunity to clarify some of the procedural history and how that relates to the Agency's current position with respect to the petition. At this point, at the opening of the hearing, I am unable to grant Mr. Fort's request that the Agency state its support for the petition.

Page 14

As required by the Illinois Environmental Protection Act and the rules promulgated thereunder, our agency did 10 11 complete a review of this petition, and we found two marked defects that prevented us from recommending that the petition be The first of those, which of course granted. was noted in our recommendation for denial, was that the consent order relied upon for the justifications for seeking this variance did not appear to be final or entered by a court as the petition stood as filed. Secondly, the compliance plan included in the petition was lacking. That compliance plan appeared at pages 11 and 12

of the original petition.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Based on those two issues, as

Page 15 Mr. Fort described, we've been in 1 2 communication with the applicant, the petitioner, for many weeks now; and we have 3 4 had the opportunity to negotiate and review all of the evidence and testimony which is 5 expected to be provided today. 6 Assuming that those exhibits meet 7 with our expectations and the testimony 8 follows what we've been led to expect, it is 9 10 a safe presumption that at the close of 11 today's hearing, our agency will be in support of this petition. 12 13 MR. HALLORAN: Okay. Thank you. And with that said, I do want to 14 add that our technical unit has been 15 feverishly wading through the prefiled 16 testimony that was filed on February 17th, 17 18 and it may be necessary during the 19 posthearing briefing that they may have 20 additional questions regarding the prefiled 21 testimony or the testimony that's about to take place today. So I just want to let 22 23 everybody know that. 24 With that said, Ms. Carver Reid,

1	Page 16 do you want to address the prefiled
2	testimony?
- 3	MS. CARVER REID: Actually, we'd like
4	to enter the prefiled testimony of Mr. Claude
5	Harmon and Mr. James Huff. have it
6	transcribed into the record as if read here
7	today, so that we can be expeditious in this
, A	matter and avoid delay by reading the actual
0	togtiment that la already been filed into the
10	cescimony chacks arready been fired finco the
ΤŪ	recora.
11	MR. HALLORAN: And you'll give the
12	court reporter a copy of that?
13	MS. CARVER REID: Yes.
14	MR. HALLORAN: Mr. Day, do you have
15	any objection to that?
16	MR. DAY: No, I don't.
17	MR. HALLORAN: Sure. That will be
18	done. We'll give the prefiled testimony to
19	the court reporter, and she can transcribe it
20	into the record as if read.
21	MS. CARVER REID: Actually, I'd like
22	to swear in the witnesses and just have them
23	verify the content of the testimony.
24	MR. HALLORAN: Sure.

Ę

1	Page 17 MS. CARVER REID: Our first witness is
2	going to be Mr. Claude Harmon
2	going to be Mr. Craude Harmon.
3	(Witness sworn.)
4	WHEREUPON:
[_] 5	CLAUDE W. HARMON
6	called as a witness herein, having been first duly
7	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
8	EXAMINATION
9	BY MS. CARVER REID:
10	Q. Mr. Harmon, will you state your name
11	and spell your last name for the record?
12	A. My name is Claude Harmon, H-A-R-M-O-N.
13	Q. By whom are you currently employed?
14	A. CITGO Petroleum Corporation.
15	Q. Will you please state your business
16	address?
17	A. 135th Street and New Avenue, Lemont,
18	Illinois.
19	Q. And the zip code?
20	A. 60439.
21	Q. Mr. Harmon, what is your current title
22	at CITGO?
23	A. I'm the environmental manager at the
24	Lemont Refinery.

Page 18 And how long have you been in that 1 Q. 2 position? Since '94. 3 Α. 4 Q. Was your testimony prefiled in this matter on February 17th, 2005? 5 6 Α. Yes. Is this that same prefiled testimony? 7 Ο. Α. Yes. 8 Do you verify that your prefiled 9 Q. testimony is true and correct? 10 Α. 11 Yes. Exhibits marked 1 through 15 were 12 Q. filed in support of your prefiled testimony. Do you 13 verify that the contents of Exhibit 1 through 15 is 14 15 true and correct? 16 Α. Yes. 17 MS. CARVER REID: At this time we 18 request that the prefiled testimony of Claude 19 Harmon be transcribed into the record as if 20 read. 21 MR. HALLORAN: Any objection, Mr. Day? 22 MR. DAY: No. 23 MR. HALLORAN: So be it. 24

TESTIMONY OF CLAUDE HARMON

1

2	My name is Claude Harmon. My current position
3	is Environmental Manager for the Lemont Refinery. I
4	have had this responsibility since August 1994. I
5	have been in the environmental field for 30 years
6	including 16 years with the Illinois Central
7	Railroad, two years with Morton International and
8	12 years at the Lemont Refinery, which was first
9	owned by UNO-VEN when I began and is now operated by
10	CITGO. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in
11	Environmental Biology from Eastern Illinois
12	University. I am affiliated with various
13	environmental committees. I am a member of the
14	National Petroleum Refiners Association. I am a
15	member of the Illinois Association of Environmental
16	Professionals. I am also a Certified Hazardous
17	Materials Manager with the National Registry of
18	Environmental Professionals.

19 The purpose of my testimony is to describe the 20 current efforts by CITGO and the Lemont Refinery to 21 reduce the Lemont Refinery's air and water 22 emissions. The Illinois Pollution Control Board 23 (the "Board") already is aware of the Lemont 24 Refinery's efforts to achieve the ammonia nitrogen

Page 19

Page 20 1 standard through regulatory proceedings (R84-13, 2 R93-8 and R98-14), which led to the current 3 site-specific limitation for ammonia nitrogen for 4 the Lemont Refinery at 35 IAC 304.213. Last fall, CITGO and PDV Midwest Refining, L.L.C. (collectively 5 referred to as "CITGO") completed negotiations with 6 7 U.S. EPA and the environmental authorities for Illinois, Georgia, Louisiana, and New Jersey to 8 9 substantially reduce emissions of SO2 and NOx, by 23,000 and 7,000 tons respectively, from three 10 11 refineries including the Lemont Refinery and two 12 asphalt plants. For the Lemont Refinery, the estimated SO2 and NOx emission reductions are 15,000 13 14 and 1,100 tons respectively. That agreement was 15 embodied in a consent decree that was approved on January 26, 2005; a copy of that signed consent 16 17 decree is submitted as Exhibit 1.

18 The consent decree includes an ambitious 19 construction and compliance schedule for the Lemont 20 Refinery. To achieve the necessary reductions, the 21 Lemont Refinery must install a wet gas scrubber in 22 the Fluidized Catalytic Cracking Unit ("FCCU"), as 23 well as substantial support equipment and controls. 24 This requires a major construction project extending

approximately 20 months. Exhibit 2 is a copy of the
 compliance schedule for the Lemont Refinery to
 comply with the consent decree. Stipulated
 penalties and other sanctions may be imposed if
 CITGO does not meet the consent decree schedule.

Page 21

As described in our variance petition, to meet 6 the emission requirements of the consent decree, we 7 are installing the wet gas scrubber in the FCCU, as 8 9 well as other equipment at the Lemont Refinery. 10 (See Exhibit 3 (construction permit drawings 11 depicting the new equipment to be installed and a 12 description of the same.)) The result is to increase the amount of total dissolved solids 13 14 ("TDS") in the Lemont Refinery treated wastewater. Exhibit 4 is a copy of the Variance Petition filed 15 in this matter on November 8, 2004, which contains 16 further information. 17

One of the critical path items is to obtain a construction permit from the water division of Illinois Environmental Protection Agency ("IEPA"). Exhibit 5 is a copy of the application for that construction permit. On December 3, 2004, we submitted that construction permit application, consistent with the overall construction schedule.

Page 22 In preliminary conversations with the water division 1 of IEPA, we learned of two critical issues that pose 2 challenges for the consent decree schedule. 3 First, 4 IEPA will not grant the construction permit without 5 also issuing a modified National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit. Second, 6 because there has been an exceedance of the TDS 7 8 standard in the past, in association with snowmelt 9 runoff, carrying road salt and similar compounds into the streams, IEPA could not issue a NPDES 10 permit for this project unless CITGO obtained a 11 12 variance from the Board. Hence, the variance 13 petition was filed soon after the consent decree was 14 announced publicly.

15 The Board has before it that variance petition. 16 I will not repeat what we already have presented in 17 this record. But I will respond to some of the 18 questions propounded by the Board, as well as 19 confirm certain information that we presented to 20 IEPA since we began this petition process.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY

21

(Responses to Board Questions 4a, 4b)
 No specific projects are being developed that
 would increase the production rate, hence there is

Page 23 no impact on the amount of TDS and sulfates 1 2 discharged. 3 The chemical used in the wet gas scrubbing process was described as "Caustic" in the 4 construction permit application submitted to IEPA in 5 December 2004 (Exhibit 5). "Caustic" references a 6 Sodium Hydroxide solution. 7 PROJECTED WATER QUALITY IMPACTS 8 (Responses to Board Questions 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d) 9 10 TDS tests for the wastewater treatment plant 11 ("WWTP") discharge are run on a weekly basis. Below are monthly averages for year 2004: 12 13 Yr 2004 TDS (ppm) 14 January 2493 February 2644 March 15 2183 April 2244 16 May 1977 June 1474 17 July 1680 Auqust 1504 18 September 1699 October 2003 19 November 1948 December 1597 20 21 Sulfate is not a parameter that is routinely tested for the WWTP discharge. 22 23 The proposed design flow rate was described in 24 the construction permit application submitted to

Page 24 IEPA in December 2004 (Exhibit 5). The expected 1 2 concentrations of both TDS and sulfates in the purge 3 water from the wet gas scrubber were described in 4 the construction permit application submitted to 5 IEPA in December 2004 (Exhibit 5). Projected increases in both TDS and sulfates in the discharge 6 7 after the wet gas scrubber begins operation are described in James Huff's December 2004 report 8 9 "Impact of CITGO's Proposed Discharge on Water Quality" (Exhibit 6.) 10 11 DETAILED COMPLIANCE PLAN (Responses to Board Questions 9a, 9b) 12 13 The proposed wet gas scrubber will impact the TDS and sulfate levels in the refinery's effluent 14 15 once the unit becomes operational. The expected concentrations of both TDS and sulfates in the 16 17 discharge are described in James Huff's December 18 2004 report "Impact of CITGO's Proposed Discharge on 19 Water Quality" (Exhibit 6) and the construction 20 permit application submitted to IEPA in December 21 2004 (Exhibit 5).

The negotiated compliance plan, completed to the satisfaction of IEPA, has been submitted to the Board as Exhibit 7. The proposed TDS compliance

Page 25 plan requires that extensive TDS data be taken from 1 the Des Plaines River at the I-55 Bridge during the 2 3 winter months. Following two seasons of stream 4 testing, the Lemont Refinery will be able to size the required holding tank or basin for the wet gas 5 scrubber discharge during periods of high salinity. 6 The project for the retention system would commence 7 by March 1, 2009. The project would be completed by 8 the winter season beginning December 1, 2009. 9 10 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT 11 (Response to Board Question 10f) Currently, the only option for a managed 12 13 release program would entail using the storm water basin ("SWB") for retention. The SWB is used to 14 collect site storm water runoff and drainage from 15 naturally existing waterways. Over the last few 16 years, a pronounced increase in storm water volume 17 18 has occurred due to residential developments near 19 the northwest facility boundary. The runoff from 20 these developments feeds into the naturally existing 21 waterways that terminate within the Lemont Refinery's boundaries and ultimately end up in the 22 23 Due to a special condition in the Groundwater SWB. 24 Management Zone Approval Letter, issued by the

Page 26 1 Bureau of Water Permit section, the SWB water level 2 must be managed below 12'9" due to the groundwater gradient. Because of the existing difficulties 3 associated with managing the water level below 12'9" 4 with the additional burden created by the increased 5 storm water runoff volume from residential 6 developments, to try to retain the wet gas scrubber 7 effluent during periods of snowmelt and deicing 8 9 would not be a viable option at this time. However, 10 strategies to divert the residential runoff prior to 11 crossing the Lemont Refinery boundaries are being pursued. If a diversion project is implemented, 12 retention of the wet gas scrubber effluent (due to 13 14 snowmelt conditions) in the SWB may be feasible. MS. CARVER REID: We have a second 15 16 witness that I'd also like to verify, do the 17 same and verify his testimony as well. 18 MR. HALLORAN: Okay. Do you want to 19 do that now? Or I thought we'd take care of Mr. Harmon first and then -- Let's take care 20 21 of Mr. Harmon first. 22 Do you have any direct, such as it 23 is, of Mr. Harmon? MS. CARVER REID: 24 No, I don't.

