1 1 BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD 2 3 IN THE MATTER OF: 4 Petition for Ford Motor Company (Chicago Assembly Plant)) AS-00-6 Adjusted Standard from 35 Ill 5) (Adjusted St andard.) Adm Code Section 218.986 6 7 The following is a transcript of the 8 proceedings held in the above-entitled matter ta ken 9 stenographically before TERRY A. STRONER, CSR, a 10 notary public within and for the County of Cook and State of Illinois, taken before, Amy Muran Felto 11 n, 12 Hearing Officer, at 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Illinois, on the 27th day of January, A 13 .D., 14 2000, scheduled to commence at 1:30 o'clock p.m. 15 commencing at 1:35 o'clock p.m.

2

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 1 APPEARANCES: 2 3 HEARING TAKEN BEFORE: 4 5 ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, 100 West Randolph Street Suite 11-500 6 Chicago, Illinois 60601 7 (312) 814-4925 BY: MS. AMY MURAN FELTON 8 HEARING OFFICER

| 9 | |
|----|--|
| 10 | SCHIFF, HARDIN & WAITE, 7200 Sears Tower |
| 11 | Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 876-1000 BY: MR. SHELDON A. ZABEL |
| 12 | BI. MR. SHELDON A. ZABEL |
| 13 | Appeared on behalf of Ford Motor Company, |
| 14 | |
| 15 | ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, 1021 North Grand Avenue East |
| 16 | P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, Illinois 62794 |
| 17 | (217) 782-5544 BY: MS. DEBORAH J. WILLIAMS |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Appeared on behalf of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. |
| 20 | ALSO PRESENT: |
| 21 | Robert A. Harsh |
| 22 | John C. Baguzis |
| 23 | Christopher Romaine Karl Karg |
| 24 | |

3

1 INDEX

00-006tr012700.txt

| 2 | | PAGES |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------|
| 3 | GREETING BY HEARING OFFICER | 4-6 |
| 4 | INTRODUCTION OF PARTIES | 6-6 |
| 5 | OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ZABEL | 7-12 |
| 6 | OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. WILLIAMS | 13-17 |
| 7 | STATEMENT BY MR. ROMAINE | 18-19 |
| 8 | CLOSING COMMENTS BY HEARING OFFICER | 20-23 |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | NO EXHIBITS WERE MARKED | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |

L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292

| 4 | | |
|-----|----|--|
| | 1 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Good afternoon and |
| ng | 2 | welcome. I am Amy Muran Felton and I am a heari |
| d. | 3 | officer with the Illinois Pollution Control Boar |
| g | 4 | I have been assigned to preside over this hearin |
| | 5 | today in the matter of petition of Ford Motor |
| | 6 | Company, Chicago assembly plant, for an adjusted |
| | 7 | standard from 35 Illinois Administrative Code |
| | 8 | 218.986 documented by the Board as AS 00-6. |
| and | 9 | Today is Thursday, January 27th, 2000, |
| | 10 | it is approximately 1:30 p.m. I note that aside |
| do | 11 | from the parties and their representatives there |
| | 12 | not appear to be any members of the public prese |

nt

- 13 with us today at this time.
- 14 The hearing was scheduled and noticed
- pursuant to Sections 106.506 and 102.162 of the
- 16 Board's procedural rules. This hearing will be
- 17 governed in accordance with the Illinois
- 18 Environmental Protection Act and the Board's
- 19 procedural rules, specifically, Sections 101.220

,

20 101.221 and 102 point -- Subpart J of the Board'

S

21 procedural rules regarding hearings will apply t

0

- these proceedings.
- This hearing is intended to develop a
- 24 record for review of this adjusted standard

L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292

5

1 proceeding by the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

| is | 2 | I will remind you that I will not be deciding th |
|------|----|--|
| | 3 | case. Rather, it is the Pollution Control Board |
| the | 4 | that will be making the decision upon review of |
| | 5 | complete record in this matter. |
| | 6 | My job is strictly to ensure that an |
| d so | 7 | orderly hearing and a clear record is establishe |
| | 8 | that the Board can have all the necessary |
| ion | 9 | information before it prior to rendering a decis |
| | 10 | in this case. |
| ve | 11 | After the hearing, the parties will ha |
| | 12 | an opportunity to submit posthearing briefs. We |
| ese | 13 | will also establish a public comment period. Th |
| | 14 | particular posthearing filings will be also |
| | 15 | considered by the Board prior to rendering its |
| ct | 16 | decision. All witnesses will be sworn and subje |
| | 17 | to cross-examination. The parties may ask a |
| | 18 | question of any witness. |
| icer | 19 | Any questions asked by the hearing off |

| | 20 | or anyone else present with us today are not |
|-----|----|---|
| | 21 | intended to express any preconceived notions or |
| r | 22 | bias, but are only to build a complete record for |
| | 23 | review by the Pollution Control Board. |
| , I | 24 | Before we begin with the hearing today |
| | | |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| 6 | | |
| f | 1 | would like to just begin with the introduction of |
| th | 2 | the parties. If you please could start first wi |
| У | 3 | the petitioner and then with the interested part |
| | 4 | that's here with us today. |
| | 5 | MR. ZABEL: I'm Sheldon Zabel, with the law |
| | 6 | firm of Schiff, Hardin & Waite representing Ford |
| | 7 | Motor Company. Do you want me to introduce the |

8 gentlemen with me?

| | 9 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Please. |
|------|----|--|
| , an | 10 | MR. ZABEL: To my far right is John Baguzis |
| | 11 | environmental control engineer at Ford's |
| xt | 12 | environmental quality office in Michigan, and ne |
| the | 13 | to me is Rob Harsh, an environmental engineer at |
| | 14 | Chicago assembly plant. |
| h | 15 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Now proceeding wit |
| | 16 | the interested party that's with us today. |
| and | 17 | MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Deborah Williams |
| | 18 | I'm assistant counsel representing the Illinois |
| | 19 | Environmental Protection Agency. |
| ork | 20 | MR. ROMAINE: I'm Christopher Romaine. I w |
| е | 21 | for the Illinois EPA in the permit section. I'v |
| 've | 22 | also worked extensively in VOC rule making and I |
| | 23 | dealt with Ford Motor Company. |
| very | 24 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Great, thank you, |

7 much. Now, I would like to address any outstand 1 ing 2 or prehearing motions. To my knowledge, there's 3 only one outstanding motion, and that is the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's motio 4 n for leave to file instanter the Agency's 5 6 recommendation which was filed with the Board 7 December 3, 1999. 8 MR. ZABEL: No objections. 9 HEARING OFFICER FELTON: As there appear to be 10 no objections to the Agency's request to file th eir recommendation instanter, the Agency's motion is 11 12 granted. 13 Are there any other outstanding motion s or 14 prehearing matters that we need to discuss?

MR. ZABEL: Nothing that I'm aware of.

| | 16 | MS. WILLIAMS: I have none. |
|------|----|--|
| ing | 17