1	Page 27 MR. HALLORAN: Mr. Day?
2	MR. DAY: No questions for Mr. Harmon.
3	MR. HALLORAN: I'm going to turn it
4	over to the technical unit, Mr. Rao or
5	Ms. Liu.
6	MR. FORT: If I could just make a
7	point here, it may be that some of the
8	questions that are directed at Mr. Harmon,
9	Mr. Huff is going to be also or maybe even
10	in a better position to answer, because they
11	worked together on this project.
12	MR. HALLORAN: Let's swear him in.
13	(Witness sworn.)
14	WHEREUPON:
15	JAMES E. HUFF, P.E.,
16	called as a witness herein, having been first duly
17	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
18	EXAMINATION
19	BY MS. CARVER REID:
20	Q. Mr. Huff, will you please state your
21	name and spell your last name for the record?
22	A. James E. Huff, H-U-F-F.
23	Q. By whom are you currently employed?
24	A. The consulting firm Huff & Huff, Inc.

1	Q.	Page 28 Will you please state the business
2	address for	Huff & Huff Inc ?
2		
3	А.	512 West Burlington Avenue, LaGrange,
4	Illinois 60	525.
5	Q.	And can you tell us when Huff & Huff,
6	Inc., was fo	ounded?
7	Α.	1979.
8	Q.	Mr. Huff, was your prefiled testimony
9	filed in the	is matter on February 17th, 2005?
10	A.	My understanding, yes.
11	Q.	Is this a copy of that same prefiled
12	testimony?	
13	Α.	Yes, it is.
14	Q.	Do you verify that your prefiled
15	testimony is	s true and correct?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	As you are aware, Exhibits 1 through
18	15 were file	ed in support of your prefiled testimony.
19	Do you verif	Ty that the contents of Exhibits 1
20	through 15 t	is true and correct?
21	А.	To the best of my knowledge, yes.
22		MS. CARVER REID: At this time we
23	reque	est that the prefiled testimony of
24	James	3 E. Huff be transcribed into the record

Г

Page 29 1 as if read. MR. HALLORAN: Mr. Day, any objection? 2 MR. DAY: NO. 3 TESTIMONY OF JAMES E. HUFF 4 My name is James E. Huff. I am Vice President 5 and part owner of Huff & Huff, Inc., an 6 environmental consulting firm founded in 1979. 7 Ι received a Bachelor of Science in Chemical 8 9 Engineering in 1970 from Purdue University and was 10 awarded a Masters of Science in Engineering from the 11 Environmental Engineering Department at Purdue University in 1971. I am a registered Professional 12 13 Engineer in Illinois as well as in New Jersey. 14 I currently serve on the Board of Directors for the American Council of Engineering Companies-IL and 15 16 served three years as Chair of the Illinois 17 Environmental Protection Agency Liaison Committee for the same organization. I also serve on the 18 19 Illinois Statewide Nutrient Science Committee, which is charged with proposing state nutrient standards, 20 21 and am the lead consultant for the Northeastern 22 Illinois Planning Commission ("NIPC") for evaluating 23 Facility Planning Amendment requests for consistency 24 with NIPC's Water Quality Management Plan.

Page 30 My work experience includes two years with 1 2 Mobil Oil as an Advanced Environmental Engineer during the construction and start-up of the Joliet 3 4 Refinery. My responsibilities at the Joliet 5 Refinery included the construction oversight and 6 start-up of the wastewater treatment facilities, 7 technical support for the wastewater treatment including sampling, discharge monitoring reports, 8 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 9 ("NPDES") permit preparation. From this experience, 10 11 I am familiar with refinery operations and the associated wastewater treatment, as well as the 12 Des Plaines River. 13

14After leaving Mobil in the fall of 1973, I was employed for three years at IIT Research Institute 15 16 in the Chemical Engineering Department, working on advanced wastewater treatment projects including 17 18 catalytic oxidation of cyanide in petroleum wastewaters. I also assisted in preparing the 19 20 Economic Impact/Cost-Benefit Analysis on a proposed total dissolved solids ("TDS") rule change in 21 22 Illinois. I then spent four years with Armak 23 Company, now called Akzo Nobel Chemicals. I was the 24 Corporate Manager of Environmental Affairs

responsible for regulatory compliance and
 engineering design of environmental systems at nine
 manufacturing facilities in the United States and
 Canada including fatty amines plants in McCook and
 Morris, Illinois.

. 6 For the last 25 years at Huff & Huff, Inc., I have been involved in over 30 environmental impact 7 studies associated with the impact of wastewater 8 9 discharges on receiving streams throughout the 10 United States. Some of these studies have involved 11 TDS, sulfates, and chlorides. Surveys I have been 12 involved with in Illinois have included the 13 following streams: Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, 14 Des Plaines River, Casey Fork Creek, Aux Sable 15 Creek, Flint Creek, Mill Creek, Thorn Creek, Kent 16 Creek, Fox River, Mississippi River, Deer Run Creek, Salt Fork of the Saline River, Cedar Creek, Tyler 17 18 Creek, Kishwaukee River. These stream surveys have 19 included water quality, fish, macroinvertebrate, 20 mussels and sediment quality. I also have completed 21 mixing zone studies on the large streams listed 22 above.

I have worked with the Lemont Refinery for thepast 22 years on various wastewater issues including

Page 31

1 two adjusted standards relating to ammonia, a mixing zone study, collection of macroinvertebrates in the 2 Ship Canal, modeling of ammonia from the Lemont 3 Refinery all the way down the Illinois River, 4 5 preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the Lemont Refinery, and preparation of 6 environmental training modules for a variety of 7 subjects. 8

Page 32

9 I have been retained by CITGO Petroleum 10 Corporation's Lemont Refinery to assist in the evaluation of alternatives for the wastewater stream 11 generated by the new FCC wet gas scrubber, 12 13 identifying water quality impacts, preparing the 14 construction permit and NPDES permit modification applications, and providing technical support on the 15 16 variance petition. A copy of my resume is presented in Exhibit 8. 17

Presented herein is a description of the areas I have investigated that are related to the variance petition, which incorporates questions raised by the Illinois Pollution Control Board (the "Board") and Illinois Environmental Protection Agency ("IEPA" or the "Agency") in these same areas.

24

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

2	The requested variance is for TDS in the
3	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal and the Des Plaines
4	River. The wet gas scrubber discharge will contain
5	significant sodium sulfate, which essentially is the
6	source of the TDS subject to the variance request.
7	To the I-55 Bridge, the Des Plaines River is
8	classified as a Secondary Contact waterway with a
9	TDS water quality standard of 1,500 mg/L. From the
10	I-55 Bridge downstream, the Des Plaines River is
11	classified as General Use with a TDS water quality
12	standard of 1,000 mg/L.
13	There are no water quality standards on sodium.
14	The sulfate General Use water quality standard is
15	500 mg/L. There is no Secondary Contact water
16	quality standard for sulfate. The proposed
17	discharge will not cause or contribute to a sulfate
18	water quality exceedance, and therefore a variance
19	for the sulfate component is not requested.
20	EXISTING WATER QUALITY DATA
21	(Responses to Board Questions 7a and 10b; IEPA
22	Recommendation Comments 15 and 19)
23	The Lemont Refinery has collected TDS samples
24	from the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal weekly from

1

Page 34 1 1998 to 2005. Exhibit 9 presents these eight-plus years of data, collected upstream of the Lemont 2 3 Refinery's wastewater discharge. To date, no TDS water quality exceedances were recorded in 1998, 4 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005. 5 In 2002, one exceedance occurred on March 8, 2002 when a TDS 6 level of 1,636 mg/L was recorded. 7 A previously submitted document entitled 8 "Impact of CITGO's Proposed Discharge on Water 9 10 Quality" (Exhibit 6) contains TDS data collected by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of 11 12 Greater Chicago ("MWRDGC") on the same waterway from 13 2000 to 2002. At the Lockport Lock & Dam, downstream of the Lemont Refinery outfall, on TDS 14 15 exceedance (1,595 mg/L) was documented on January 4, 2001. (The Lemont Refinery recorded 1,408 mg/L on 16 17 January 5, 2001.) At the next station, Jefferson 18 Street in Joliet, one TDS exceedance (1,535 mg/L)was recorded on February 24, 2000. Further 19 20 downstream at the Empress casino, one exceedance 21 (1,867 mg/L) was recorded also on February 24, 2000. 22 At the I-55 Bridge, where the General Use water 23 quality standard begins, the 1,000 mg/L standard was 24 exceeded on the following dates: 3/16/2000 - 1,902

Page 35 mg/L, 1/25/2001 - 1,194 mg/L, 2/1/2001 - 1,075 mg/L, 1 2/8/2001 - 1,139 mg/L. The last three occurred over 2 three consecutive sampling events, implying that the 3 4 TDS excursion was persistent for at least 15 days. A review of all the TDS data (Exhibits 6 and 9) 5 6 reveals that all of the elevated TDS readings occur in the winter, and are attributable to snowmelt 7 runoff carrying salt runoff from highway deicing 8 activities. The Agency's Recommendation Comment 15 9 10 states that no information has been provided between the discharge and downstream water quality standard 11 violation. Assuming during snowmelt the streams are 12 13 at their harmonic mean flow, the flow at the I-55 Bridge would be 3,690 cfs. This is a conservative 14 15 flow estimate. At 1,000 mg/L TDS, this translates 16 into 20,000,000 pounds per day of TDS passing 17 beneath the I-55 Bridge. The Lemont Refinery wet 18 gas scrubber will contribute an average 215,000 pounds per day, or approximately 11 mg/L, or 1 19 20 percent of the total loading under this scenario. 21 According to Standard Methods, the precision of the TDS test method with a known sample TDS 22 concentration of 293 mg/L when tested in 77 samples 23 24 yielded a standard deviation of 21.20 mg/L. In

Page 36 essence, the contribution from the Lemont Refinery 1 will be less than the precision of this test when 2 3 the Des Plaines River exceeds 1,000 mg/L. Note, when the 1,902 mg/L TDS was recorded in the 4 5 Des Plaines River, this is equivalent to 38,000,000 pounds per day of TDS, and the Lemont Refinery's 6 contribution would be on the order of 0.6 percent of 7 the total loading. 8

There is a strong correlation between the 9 upstream TDS readings and the downstream TDS 10 11 readings. This is to be expected as TDS is 12 considered a "conservative" pollutant; that is, 13 there is little or no reduction due to chemical or biological processes. 14 In addition, the preponderance of flow at the I-55 Bridge originates 15 from the Chicago Area, so there is limited 16 17 dilutional effects until further downstream. 18 TOXICITY/FUTURE POSSIBLE CHANGES IN WATER QUALITY 19 Water quality standards historically have been developed based on toxicity. As TDS is composed of 20 a variety of anions and cations, there are no 21 22 "toxicity" values that can be applied to the generic 23 TDS parameter. Sulfates and chlorides make up the 24 majority of the anions, and these compounds

typically are regulated. In Illinois for General
 Use waters, TDS, sulfates and chlorides all are
 regulated.

Several years ago, IEPA began a detailed review 4 of these water guality standards that by early 2004 5 led the Agency to hold a stakeholders' meeting. 6 The 7 Agency, at this point, believed that technical data supported elimination of the TDS water quality 8 standard and increasing the sulfate General Use 9 limit to approximately 1,800 mg/L. 10 Information provided to the stakeholders by the Agency on this 11 issue is included in Exhibit 10. 12

13 U.S. EPA's review of the Agency's work has lead to additional toxicity testing by the State of 14 Illinois, which is ongoing and expected to be 15 16 completed by September 2005. If the additional 17 toxicity tests are consistent with the previous 18 research, the Agency is expected to propose these changes in water quality standards in the fourth 19 20 quarter of 2005.

The Agency's efforts are relevant to the Lemont Refinery's petition, as it goes to the environmental impact the proposed discharge will have; that is, sodium sulfate, at the proposed levels discharged,

Page 37

Page 38 1 will not impact the aquatic community in the Chicago 2 Sanitary and Ship Canal or in the Des Plaines River. 3 There is no adverse effect on aquatic life due to 4 TDS and sulfate levels.

5

PROJECTED EFFLUENT CONTRIBUTION

6 (Responses to Board Questions 6 and 11 7 The projected effluent contribution was described in my report, "Impact of CITGO's Proposed 8 Discharge on Water Quality" (Exhibit 6), and will 9 average 215,000 pounds per day of TDS. The loadings 10 11 were further described in the construction permit 12 application submitted to IEPA in December 2004 13 (Exhibit 5), and also in the NPDES permit modification application submitted to the Agency in 14 15 August 2004 (Exhibit 11). Exhibit 12 is a copy of 16 the existing NPDES permit.

17 PROJECTED WATER QUALITY IMPACTS 18 (Responses to Board Questions 10b, 10c, 10d, 10e) 19 The projected incremental increase in both TDS and sulfates in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal 20 21 and in the Des Plaines River were described in my 22 December 2004 report "Impact of CITGO's Proposed 23 Discharge on Water Quality" (Exhibit 6). This analysis was done based on the 7-day, 10-year low 24

Page 39 flow rates in the streams, and relied on the 1992 1 2 mixing zone study completed by Huff & Huff, Inc., 3 for the Lemont Refinery. (This mixing zone study 4 was provided to the Board as part of the Lemont Refinery's Ammonia Adjusted Standard request, 5 R93-8.) The effluent design has not changed since 6 that study, and remains valid with the added flow of 7 274,000 gallons per day from the wet gas scrubber. 8 9 ALTERNATIVES 10 (Responses to IEPA Recommendation Comment 17 and 11 Board Questions 8 and 10f) 12 Huff & Huff, Inc., considered several alternatives for this 274,000 gallons per day 13 Deep well disposal initially was evaluated 14stream. 15 along with direct discharge. The Agency determined that the injection of this waste stream would 16 17 constitute a Class I underground injection well in 18 Illinois. (See Exhibit 13.) Class I wells require 19 injection beneath a cap rock that will prevent 20 migration upwards into higher aquifers. 21 Northeastern Illinois does not have a cap rock above the Mount Simon formation used for disposal wells 22 23 throughout the Midwest, and therefore this 24 alternative was not viable.

Page 40 Based on the TDS stakeholders' meeting in early 1 2 2004, direct discharge appeared to be the logical alternative to deep well disposal. 3 I had anticipated that the Agency TDS and sulfate rule 4 5 change would have gone to the Board by mid-2004, which possibly would have made this variance request 6 7 unnecessary. This did not happen, and the Agency position that the addition of this wastewater stream 8 9 would contribute to the existing TDS violations that 10 periodically occur due to salt runoff from highway deicing activities leads to this variance request. 11 12 The Board has heard numerous requests over the 13 years for variances from the TDS water quality 14 standards and these requests consistently have found 15 evaporation technology cost- and energy-prohibitive. 16 The evaporation costs are described in Exhibit 14. 17 These costs were derived from Rhodia's adjusted 18 standard request, using scale-up factors. 19 TDS COMPLIANCE PLAN AND SCHEDULE 20 Exhibit 7 is a proposed TDS compliance 21 commitment, which includes tasks and schedules. The 22 plan calls for extensive TDS data collection from 23 the Des Plaines River at the I-55 Bridge during the 24 winter months. After two seasons of stream testing,

Page 41 the Lemont Refinery will be in a position to size 1 the necessary holding tank or basin for the wet gas 2 scrubber discharge during periods of high salinity. 3 4 Physical construction of the holding tank or basin would begin by March 1, 2009, and construction would 5 be complete for the winter season beginning 6 December 1, 2009. 7

RESPONSES TO BOARD QUESTIONS 5, 7b, 10b, 10e, 12 8 Clarify whether Best Available Technology 5. 9 ("BAT") applies only to ammonia. 10

In the testimony of Robert Stein of Aware 11 (R98-14), Mr. Stein compared the entire wastewater 12 13 treatment facilities to the federal BAT requirements. Mr. Stein concluded: "[o]ur analysis 14 of the Lemont Refinery wastewater treatment system 15 16 indicates that it exceeds the BAT technology for 17 refinery wastewater treatment as presented in the 18 1982 U.S. EPA Development Document." The BAT determination applied to the total wastewater 19 stream, not just those that applied to ammonia. 20 21 Have modeling studies been completed to 7b. better define the impact on water quality 22 23 violations? 24

As noted earlier, TDS is considered a

Page 42 conservative pollutant, so modeling after mixing 1 essentially is a mass balance. A mass balance 2 approach was used to predict the incremental change 3 4 and average TDS and sulfate levels with the addition of the proposed discharge. This was presented in my 5 December 2004 report, "Impact of CITGO's Proposed 6 Discharge on Water Quality" (Exhibit 6). The mixing 7 zone study from 1992 was utilized in this same 8 report. 9

10 10b. Please comment on the impact of the11 sulfate loading.

12 The sulfate impact is presented in my December 13 2004 Report "Impact of CITGO's Proposed Discharge on 14 Water Quality" (Exhibit 6), and will amount to an 15 average of 142,000 pounds per day.

16 10e. Please indicate if the current and
17 amended NPDES permits allow for mixing of
18 Outfall 001.

19 The mixing zone study was part of the record in 20 the Lemont Refinery's Adjusted Standard request 21 (R93-8), and was incorporated in R98-14. This 22 mixing zone study was an integral part of the 23 ammonia adjusted standard, which was relied upon by 24 the Agency in the issuance of the NPDES permits.

Page 43 Based on this, the answer is yes, the current and 1 2 amended NPDES permits allow for mixing. 12. Would you propose interim effluent limits 3 4 on TDS and sulfates? Would you propose monitoring? A proposed TDS compliance plan has been 5 submitted as Exhibit 7. This compliance plan 6 7 includes extensive stream monitoring. Interim effluent limits are not proposed. 8 First, no water quality violations of the sulfate 9 10 water quality standard will occur; therefore, there 11 is no basis for sulfate effluent limits. For TDS, it is clear that the TDS water quality 12 violations are due solely to salt runoff from 13 highway deicing activities. The proposed discharge 14 will not change this fact. Limiting the discharge 15 from the Lemont Refinery, if possible, would not 16 change the number of TDS water quality violations in 17 18 the Ship Canal or at the I-55 Bridge, as the FCC wet 19 gas scrubber will be contributing on the order of 1 percent of the total salinity loading during these 20 21 excursions.

The Agency historically has taken the position that the occurrence of water quality exceedances downstream of a discharger of the same pollutant

Page 44 1 does not necessarily lead to a more restrictive 2 permit limit or enforcement action. As noted by the 3 Agency in a letter from Dean J. Studer, Supervisor, Southern Municipal Unit, Permit Section of IEPA, to 4 Steven Davis, Galesburg Sanitary District, November 5 15, 2004: "[t]he intent of the Agency was, and 6 still is, that a District action must be responsible 7 for a violation of the water quality standard before 8 it is considered a permit violation." 9 (See 10 Exhibit 15.) The Lemont Refinery request also would seem similar to the Village of Wauconda's recent 11 12 NPDES permit, where the Agency, with knowledge of 13 dissolved oxygen violations downstream, concluded 14 that lowering the effluent BOD5 limit was not necessary "since it is believed that this effluent 15 16 will not cause or contribute to a violation of water 17 quality standards." (Response to Comments, 18 Questions and Concerns regarding the Village of 19 Wauconda's NPDES Permit, at p. 13.) As further 20 noted by the Agency, "[t] his informatin is limited; 21 the extent to which it is representative of normal stream conditions and its relationship to Wauconda 22 discharge is unknown." The Agency included 23 24 dissolved oxygen monitoring in the NPDES permit for

Wauconda to collect additional data, and the Lemont
 Refinery's Compliance Plan includes a similar data
 gathering period.

The Lemont Refinery will have no control over 4 5 the TDS concentrations, so the only possibility to 6 control the pounds per day discharged is by limiting the discharge rate. This means the Lemont Refinery 7 essentially would have to hold treated effluent. 8 9 Presumably, if the Des Plaines River TDS is greater 10 than 1,000 mg/L at the I-55 Bridge, the Lemont Refinery would have to cease all discharge. 11 Today, there is no storage capacity at the Lemont Refinery 12 13 to achieve this concept. As described earlier in my testimony, these violations appear to occur for over 14 15 15 consecutive days, but less than 22 days. The 16 Lemont Refinery will have to come up with in excess 17 of 4,000,000 gallons of capacity to isolate the wet 18 gas scrubber during these periods of elevated TDS levels at the I-55 Bridge. Currently, this excess 19 20 capacity does not exist, and the actual number of 21 days that would require holding wet gas scrubber water currently is poorly understood. The requested 22 compliance time frame is for the collection of the 23 24 necessary data to properly size this holding

Page 45

1	Page 46 basin/tankage. Providing some interim effluent TDS
2	limit will provide no benefit to the receiving
3	water, based on the Agency-generated information
4	contained in Exhibit 10.
5	MR. HALLORAN: Any cross?
6	MR. DAY: No.
7	MR. HALLORAN: Thank you.
8	Now I'll turn it over to the
9	technical unit. Mr. Rao or Ms. Liu?
10	MS. LIU: I don't have anything right
11	now.
12	MR. RAO: Same here.
13	MR. HALLORAN: So these are the only
14	two witnesses that are here today?
15	MS. CARVER REID: Yes, sir.
16	MR. HALLORAN: Off the record for a
17	minute.
18	(Discussion off the record.)
19	MR. HALLORAN: We're back on the
20	record.
21	Mr. Day, it appears that CITGO
22	has petitioners have rested their case in
23	chief.
24	Is that correct, Ms. Carver Reid?

1		Page 47
Ŧ		MD. CARVER REID: I Have one more
2		item. I would like to, at this time, enter
3		what has been marked as Exhibits 1 through
4		15, in support of the prefiled testimony,
5		into the record as evidence in this
6		proceeding today.
7		MR. HALLORAN: Mr. Day, any objection?
8		MR. DAY: No.
9		MR. HALLORAN: The written testimony
10		itself will be transcribed into the
11		transcript. The exhibits will not. They
12		will just be a part of the record. Is that
13		fair enough?
14		MS. CARVER REID: Yes. Thank you.
15		MR. HALLORAN: Mr. Day, you're on.
16		MR. DAY: With the entry of these
17		exhibits and the submission of the testimony
18		of Mr. Harmon and Mr. Huff, the petitioner
19		has met with the expectations that I
20		described earlier of our agency. The defects
21	· ·	that we had noted in our initial review of
22		the testimony have been cured, and our agency
23		is prepared to support the petitioner at this
24		point; and we will enter no further testimony

1	Page 48
<u>т</u>	MR UNITORNY Charle There is a set
2	MR. HALLORAN: Okay. Thank you,
3	Mr. Day. You've rested your case in chief?
4	MR. DAY: Yes.
5	MR. HALLORAN: Any rebuttal from the
. 6	petitioner?
7	MS. CARVER REID: No.
8	MR. HALLORAN: Any closings from the
9	petitioner or the respondent?
10	MS. CARVER REID: No.
11	MR. HALLORAN: Okay. We can go off
12	the record.
13	(Discussion off the record.)
14	BY MR. HALLORAN:
15	Q. We've been off the record talking
16	about posthearing briefs. And we've agreed that it
17	appears that the technical unit from the Illinois
18	Pollution Control Board will have your questions, if
19	any, submitted to the petitioner on or before
20	March 3rd.
21	And then we've decided that we're
22	going to be filing simultaneous posthearing briefs
23	or responses, such as they are, on or before
24	March 15th. And there's been an agreement that the

]	Page 49
1	parties will overnight their responses or briefs on
2	March 14th so everybody will have it on March 15th.
3	Basically the no-mailbox rule will apply.
4	March 21st, simultaneous replies, if any, are due
5	then. And I'm going to set public comment; the
6	close for that is public comment is due on or
7	before March 4th.
8	I think that's about it. But I do
9	have to make a credibility determination. And based
10	on my legal expertise, observations, I find that
11	there are no credibility issues with the witnesses
12	that have testified here today.
13	Have I forgotten anything?
14	It doesn't look that I have. So
15	in any event, thanks for coming. And this hearing
16	is now concluded. Thank you.
17	(Which were all the proceedings
18	had in the above-entitled cause.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Page 50 1 STATE OF ILLINOIS SS.) 2 COUNTY OF COOK 3 4 Kathy A. O'Donnell, being first duly sworn, on oath says that she is a Registered Professional 5 Reporter doing business in the City of Chicago, 6 County of Cook and the State of Illinois; 7 That she reported in shorthand the 8 proceedings had at the foregoing Illinois Pollution 9 Control Board hearing; 10 11 And that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken 12 as aforesaid and contains all the proceedings had at 13 the said Illinois Pollution Control Board hearing. 1415 16 KATHY A. O'DONNELL, RPR 17 18 CSR No. 084-004466 19 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this day of 20 A.D., 2005. 21 22 23 OFFICIAL SEAL 24 KIMBERLY A MEEKS NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF ILLINOIS MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 12/17/07 ~**~~~**~

A	alternatives 32:11 39:9	Aux 31:14	boundary 25:19
able 8:15 25:4	39:13	available 10:12 41:9	Bradley 2:2 4:2
above 10:2 11:22 15:21	ambitious 20:18	Avenue 2:12 13:8 17:17	Bridge 25:2 33:7.10
49.16 40.9	amended 42:17 43:2	28:3	34:22 35:14.17 36:15
48:10 49:8	Amendment 29:23	average 35.18 38.10 42.4	40.23 43.18 45.10 19
above 31:22 39:21	American 20:15	A2.15	briefing 15:10
above-entitled 49:18	American 29.15	42.13	brief $48.16.22.40.1$
According 35:21	ammes 51.4	averages 25:12	Drieis 46.10,22 49.1
achieve 8:16 19:24 20:20	ammonia 13:12,15 19:24	avoid 9:24 16:8	Brighte 2:14
45:13	20:3 32:1,3 39:5 41:10	awarded 29:10	burden 8:22 9:4 26:5
Act 14:9	41:20 42:23	aware 19:23 28:17 41:11	Bureau 26:1
action 44:2,7	among 7:10	A.D 1:22 50:20	Burlington 28:3
activities 8:20 35:9 40:11	amount 8:9 21:13 23:1	a.m 1:24	business 17:15 28:1 50:6
43:14	42:14		·
ACTIVITY 22.21	analysis 30:20 38:24	<u> </u>	C
actual 16:8 45:20	41:14	B 3:11 5:6	C 2:6
Actually 16:3 21	Anand 2:2 4:15	Bachelor 19:10 29:8	calculation 9:17
Actually 10.5,21	and/or 7:14	back 46:19	call 11:20
add 15.15	anions 36:21.24	balance 9:16 42:2.2	called 17:6 27:16 30:23
addition 26:14 40:9 40:4	announced 22:14	based 11:14 13:21 14:24	calls 7:12 40:22
audition 30:14 40:8 42:4	answer 13:4 27:10 43:1	36:20 38:24 40:1 43:1	Canada 31:4
additional 11:14 15:20	anticinated 12.2 40.4	46.3 40.0	Canal 8:3 31:13 32:3
26:5 37:14,16 45:1	anticipated 12.2 TU.T anything 16.10 10.12	Besically 40.2	33.3 24 38.2 20 43.18
additions 8:2 11:15	anything 40.10 49.13	basic $25.5 14 41.2 4$	35.5,24 58.2,20 45.18
address 9:22 12:1 13:7	apologize 5:19,25	basin (torsho as 46.1	cap 59.19,21
16:1 17:16 28:2	appear 14:18 45:14	basin/tankage 40:1	capability 10:8
adequate 10:12	APPEARANCES 2:1	Dasis 23:11 43:11	capacity 10:6 45:12,17
adjusted 8:10 32:1 39:5	appeared 14:22 40:2	BAT 41:10,13,16,18	45:20
40:17 42:20,23	appears 46:21 48:17	becomes 13:1 24:15	care 26:19,20
Administrative 13:14	APPLICABLE 33:1	before 7:2 11:5 13:8	carrying 22:9 35:8
adopted 13:9,16	applicant 15:2	22:15 44:8 48:19,23	Carver 2:7 3:6,9 6:3,4,4
advanced 30:2,17	application 21:21,23 23:5	49:7 50:19	15:24 16:3,13,21 17:1,9
adverse 8:23 9:1,6 38:3	23:24 24:4,20 38:12,14	began 19:9 22:20 37:4	18:17 26:15,24 27:19
Affairs 30:24	applications 32:15	begin 41:5	28:22 46:15,24 47:1,14
affiliated 4:13.16 19:12	applied 36:22 41:19,20	beginning 25:9 41:6	48:7,10
aforesaid 50:13	applies 41:10	begins 24:7 34:23	case 5:12 46:22 48:3
after 22.13 24.7 30.14	apply 49:3	behalf 6:7,15	Casey 31:14
40.24 42.1	appreciate 7:1 11:10	being 8:14 12:24 13:20	casino 34:20
10.24 + 2.1	approach 42:3	22:23 26:11 50:4	catalytic 20:22 30:18
Again 10.10	approached 10:2	believe 8:24 11:12 12:14	cations 36:21
agencies 7.5	Approval 25:24	12:15	cause 33:17 44:16 49:18
agency 1:11 2:12 4:9 0:12	approved 20:15	believed 37:7 44:15	caused 8:19
0:14,15 /:2 11:10,18,22	approximately 4.11 21.1	helow 23:11 26:2 4	Caustic 23:4.6
12:1,10 13:19 14:6,10	35.19 37.10	heneath 35.17 30.10	cease 45.11
15:11 21:20 29:17	Anril 23.15	henefit 7.20 46.2	Cedar 31:17
32:22,23 37:6,7,11,18	aquatic 38.1 3	hest 28.21 41.0	Central 19.6
38:14 39:15 40:4,7	aquate 30.1,3	hetter 12.18 27.10 /1.22	cortain 22.10
42:24 43:22 44:3,6,12	ayunci 5 39.20 Amon 26.16	botwoon 25.10 27.10 41.22	Cortified 10.16
44:20,23 47:20,22	Area 50.10	bewond 5:21	ofs 25.14
Agency's 12:7 14:2 35:9	areas 32:18,23	beyond 5.21	Choir 20:16
37:13,21	arise 8:4	Diological 36:14	Chair 29:10
Agency-generated 46:3	Armak 30:22	ыююду 19:11	cnallenges 22:3
ago 37:4	asphalt 20:12	Board 1:1,18 2:3 4:4 5:11	cnange 5:19 9:10 13:9
agreed 48:16	assigned 4:5	/:2 8:21 11:8,10 12:2,6	30:21 40:5 42:3 43:15
agreement 7:8 20:14	assist 32:10	13:5 19:22,23 22:12,15	43:17
48:24	assisted 30:19	22:18,22 23:9 24:12,24	changed 5:16 39:6
air 8:13 11:4 19:21	associated 26:4 30:12	25:11 29:14 32:21,21	changes 36:18 37:19
Akzo 30:23	31:8	33:21 38:6,18 39:4,11	charged 29:20
Alisa 2:3 4:14	association 19:14,15 22:8	40:5,12 41:8 48:18	chemical 23:3 29:8 30:16
allow 42.17 43.2	Assuming 15:7 35:12	50:10,14	36:13
along 39.15	attention 11:20	Board's 5:7	Chemicals 30:23
already 16.0 10.02 22.14	attributable 35:7	BOD5 44:14	Chicago 1:20 2:5,9 6:7
altornative 0.24 20.24	August 19:4 23:17 38:15	both 7:3 24:2.6.16 38:19	8:3 31:13 33:3.24 34:12
40.2	authorities 20:7	boundaries 25:22 26:11	36:16 38:1.20 50:6
40:3			

J

			1 450 5
chief 46:23 48:3	concentrations 24:2.16	costs 40:16.17	denial 14:15
chlorides 31:11 36:23	45:5	Council 29:15	Department 29:11 30:16
37:2	concept 45:13	counsel 6:13	depicting 21:11
CITGO 1:5 4:6 6:8.24.24	Concerns 44:18	County 50:2.7	derived 40:17
7:5.7.14.22 8:6.8.15.19	concluded 41:14 44:13	couple 13:4	Des 25:2 30:13 31:14
10:3.19 12:22 17:14.22	49:16	course 14.14	33:3.7.10 36:3.5 38:2
19.10 20 20.5 6 21.5	condition 25.23	court 14.19 16.12 19	38.21 40.23 45.9
22.11 32.9 46.21	conditions 10:13 11:23	covered 7:10	describe 19:19
CITGO's 24.9 18 34.9	12.15 13.20 26.14	Cracking 20.22	described 15:1 21:6 23:4
38.8 22 42.6 13	44.22	created 26:5	23.23 24.3 8 17 38.8 11
City 50:6	confirm 13.19 22.19	credibility 49.9 11	38.21 40.16 45.13
clarify 14.1 41.9	consecutive 35:3 45:15	Creek 31:14 15 15 15 15	47.20
Class 39.17 18	consent 7.7 11 12 18 23	31.16 16 17 18	description 21.12 22.21
classified 33:8.11	8:14.19 10:22 11:9	critical 21.18 22.2	32:18
Claude 2:15 3:5 16:4	14:16 20:15 16 18 21:3	cross 46.5	design 8:9 10 16 23:23
17:2.5.12.18:18.19:1.2	21:5.7 22:3.13	crossing 26.11	31.2 39.6
clear 43:12	conservative 35:14 36:12	CSR 50.18	detailed 24.11 37.4
close 15:10 49:6	42:1	cured 47:22	details 11:2.3
closely 11:12	considered 36:12 39:12	current 14:3 17:21 19:2	determination 41:19 49.9
closings 48:8	41:24 44:9	19:20 20:2 42:16 43:1	determined 39:15
code 13:15 17:19	consistency 29:23	currently 17:13 25:12	develop 5:10
collect 25:15 45:1	consistent 21:24 37:17	27:23 29:14 45:19.22	developed 22:23 36:20
collected 12:13 33:23	consistently 40:14	cvanide 30:18	Development 41:18
34:2.10	constitute 39:17		developments 10:16
collection 32:2 40:22	construction 20:19.24	D	25:18.20.26:7
45:23	21:10.19.22.23.24 22:4	D 3:1	deviation 35:24
collectively 20:5	23:5.24 24:4.19 30:3.5	Dam 34:13	difficulties 26:3
come 7:18 45:16	32:14 38:11 41:4.5	Darin 2:11 6:16	dilutional 36:17
comes 12:7	consultant 29:21	data 12:12 25:1 33:20	dioxide 7:16
coming 49:15	consulting 27:24 29:7	34:2.10 35:5 37:7 40:22	direct 26:22 39:15 40:2
commence 25:7	Contact 33:8.15	45:1.2.24	directed 27:8
commencing 1:22	contain 33:4	date 34:3	Directors 29:14
comment 5:2 35:9 39:10	contained 46:4	dates 34:24	discharge 9:14 10:1.4.6.9
42:10 49:5.6	contains 21:16 34:10	Davis 44:5	12:23 22:5 23:11.22
comments 12:1 33:22	50:13	day 1:20 2:10 6:10,11,11	24:6,9,17,18 25:6 30:8
44:17	content 16:23	6:20 13:23,24 16:14,16	30:9 33:4,17 34:3,9
Commission 29:22	contents 18:14 28:19	18:21,22 27:1,2 29:2,3	35:11 37:23 38:9,23
commitment 40:21	continued 12:10	35:16,19 36:6 38:10	39:15 40:2 41:3 42:5,7
committed 7:22	contribute 33:17 35:18	39:8,13 42:15 45:6 46:6	42:13 43:14,15 44:23
Committee 29:17,19	40:9 44:16	46:21 47:7,8,15,16 48:3	45:7,11
committees 19:13	contributing 43:19	48:4 50:19	discharged 23:2 37:24
communication 15:2	contribution 36:1,7 38:5	days 35:4 45:15,15,21	45:6
community 38:1	38:7	deals 7:24	discharger 43:24
Companies-IL 29:15	control 1:1,18 2:3 4:4	Dean 44:3	discharges 8:6,12 31:9
Company 30:23	5:10 19:22 32:21 45:4,6	December 21:22 23:6,19	discussed 11:4
compared 41:12	48:18 50:10,14	24:1,5,8,17,20 25:9	Discussion 46:18 48:13
complete 14:11 41:6	controls 20:23	38:12,22 41:7 42:6,12	discussions 11:22
completed 20:6 24:22	conversations 22:1	decided 48:21	disposal 39:14,22 40:3
25:8 31:20 37:16 39:2	Cook 50:2,7	decision 5:12	dissolved 8:1,3,18 13:6
41:21	copy 16:12 20:16 21:1,15	decree 7:11,12,18,23 8:15	21:13 30:21 44:13,24
completely 8:4	21:21 28:11 32:16	8:19 10:22 11:9 20:15	District 34:11 44:5,7
compliance 8:16 10:20	38:15	20:17,18 21:3,5,7 22:3	diversion 26:12
12:9 13:1 14:20,22	Corp 6:8	22:13	divert 26:10
20:19 21:2 24:11,22,24	Corporate 30:24	deep 10:2 39:14 40:3	division 6:13 11:4,5
31:1 40:19,20 43:5,6	Corporation 1:5 4:6	Deer 31:16	21:19 22:1
45:2,23	17:14	defects 14:12 47:20	document 34:8 41:18
comply 21:3	Corporation's 32:10	define 41:22	documented 34:15
component 33:19	correct 18:10,15 28:15	degree 19:10	doing 9:9 10:2 50:6
composed 36:20	28:20 46:24 50:12	deicing 8:20 26:8 35:8	done 16:18 38:24
compounds 22:9 36:24	correlation 36:9	40:11 43:14	down 32:4
concentration 35:23	cost 40:15	delay 16:8	downstream 33:10 34:14

34:20 35:11 36:10,17 30:24 31:2,7 32:7,22 **Exxon** 4:18 fourth 37:19 43:24 44:13 37:22 Fox 31:16 F drainage 25:15 EPA 7:8 10:22 11:5 20:7 frame 45:23 drawings 21:10 41:18 F 5:6 from 4:15,18 5:16,22 Drive 2:8 EPA's 37:13 facilities 30:6 31:3 41:13 6:11 7:13 8:5,12,20 9:6 due 9:17 10:15 25:18,23 equipment 8:9 20:23 21:9 facility 25:19 29:23 9:8 10:1,9 11:24 14:13 26:2,13 36:13 38:3 21:11 fact 9:9 43:15 19:11 20:10 21:19 40:10 43:13 49:4,6 equivalent 36:5 factors 10:18 40:18 22:12 24:3 25:1,15,19 duly 17:6 27:16 50:4 essence 36:1 facts 12:3 26:6 29:9,10 30:10 32:3 during 10:12 12:22,24 essentially 33:5 42:2 45:8 fair 47:13 33:9.24.24 34:12 35:8 15:18 25:2,6 26:8 30:3 estimate 35:15 fall 20:4 30:14 36:1,16 39:8 40:10,13 35:12 40:23 41:3 43:20 estimated 20:13 familiar 30:11 40:17,22 42:8 43:13,16 45:18 evaluated 39:14 fatty 31:4 44:3 48:5.8.17 evaluating 9:9 12:23 favorable 11:13 **funding** 12:17 Е 29:22 FCC 32:12 43:18 further 9:22 21:17 34:19 E 2:11,15 3:1,8,11 27:15 evaluation 32:11 FCCU 20:22 21:8 36:17 38:11 44:19 27:22 28:24 29:4,5 evaporation 40:15.16 feasible 26:14 47:24 earlier 41:24 45:13 47:20 even 11:2 27:9 February 1:2,22 4:10 future 8:6 early 37:5 40:1 event 5:23 49:15 15:17 18:5 23:14 28:9 F-O-R-D 4:23,24 East 2:12 events 12:24 35:3 34:19.21 Eastern 19:11 everybody 4:2 15:23 49:2 federal 41:13 G Economic 30:20 evidence 9:11 15:5 47:5 feeds 25:20 Galesburg 44:5 effect 8:24 9:2,6,13 38:3 evidentiary 5:13 feverishly 15:16 gallons 39:8,13 45:17 effects 8:11 36:17 **Examination 3:6,9 17:8** few 25:16 gas 8:12 9:8 10:1,9 20:21 effluent 13:13 24:14 26:8 27:18 field 19:5 21:8 23:3 24:3,7,13 26:13 38:5,7 39:6 43:3 examined 17:7 27:17 filed 11:6 14:19 15:17 25:5 26:7,13 32:12 33:4 43:8,11 44:14,15 45:8 exceedance 22:7 33:18 16:9 18:13 21:15 22:13 35:18 39:8 41:2 43:19 46:1 34:6,15,18,20 28:9,18 45:18,21 efforts 19:20.24 37:21 exceedances 34:4 43:23 filing 48:22 gathering 45:3 eight-plus 34:1 General 33:11,14 34:22 exceeded 34:24 final 14:18 either 10:4 exceeds 36:3 41:16 find 49:10 37:1.9 elevated 9:18 35:6 45:18 findings 9:10 generated 32:12 except 8:17 elimination 22:6 30:9 excess 45:16,19 Fine 4:21 generic 36:22 37:8 excursion 35:4 fine-tuning 12:11 Georgia 20:8 embodied 20:15 give 16:11,18 excursions 43:21 firm 6:5 27:24 29:7 emission 7:13 8:13 20:13 Exhibit 3:13 9:11 10:17 firmly 7:22 go 10:18 48:11 21:7 10:24 11:24 18:14 first 14:14 17:1,6 19:8 goes 5:14 37:22 emissions 7:17 19:22 20:9 20:17 21:1,10,15,21 22:3 26:20,21 27:16 going 5:4,21 10:17 12:3 employed 8:14 17:13 23:6 24:1,5,10,19,21,24 43:9 50:4 17:2 27:3,9 48:22 49:5 27:23 30:15 32:17 34:1,10 37:12 fish 31:19 gone 40:5 five-year 13:2 38:9,13,15,15,23 39:18 Good 4:2 end 25:22 40:16,20 42:7,14 43:6 Flint 31:15 gradient 26:3 energy-prohibitive 40:15 44:10 46:4 flow 23:23 35:13,13,15 Grand 2:12 exhibits 11:19,21 15:7 36:15 39:1,7 grant 9:2 14:5 22:4 Fluidized 20:22 18:12 28:17,19 35:5 granted 9:5 14:14 47:3,11,17 focuses 12:10 greater 34:12 45:9 29:15 30:16 31:2 exist 45:20 following 25:3 31:13 groundwater 25:23 26:2 existing 10:7,11 25:16,20 34:24 н 26:3 33:20 38:16 40:9 follows 15:9 17:7 27:17 expect 15:9 Ford 2:16 4:16,19,22,22 H 3:11 expectations 5:22 15:8 4:24 5:3 Halloran 2:2 4:1,3,18,20 47:19 foregoing 50:9,11 4:23 5:1,4 6:10,17 expected 15:6 24:1,15 forgotten 49:13 13:22 15:13 16:11,14 36:11 37:15,18 Fork 31:14.17 16:17.24 18:21.23 expedite 11:8 formation 39:22 26:18 27:1,3,12 29:2 46:5,7,13,16,19 47:7,9 expeditious 16:7 Fort 2:6 6:5,19,22,23 experience 30:1,10 13:22 15:1 27:6 47:15 48:2,5,8,11,14 4:8 6:12,14 7:6,20 8:11 expertise 49:10 Fort's 14:5 hallway 5:19 handle 10:6 14:9 17:23 19:3,5,11,13 extending 20:24 found 14:12 40:14 19:15,18 20:7 21:20 handling 10:9 extensive 25:1 40:22 43:7 founded 28:6 29:7 25:10 29:7,11,17 30:2 extent 12:11 44:21 four 7:8 30:22 happen 40:7

Empress 34:20 enforcement 44:2 Engineer 29:13 30:2 engineering 29:9,10,11 enhance 12:14 enough 47:13 entail 25:13 enter 16:4 47:2,24 entered 7:7 14:18 entire 41:12 entities 7:15 entitled 4:5 34:8 entry 47:16 environmental 1:10 2:12

			1 // 25.04.44.0
Harmon 2:15 3:5 12:8	impacts 23:8 32:13 38:17	1-55 25:2 33:7,10 34:22	letter 25:24 44:3
16:5 17:2,5,10,12,21	Impact/Cost-Benefit	35:13,17 36:15 40:23	Let's 26:20 27:12
18:19 19:1,2 26:20,21	30:20	43:18 45:10,19	level 26:1,4 34:7
26:23 27:2,8 47:18	implemented 26:12		levels 9:7,18 24:14 37:24
harmonic 35:13	implying 35:3	J	38:4 42:4 45:19
having 17:6 27:16	importantly 9:23	J 44:3	Liaison 29:17
Hazardous 19:16	imposed 21:4	James 2:10,15 3:8 6:11	life 38:3
heard 40:12	improvement 7:6	16:5 24:8,17 27:15,22	light 9:10
hearing 1:18 4:3 5:5,8,9	Inc 27:24 28:2,6 29:6	28:24 29:4,5	like 6:2 13:24 16:3,21
5:14,16 6:18,23 11:7	31:6 39:2,12	January 20:16 23:14	26:16 47:2
14:5 15:11 49:15 50:10	included 8:8 9:11 10:24	34:15,17	limit 37:10 44:2,14 46:2
50:14	11:18 14:21 30:5 31:12	Jefferson 34:17	limitation 20:3
held 1:18	31:19 37:12 44:23	Jeffrev 2:6 6:5	limited 36:16 44:20
hence 22:12.24	includes 20:18 30:1 40:21	Jersev 20:8 29:13	limiting 43:15 45:6
her 50:12	43.7 45.2	Jim 9:21 10:17	limits 43:3 8 11
high 25.6 41.3	including 7.9 19.6 20.11	Joliet 30:3 4 34:18	listed 31.21
higher 30.20	30.8 17 31.4 24	July 23.17	little 36:13
highway 35.8 40.10	incorporated 42:21	June 23.16	L in 2.3 1.14 27.5 16.0 10
12.11/	incorporates 22.20	inet 6.18 0.20 12.5 15.22	TID 2.7
40.14 him 27.12	incorpose 21.12 22.24	16.22 27.6 A1.20 A7.12	Luck 2.7
historice 1.2	1111 1111 22:24 25.17 29.10	10.22 27.0 41:20 47:12 instifications 14:17	10aung 55:20 50:8 42:11
history 14:2	23.17 38.19 increased 26.5	Justifications 14:17	45.20 Joodings 29:10
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Instory } 14:2 \\ \text{hitch } 5.14 \end{array}$	increased 20:5	K	10adings 38:10
mitch 5:14	increases 24:6	$\frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{V}_{\text{other}} 50.4.17}$	LOCK 54:15
	increasing 37:9	Kathy 50:4,17	Lockport 34:13
holding 25:5 41:2,4 45:21	incremental 38:19 42:3	Kent 31:15	logical 40:2
45:24	independent 8:5	kind 5:2	long 18:1
hour 1:22	indicate 42:16	Kishwaukee 31:18	look 49:14
Huff 2:15 3:8 12:8 16:5	indicates 41:16	know 9:17 15:23	Louisiana 20:8
27:9,15,20,22,24,24	informally 11:18	knowledge 28:21 44:12	low 38:24
28:2,2,5,5,8,24 29:4,5,6	informatin 44:20	known 35:22	lowering 44:14
29:6 31:6,6 39:2,2,12	information 11:14,17	knows 8:21	L.L.C 1:6 4:7 6:9 20:5
39:12 47:18	12:16 21:17 22:19		
Huff's 9:21 10:17 24:8,17	35:10 37:10 46:3	L	M
Hydroxide 23:7	initial 47:21	lacking 11:1 14:21	macroinvertebrate 31:19
H-A-R-M-O-N 17:12	initially 39:14	LaGrange 28:3	macroinvertebrates 32:2
H-U-F-F 27:22	injection 10:3 39:16,17	language 11:23	made 40:6
	39:19	large 31:21	major 7:15 20:24
<u> </u>	install 20:21	last 13:18 17:11 20:4	majority 36:24
IAC 20:4	installed 21:11	25:16 27:21 31:6 35:2	make 5:1,13 10:23 27:6
ideas 12:20	installing 21:8	law 6:5	36:23 49:9
identifying 32:13	Institute 30:15	lead 12:18 29:21 37:13	making 5:11
IEPA 9:8 10:2 11:12	instrumentation 9:15	44:1	managed 25:12 26:2
12:13 21:20 22:2,4,10	instruments 9:21	leads 40:11	Management 25:24
22:20 23:5 24:1,5,20.23	integral 42:22	learned 22:2	29:24
32:22 33:21 37:4 38:12	intended 5:9	least 35:4	manager 17:23 19:3.17
39:10 44:4	intent 44:6	leaving 30:14	30:24
IIT 30:15	interim 43:3.8 46:1	LeCrone 2:11 6:16	managing 26:4
Illinois 1:1.10.16.20 2:3 5	International 19.7	led 13:12 15:9 20:2 37:6	manufacturing 31:3
2:9.12.13 4:4.8 6:12.14	introduce 4:14 6·2	legal 6:13 49:10	many 5:20 12:3 15:3
7:9.21 8:4 9:19 10:14	investigated 10.4 32.19	Lemont 7:9:18 8:7 10:20	March 23:15 25:8 34.6
10:22 11:5 12:12 13:14	involved 31.7 10 12	13:8 17:17 24 19:3 8 20	41:5 48:20.24 49:2.24
14:8 17:18 19:6 11 15	isolate 45.17	19:21.23 20:4 11 12 19	49:7
19.22 20.8 21.20 28.4	issuance 42.24	20.21 21.2 9 14 25.4 21	marked 14.12 18.12 47.3
20.13 16 10 22 30.22	issue 8.18 10.14 11.13	26.11 31.23 32.3 6 10	mass 9.16 42.2 7
27.13,10,17,22 30.22	22.10 27.12	23.72 24.7 14 16 25.17	Mass 7.10 72.2,2 Mastare 20.10
27.15 20.10 21 40.17	22.10 57.12	26.1 6 27.01 20.2 4	Matarials 10.17
50.1 7 0 14	Issueu 25:24	50.1,0 57.21 59.5,4 41,1 15 40:00 42:16	INTALEFIAIS 19:17
JU:1,/,9,14	Issues 12:11 14:24 22:2	41.1,13 42:20 43:10 44.10 45.1 4 7 10 12 14	19.5 01.16 00.0
112 12 25:10 21:70	31:24 49:11	++.10 +5.1,4,/,10,12,10 loss 26:2 45:15	10:3 21:10 28:9
24:13,18 25:10 31:7,8	1ssung 22:5	less 30:2 43:13	matters 5:13
34:9 37:23 38:1,8,22	item 4/:2	let 15:22	may 10:14 15:18,19 21:4
41:22 42:6,10,12,13	items 21:18	Leussa 2:7 6:4	23:16 26:14 27:7
1		• .	

necessarily 44:1 46:13 32:14 38:11,13,16 44:2 maybe 27:9 McCook 31:4 necessary 13:2 15:18 opening 6:20 14:4 44:4,9,12,19,24 mean 35:13 20:20 41:2 44:15 45:24 operated 7:14 19:9 permits 42:17,24 43:2 permitting 11:5 means 45:7 negotiate 15:4 operation 24:7 persistent 35:4 meet 15:7 21:5,6 negotiated 24:22 operational 24:15 petition 11:2,16 12:1 meeting 7:22 37:6 40:1 negotiations 20:6 operations 30:11 member 4:21 19:13,15 new 13:8 17:17 20:8 opportunity 6:21 7:1 14:4,7,11,13,19,21,23 15:12 21:6,15 22:13,15 members 4:12 21:11 29:13 32:12 14:1 15:4 met 47:19 next 34:17 option 25:12 26:9 22:20 32:16,20 37:22 petitioner 8:23 9:4 15:3 method 13:1 35:22 nine 31:2 order 11:7 14:16 36:7 47:18,23 48:6,9,19 Methods 35:21 NIPC 29:22 43:19 **petitioners** 1:7 3:13 4:8 Metropolitan 34:11 **NIPC's** 29:24 organization 29:18 original 14:23 6:8.24 46:22 mg/L 33:9,12,15 34:7,15 nitrogen 13:12,15 19:24 petroleum 1:5 4:6 6:8 originates 36:15 34:16,18,21,23 35:1,1,1 20:3 17:14 19:14 30:18 32:9 35:2,15,19,23,24 36:3,4 nitrous 7:17 other 8:17 21:4.9 25:10 Nobel 30:23 otherwise 12:13,17 phenomenon 12:19 37:10 45:10 Midwest 1:6 4:7 6:9 7:1 normal 6:18 44:21 outfall 34:14 42:18 phonetic 13:10 outweighs 8:23 Physical 41:4 20:5 39:23 North 2:12 over 25:16 27:4 31:7 35:2 place 15:22 mid-2004 40:5 Northeastern 29:21 39:21 40:12 45:4,14 46:8 Plaines 25:2 30:13 31:14 might 12:17 migration 39:20 northwest 25:19 overall 7:19 21:24 33:3,7,10 36:3,5 38:2 38:21 40:23 45:9 Mill 31:15 **NOTARY 50:23** overnight 49:1 minimize 8:10 note 5:8,16 36:3 oversight 30:5 plan 12:9 14:20,22 24:11 noted 14:15 41:24 44:2 owned 7:14 13:10 19:9 24:22 25:1 29:24 32:6 minute 46:17 44:20 47:21 owner 29:6 40:19,22 43:5,6 45:2 Mississippi 31:16 notes 50:12 oxidation 30:18 **Planning** 29:22,23 mixing 31:21 32:1 39:2.3 plant 10:7 23:10 42:1,7,17,19,22 43:2 **noticed** 5:9.18 oxide 7:17 plants 20:12 31:4 Mobil 4:19,20 30:2,14 November 21:16 23:19 oxygen 44:13,24 please 17:15 27:20 28:1 44:5 **O'Donnell** 50:4,17 model 9:19 modeling 32:3 41:21 42:1 NOx 20:9,13 olur 41:14 42:10.16 point 14:4 27:7 37:7 no-mailbox 49:3 modification 32:14 38:14 Р modified 11:24 22:5 NPDES 22:6,10 30:10 47:24 p 2:2 44:19 pollutant 22:5 30:9 36:12 modify 8:15 32:14 38:13,16 42:17 modules 32:7 42:24 43:2 44:12,19,24 **PAGE** 3:3,13 42:1 43:24 pages 14:22 monitoring 12:10 30:8 number 43:17 45:20 **Pollution** 1:1,18 2:3 4:4 parameter 23:21 36:23 43:4,7 44:24 numerous 40:12 5:10 19:22 32:5,21 nutrient 29:19,20 48:18 50:9,14 monthly 23:12 parameters 8:17 months 21:1 25:3 40:24 part 7:5,15 10:15 29:6 poorly 45:22 0 pose 22:2 more 44:1 47:1 39:4 42:19,22 47:12 position 14:3 18:2 19:2 oath 50:5 particularly 11:20 morning 4:2 objection 16:15 18:21 parties 4:13 5:22 6:2 49:1 27:10 40:8 41:1 43:22 Morris 31:5 Morton 19:7 29:2 47:7 party 4:17 possibility 45:5 passing 35:16 most 9:23 11:3 obligations 7:23 possible 36:18 43:16 observations 49:10 past 22:8 31:24 possibly 40:6 **Mount 39:22** Postel 2:14 move 4:13 **obtain** 21:18 path 21:18 patterns 10:16 posthearing 15:19 48:16 **MSD** 10:5 obtained 22:11 occur 35:6 40:10 43:10 PCB 1:8 4:6 48:22 much 6:17 PDV 1:6 4:7 6:8 7:1 20:5 pounds 35:16,19 36:6 Municipal 44:4 45:14 mussels 31:20 occurred 25:18 34:6 35:2 penalties 10:21 21:4 38:10 42:15 45:6 must 20:21 26:2 44:7 occurrence 43:23 people 5:20 7:21 ppm 23:13 October 23:18 per 35:16,19 36:6 38:10 practical 9:24 **MWRDGC** 34:12 off 46:16,18 48:11,13,15 precision 35:21 36:2 39:8,13 42:15 45:6 Ν officer 4:3 6:24 percent 35:20 36:7 43:20 predict 42:3 N 3:1 Oil 30:2 perhaps 12:20 prefiled 15:16,20 16:1,4 name 4:2,21 17:10,11,12 Okay 4:21 15:13 26:18 period 13:2 45:3 16:18 18:4,7,9,13,18 19:2 27:21,21 29:5 48:2,11 periodically 40:10 28:8,11,14,18,23 47:4 periods 25:6 26:8 41:3 preliminary 22:1 Nath 2:7 6:6 once 24:15 one 9:19 21:18 34:6,18,20 preparation 30:10 32:5,6 National 19:14,17 22:5 45:18 permit 21:10,19,22,23 30:9 47:1 prepared 47:23 preparing 30:19 32:13 naturally 25:16,20 ongoing 37:15 22:4,6,11 23:5,24 24:4 near 25:18 only 8:2 25:12 41:10 45:5 24:20 26:1 30:10 32:14 preponderance 36:15

1		·····	<u>_</u>
present 2:14 8:5 12:4	P.E 2:3,15 3:8 27:15	26:11 30:4,5,11 31:23	24:12 33:21 38:6,18
presentation 12:4		32:4,6,10 33:23 34:14	39:10 41:8 48:23 49:1
presented 11:24 13:20	Q	34:16 35:17 36:1 39:3	responsibilities 30:4
22:16,19 32:16.18	quality 9:9 23:8 24:10.19	41:1,15,17 43:16 44:10	responsibility 19:4
41:17 42:5.12	29:24 31:19,20 32:13	45:4,7,11,12,16	responsible 31:1 44:7
presents 34:1	33:9.11.13.14.16.18.20	refinery's 19:21.24 24:14	responsive 12:5
President 29:5	34:4.10.23 35:11 36:18	25:22 34:3 36:6 37:22	rested 46:22 48:3
Presumably 45:9	36:19 37:5.8.19 38:9.17	39:5 42:20 45:2	restrict 12:23
presumption 15:10	38:23 40:13 41:22 42:7	Refining 1:6 4:7 6:9 20:5	restrictive 44:1
prevent 39:19	42:14 43:9.10.12.17.23	regarding 15:20 44:18	result 9:2.8 21:12
prevented 14:12	44:8,17	registered 29:12 50:5	resume 32:16
Prevention 32:5	quarter 37:20	Registry 19:17	retain 26:7
previous 37:17	quarters 5:24	regulated 37:1.3	retained 32:9
previously 34:8	Question 25:11	REGULATIONS 33:1	retention 25:7,14 26:13
principal 8:13	questions 12:2,5,6 13:5	regulatory 20:1 31:1	reveals 35:6
prior 26:10	15:20 22:18,22 23:9	Reid 2:7 3:6.9 6:3.4.4	review 14:11 15:4 35:5
procedural 5:7 14:1	24:12 27:2,8 32:20	15:24 16:3.13.21 17:1.9	37:4,13 47:21
proceed 6:18	33:21 38:6,18 39:11	18:17 26:15.24 27:19	revised 12:4,9
proceeding 47:6	41:8 44:18 48:18	28:22 46:15,24 47:1.14	Rhodia's 40:17
proceedings 1:16 13:16		48:7,10	right 46:10
20:1 49:17 50:9.13	<u> </u>	rejected 10:3	River 8:4 9:19 10:14
process 22:20 23:4	Railroad 19:7	related 7:15 32:19	12:12 25:2 30:13 31:14
processes 36:14	raised 12:5,6 32:20	relates 14:2	31:16,16,17,18 32:4
production 22:24	Randolph 1:20 2:4	relating 13:11 32:1	33:4,7,10 36:3,5 38:2
Professional 29:12 50:5	Rao 2:2 4:15 27:4 46:9,12	relationship 44:22	38:21 40:23 45:9
Professionals 19:16,18	rate 22:24 23:23 45:7	relative 9:13	road 8:20 22:9
program 25:13	rates 39:1	release 25:13	Robert 41:11
project 7:3,5,19,19 12:24	read 16:6,20 18:20 29:1	relevant 37:21	rock 39:19,21
20:24 22:11 25:7,8	reading 16:8	relied 14:16 39:1 42:23	Room 5:17,17
26:12 27:11	readings 35:6 36:10,11	relief 8:22 13:5	rooms 5:20
projected 9:7 23:8 24:5	realize 5:20	remains 39:7	Rosenthal 2:7 6:6
38:5,7,17,19	rebuttal 48:5	repeat 22:16	routinely 12:13 23:21
projects 22:23 30:17	received 19:10 29:8	replies 49:4	RPR 50:17
promulgated 14:10	receiving 31:9 46:2	report 1:16 24:8,18 38:8	rule 5:12 9:10 13:9 30:21
pronounced 25:17	recent 44:11	38:22 42:6,9,13	40:4 49:3
properly 5:9,18 45:24	Reclamation 34:11	reported 50:8	rules 14:9
propose 37:18 43:3,4	recommendation 11:13	reporter 16:12,19 50:6	rule-making 13:16
proposed 23:23 24:9,13	12:7 14:15 33:22 35:9	reports 30:8	ruling 11:8
24:18,24 30:20 33:16	39:10	representative 44:21	run 5:5 23:11 31:16
34:9 37:23,24 38:8,22	recommending 14:13	representing 6:13	runoff 10:13,15 22:9
40:20 42:5,6,13 43:5,8	record 4:1 5:8,10 7:6 9:1	request 11:8 14:6 18:18	25:15,19 26:6,10 35:8,8
43:14	11:15 13:21 16:6,10,20	28:23 33:6 39:5 40:6,11	40:10 43:13
proposing 29:20	17:11 18:19 22:17	40:18 42:20 44:10	R84-13 13:16 20:1
propounded 22:18	27:21 28:24 42:19	requested 11:2,7 33:2,19	R93-8 13:17 20:2 39:6
Protection 1:11 2:12 4:9	46:16,18,20 47:5,12	45:22	42:21
6:12,14 14:9 21:20	48:12,13,15	requests 29:23 40:12,14	R98-14 13:17 20:2 41:12
29:17 32:22	recorded 34:4,7,16,19,21	require 39:18 45:21	42:21
provide 12:16 46:2	36:4	required 7:17 8:2 14:8	
provided 11:15,18 15:6	reduce 12:20 19:21 20:9	25:5	<u> </u>
35:10 37:11 39:4	reduction 7:16 8:13	requirements 21:7 41:14	S 3:11
provides 12:12	36:13	requires 20:24 25:1	Sable 31:14
providing 32:15 46:1	reductions 7:13 20:13,20	research 30:15 37:18	sate 15:10
provisions 5:7	reterences 23:6	residential 10:16 25:18	Saline 31:17
public 4:12 5:2 8:24 9:2	reterred 20:6	26:6,10	salinity 25:6 41:3 43:20
49:5,6 50:23	retuing 11:1	resolved 13:13	salt 22:9 31:17 35:8
publicly 22:14	retineries /:10 20:11	respect 11:16 14:3	40:10 43:13
Purdue 29:9,11	Keimers 19:14	respectively 20:10,14	same 18:7 21:12 26:17
purge 24:2	reinery 7:9,19 8:7 10:8	respond 22:17	28:11 29:18 32:23
purpose 19:19	10:11,20 13:7,10 17:24	respondent 1:13 4:9 48:9	34:12 42:8 43:24 46:12
pursuant 5:5	19:3,8,20:20:4,11,12,20	Kesponse 25:11 44:17	sample 9:15 35:22
pursuea 26:12	20:21 21:2,9,14 25:4	responses 22:22 23:9	samples 33:23 35:23

.

sampling 9:14,21 30:8 35:3 sanctions 21:4 Sanitary 31:13 33:3,24 38:2,20 44:5 satisfaction 24:23 says 50:5 scale-up 40:18 scenario 35:20 schedule 10:20,23,24 11:9,11 20:19 21:2,5,24 22:3 40:19 schedules 40:21 Science 19:10 29:8,10,19 Scott 2:11 6:16 scrubber 8:12 9:8 10:1 10:10 20:21 21:8 24:3,7 24:13 25:6 26:7,13 32:12 33:4 35:18 39:8 41:3 43:19 45:18,21 scrubbing 23:3 Sears 6:6 season 25:9 41:6 seasons 25:3 40:24 second 22:6 26:15 Secondary 33:8,15 Secondly 14:20 section 5:5.6 26:1 44:4 sediment 31:20 see 4:11 21:10 39:18 44:9 seeking 7:4 14:17 seem 44:11 sensitivity 9:15 separate 8:5 September 23:18 37:16 series 13:11 serve 29:14,18 served 29:16 set 49:5 several 11:21 37:4 39:12 sewering 10:4 Ship 8:3 31:13 32:3 33:3 33:24 38:2,20 43:18 shorthand 50:8,12 show 5:21 9:1 shows 7:7 signed 20:16 significant 7:5,13,20 33:5 similar 22:9 44:11 45:2 Simon 39:22 simultaneous 48:22 49:4 since 18:3 19:4 22:20 39:6 44:15 sir 46:15 site 25:15 site-specific 13:9,13 20:3 size 25:4 41:1 45:24 snowmelt 8:20 9:18 12:15,19 22:8 26:8,14 35:7,12 sodium 23:7 33:5,13

37:24 solely 43:13 solids 8:1,3,18 13:6 21:13 30:21 solution 23:7 some 14:1 22:17 27:7 31:10 46:1 Sonnenschein 2:7 6:6 soon 22:13 source 33:6 sources 7:14 South 2:8 Southern 44:4 SO2 20:9,13 special 25:23 specific 12:5 22:23 spell 17:11 27:21 spent 30:22 Springfield 2:13 SS 50:1 Stacy 2:16 4:22 stakeholders 37:6,11 40:1 standard 13:14 20:1 22:8 33:9,12,14,16 34:23,23 35:11,21,24 37:9 39:5 40:18 42:20,23 43:10 44:8 standards 29:20 32:1 33:13 36:19 37:5,19 40:14 44:17 start-up 30:3,6 state 7:21 14:6 17:10,15 27:20 28:1 29:20 37:14 50:1,7 statement 5:2 states 7:8 31:3,10 35:10 Statewide 29:19 station 34:17 stay 11:9 Stein 41:11,12,14 Steven 44:5 still 44:7 stipulated 10:21 21:3 stood 14:19 storage 45:12 storm 25:13,15,17 26:6 32:5 strategies 26:10 stream 25:3 31:18 32:11 39:14,16 40:8,24 41:20 43:7 44:22 streams 22:10 31:9,13,21 35:12 39:1 Street 1:20 2:4 13:8 17:17 34:18 strong 36:9 Studer 44:3 studies 31:8,10,21 41:21 study 32:2 39:2,3,7 42:8 42:19,22

subject 10:21 33:6 subjects 32:8 submission 47:17 submitted 20:17 21:23 23:5,24 24:4,20,23 34:8 38:12,14 43:6 48:19 Subpart 5:6,6 SUBSCRIBED 50:19 substantial 7:16 8:8 9:4 20:23 substantially 20:9 suggested 6:19 Suite 2:4.8 sulfate 9:7 23:21 24:14 33:5,14,16,17,19 37:9 37:24 38:4 40:4 42:4,11 42:12 43:9,11 sulfates 13:7 23:1 24:2,6 24:16 31:11 36:23 37:2 38:20 43:4 sulfur 7:16 Supervisor 44:3 support 13:19 14:6 15:12 18:13 20:23 28:18 30:7 32:15 47:4,23 supported 37:8 sure 5:13 16:17.24 surveys 31:11,18 SWB 25:14,14,23 26:1,14 swear 16:22 27:12 sworn 17:3,7 27:13,17 50:4,19 system 22:6 25:7 30:9 41:15 systems 31:2 Т T 3:11 take 13:24 15:22 26:19 26:20 taken 25:1 43:22 50:12 talking 48:15 tank 25:5 41:2,4 tankage 10:11 tasks 40:21 TDS 8:6,18 9:7,13,16,19 9:24 12:11 13:6 21:14 22:7 23:1,10,13 24:2,6 24:14,16,24 25:1 30:21 31:11 33:2,6,9,11,23 34:3,6,10,14,18 35:4,5 35:6,15,16,22,22 36:4,6 36:10.10.11.20.23 37:2 37:8 38:4,10,19 40:1,4 40:9,13,19,20,22 41:24 42:4 43:4,5,12,12,17 45:5,9,18 46:1 technical 4:15 15:15 27:4 30:7 32:15 37:7 46:9 48:17 technology 8:14 40:15

41:9,16 tell 28:5 terminate 25:21 test 8:21 35:22 36:2 tested 23:22 35:23 **testified** 17:7 27:17 49:12 testimony 9:22 10:17 11:19 12:8 15:5.8,17,21 15:21 16:2,4,9,18,23 18:4,7,10,13,18 19:1,19 26:17 28:8,12,15,18,23 29:4 41:11 45:14 47:4,9 47:17,22,24 testing 25:4 37:14 40:24 tests 23:10 37:17 Thank 5:4 6:10,17,23 13:22 15:13 46:7 47:14 48:2 49:16 thanks 49:15 their 35:13 46:22 49:1 themselves 6:2 thereunder 14:10 think 49:8 Thorn 31:15 though 11:3 thought 26:19 three 7:10 20:10 29:16 30:15 35:2.3 through 3:14 5:18 11:21 13:1 15:16 18:12,14 20:1 28:17.20 47:3 throughout 31:9 39:23 tight 5:24 10:19 11:11 time 10:13,24 12:22 18:17 26:9 28:22 45:23 47:2 title 17:21 today 4:10 11:19 13:21 15:6,22 16:7 45:11 46:14 47:6 48:1 49:12 today's 15:11 together 27:11 told 10:5 tons 20:10,14 total 7:24 8:2,17 13:6 21:13 30:21 35:20 36:8 41:19 43:20 **Tower** 6:7 toxicity 36:20,22 37:14 37:17 **TOXICITY/FUTURE** 36:18 training 32:7 transcribe 16:19 transcribed 16:6 18:19 28:24 47:10 transcript 47:11 50:12 translates 35:15 treated 21:14 45:8 treatment 10:7 23:10 30:6,7,12,17 41:13,15

			I uge 5
41.17	verify 9.20 16.23 18.9 14	we've 9.11 11.12 15.1 9	10c 38·18
true 18:10 15 28:15 20	26:16 17 28:14 19	48.15 16 21	104 38.18
50.11	$x_{0} = x_{0} + x_{0$	winter $25:3 0 35:7 40:24$	100 38.18 /1.8 /2.16
50.11 tury 26:7	viable 26:0 20:24	41.6	106 38.10 41.8 42.10
try 20.7	Viable 20.9 59.24	41.0	101 23.11 39.11
	Vice 29:5		10-year 38:24
Twait 2:11 6:16	Village 44:11,18	witness 3:3 17:1,3,6	100 1:18 2:4
two 14:12,24 19:7 20:11	violation 35:12 44:8,9,16	26:16 27:13,16	101 5:6
22:2 25:3 30:1 32:1	violations 40:9 41:23	witnesses 16:22 46:14	1021 2:12
40:24 46:14	43:9,13,17 44:13 45:14	49:11	104 5:5
Tyler 31:17	volume 25:17 26:6	work 30:1 37:13	11 14:22 35:19 38:6,15
typically 37:1	vs 1:8 4:8	worked 11:12 27:11	11-500 2:4
t]he 44:6	·	31:23	11-512 5:17
t]his 44:20	W	working 7:3 11:11 30:16	12 14:22 19:8 38:15 41:8
	W 2:15 3:5 17:5	written 47:9	43:3
U	Wacker 2:8	WWTP 23:11,22	12'9 26:2,4
ultimate 5:11	wading 15:16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13 39:18 44:19
ultimately 25:22	want 4:14 5:7.15 15:14	Х	135th 13:7 17:17
unable 14:5	15:22 16:1 26:18	$\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ 3.1 11	14 40.16
under 7:23 8:14 10:19 22	wants 6.19		14th 49.2
11.9 35.20	waste 39.16	Y	142 000 42 15
underground 30.17	wastewater 8.1 11 17	vear 23.12	1474 23.16
understanding 12.1/	10.7 21.14 22.10 20.6 7	vears 10.5 6 7 8 25.17	15 3.1/ 18.10 1/ 20.19
28.10	$\begin{array}{c} 10.7 \ 21.17 \ 23.10 \ 30.0, \\ 30.12 \ 17 \ 21.9 \ 24 \ 23.11 \end{array}$	20.16 20.1 15 22 21.4	28.20 22.22 25.4 0 44.6
20.10	24.2 40.9 41.12 15 17	29.10 50.1,15,22 51.0	28:20 33:22 33:4,9 44:0
	34.3 40.8 41.12,13,17	51:24 54:2 57:4 40:15	44:10 45:15 47:4
undertake 12:18	41:19		15th 48:24 49:2
underwent 13:11	wastewaters 30:19	yielded 35:24	15,000 20:13
Unical 13:10	water 9:9 11:4 19:21	Yr 23:13	1504 23:17
unit 4:15 15:15 20:22	21:19 22:1 23:8 24:3,9		1597 23:19
24:15 27:4 44:4 46:9	24:19 25:13,15,17 26:1	<u>L</u>	16 19:6
48:17	26:1,4,6 29:24 31:19	zip 17:19	1680 23:17
United 31:3,10	32:5,13 33:9,11,13,14	zone 25:24 31:21 32:2	1699 23:18
University 19:12 29:9,12	33:15,18,20 34:4,9,11	39:2,3 42:8,19,22	17 3:6 39:10
unknown 44:23	34:22 35:11 36:18,19		17th 15:17 18:5 28:9
unless 22:11	37:5,8,19 38:9,17,23		18 3:14
unnecessary 40:7	40:13 41:22 42:7,14	0.6 36:7	19 33:22
UNO-VEN 19:9	43:9,10,12,17,23 44:8	001 42:18	1948 23:19
until 36:17	44:16 45:22 46:3	05-85 1:8 4:6	1970 29:9
upgrading 10:15	waters 37:2	084-004466 50:18	1971 29:12
upstream 34:2 36:10	waterway 33:8 34:12		1973 30:14
upwards 39:20	waterways 25:16.21	<u>1</u>	1977 23:16
Use 33:11.14 34:22 37:2	Wauconda 44:22 45:1	1 3:14 18:12,14 20:17	1979 28:7 29:7
37:9	Wauconda's 44:11.19	25:8.9 28:17.19 35:19	1982 41.18
used 23:3 25:14 39:22	way 32:4	41:5.7 43:20 47:3	1992 39.1 42.8
42:3	ways 12:23	1.000 33:12 34:23 35:15	1994 19·4
using 25.13 40.18	weekly 23.11 33.24	36:3 45:10	1998 34.1 4
utilized 42.8	weeks 15.3	1.075 35:1	1000 34.5
US 7.8 10.22 20.7 37.13	well 6:21 10:2 20:23 21:0	1 100 20.14	1777 54.5
41.18	22.18 26.17 20.23 21.9	1,139 35.2	2
41.10	20.12 20.14 17 40.2	1 10/ 35.1	$\frac{2}{2}$ 10.24 11.21 21.1
V	50.12 59.14,17 40.5 wolls 20.19 22	1 408 34.16	2 10.27 11.21 21.1 2/1/2001 25.1
valid 30:7	Wono 5.20 12.2 12.12 15	1 500 33.0	2/1/2001 33.1
values 26:00	10.10 04.2 00.10 04.4	1 535 3 <i>A</i> ·19	21012001 33.2 20 21.1
values 50.22	10.12 24.3 20.18 34.4	1 505 2 <i>A</i> ·15	20 21.1
variability $9:20$	38.11,21 40.1/49.1/	1,373 34.13	20,000,000 35:10
variance /:4,24 8:22 9:3	west 1:18 2:4 28:3	1,030,34:7	2000 34:5,13,19,21
9:5 11:1,6,16,23 13:3	wet 8:12 9:8 10:1,9 20:21	1,000 37:10 1,967 24:21	2001 34:5,16,17
13:20 14:17 21:6,15	21:8 23:3 24:3,7,13	1,00/ 34:21	2002 34:5,6,13
22:12,12,15 32:16,19	25:5 26:7,13 32:12 33:4	1,902 34:24 36:4	2003 23:18 34:5
33:2,6,18 40:6,11	35:17 39:8 41:2 43:18	1/25/2001 35:1	2004 21:16,22 23:6,12,13
variances 13:11,12 40:13	45:17,21	10 9:11 37:12 46:4	24:1,5,8,18,21 34:5
variety 32:7 36:21	we'll 4:13 6:18 16:18	10b 33:21 38:18 41:8	37:5 38:12,15,22 40:2
various 19:12 31:24	we're 4:1 5:4 46:19 48:21	42:10	42:6,13 44:6

. .

2005 1:2,22 4:10 18:5 20:16 28:9 34:1,5 37:16 37:20 50:20 2009 25:8,9 41:5,7 21st 49:4 21.20 35:24 215,000 35:18 38:10 217 2:13 2183 23:15 22 31:24 45:15 2244 23:15 23,000 20:10 233 2:8 24 1:2 34:19,21 24th 1:20 4:10 2493 23:14	7 7 11:24 24:24 40:20 43:6 7a 33:21 7b 41:8,21 7,000 20:10 7-day 38:24 77 35:23 782-0610 2:13 8 8 21:16 32:17 34:6 39:11 8000 2:8 6:6 814-8917 2:5 876-2380 2:9	
25 31:6 26 20:16 2644 23:14 27 3:9 274,000 39:8,13 293 35:23	9 34:1 35:5 9a 24:12 9b 24:12 9:00 1:24 9:05 4:11 94 18:3	
3 3 21:10,22 3rd 48:20 3,690 35:14 3/16/2000 34:24 30 19:5 31:7 304.213 13:15 20:4 312 2:5,9 35 13:14 20:4 38,000,000 36:5		
4 4 21:15 34:15 4a 22:22 4b 22:22 4th 49:7 4,000,000 45:17 5 5 10:17 21:21 23:6 24:1.5		
24:21 34:17 38:13 41:8 41:9 5-85 5:17 500 33:15 512 28:3 6 6 11:21 24:10,19 34:10		
35:5 38:6,9,23 42:7,14 6a 23:9 6b 23:9 6c 23:9 6d 23:9 60439 17:20 60525 28:4 60601 2:5 60606 2:9 6:7 62794 2:13		

BEFORE	THE POLLUTION CONTR	OL BOARD
	OF THE STATE OF ILLINC	DIS CLERK'S OFFICE
IN THE MATTER OF:		FEB 17 2005
CITGO PETROLEUM COR	$\mathbf{PORATION and}$	STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
PDV MIDWEST REFINING,	L.L.C.,)	
) PC	B 05-85
Petitioners,) (V:	ariance – Water)
ν.))	8
ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENT	AL)	
PROTECTION AGENCY,	ý	
)	
)	

EXHIBITS ON BEHALF OF CITGO PETROLEUM CORPORATION and PDV MIDWEST REFINING, L.L.C.



CONSENT DECREE

1.

0>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Jurisdiction and Venue (Paragraphs 1-3)7
II.	Applicability and Binding Effect (Paragraphs 4-8)
Ш.	Objectives (Paragraph 9)
IV.	Definitions (Paragraph 10) 10
V.	Affirmative Relief/Environmental Projects (Paragraphs 11-134)
	A. NOx Emissions Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 11-31)
	B. SO2 Emissions Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 32-42)
	C. PM Emissions Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 43-47)
	D. CO Emissions Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 48-50)50
	E. NSPS Applicability to FCCU Regenerators (Paragraph 51)
	F. NOx Emissions Reductions from Heaters and Boilers (Paragraphs 52-62)
	G. SO2 Emissions Reductions from and NSPS Applicability of Heaters, Boilers and Other Fuel Gas Combustion Devices (Paragraphs 63-65)
	H. Sulfur Recovery Plants (Paragraphs 66-73)60
	I. Hydrocarbon Flaring (Paragraphs 74-76)
	J. Control of Acid Gas Flaring and Tail Gas Incidents (Paragraphs 77-93)
	K. Control of Hydrocarbon Flaring Incidents (Paragraph 94)
	L. Benzene Waste NESHAP Program Enhancements (Paragraphs 95-112)
	M. Leak Detection and Repair ("LDAR") Program Enhancements (Paragraphs 113- 130)
	N. Incorporation of Consent Decree Requirements into Federally Enforceable Permits (Paragraphs 131-134)

	VI.	Emission Credit Generation (Paragraphs 135-138)
	VII.	Modifications to Implementation Schedules (Paragraphs 139-140)
•	VIII.	Environmentally Beneficial Projects (Paragraphs 141-143)
	IX.	Recordkeeping and Reporting (Paragraph 144)
	Х.	Civil Penalty (Paragraphs 145-148)
	XI.	Stipulated Penalties (Paragraphs 149-226) 120
		A. Requirements for NOx Emission Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 150-156). 121
		B. Requirements for SO ₂ Emission Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 157-160)122
		C. Requirements for PM Emission Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 161-163) 124
		D. Requirements for CO Emission Reductions from FCCUs (Paragraphs 164-165)124
4		E. Requirements Related to NSPS Applicability to FCCU Regenerators (Paragraph 166)
		F. Requirements for NOx Emission Reductions from Heaters/Boilers (Paragraphs 167-170)
		G. Requirements for SO ₂ Emission Reductions from Heaters/Boilers (Paragraphs 171-171a)
		H. Requirements for Sulfur Recovery Plants (Paragraphs 172-178)
		I. Requirements for Flaring Devices (Paragraphs 179-180)
*		J. Requirements for Control of AG Flaring and Tail Gas Incidents (Paragraphs 181-184)
		K. Requirements for Control of Hydrocarbon Flaring Incidents (Paragraph 185) 132
		L. Requirements for Benzene Waste NESHAP Enhancements (Paragraphs 186-203) .132
		M. Requirements for Leak Detection and Repair Program Enhancements (Paragraphs 204-220)

58

•

	N. Requirements to Incorporate Consent Decree Requirements into Federally- Enforceable Permits (Paragraph 221)
	O. Requirements for Reporting and Recordkeeping (Paragraph 222)
	P. Requirements for Environmentally Beneficial Projects and Civil Penalties (Paragraph 223)
	Q. Requirement to Pay Stipulated Penalties (Paragraph 224)
	R. Payment of Stipulated Penalties (Paragraph 225)
	S. Stipulated Penalties Dispute (Paragraph 226) 139
XII.	Interest (Paragraph 227) 140
XIII.	Right of Entry (Paragraph 228)140
XIV.	Force Majeure (Paragraphs 229-237) 141
XV.	Retention of Jurisdiction/Dispute Resolution (Paragraphs 238-246)
XVI.	Effect of Settlement (Paragraphs 247-261)
XVII.	General Provisions (Paragraphs 262-273) 154
XVIII.	Termination (Paragraph 274-276) 161
XIX.	Signatories (Paragraph 277)165

iii

i

.

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: State and Federal Compliance Orders and Notices

Appendix B:

List of Hydrocarbon Flaring Devices

Appendix B-1:

List of NSPS Hydrocarbon Flaring Devices

Appendix B-2:

List of NSPS Acid Gas Flaring Devices

Appendix C:

List of Heaters and Boilers

Appendix D:

Determining the Optimized Addition Rates of Low NOx Combustion Promoters and NOx Reducing Catalyst Additives

Appendix E:

NSPS Subpart J Compliance Schedule for Heaters and Boilers and Streams in Fuel Gas

Appendix F:

Fuel Gas Combustion Devices Compliance Schedule

Appendix G:

NSPS Subpart J Compliance Schedule for NSPS Flaring Devices

Appendix H:

Predictive Emissions Monitoring Systems for Heaters and Boilers with Capacities Between 100 and 150 MMBTU/HR

iv

Appendix I:

Koch Guidance

•

۷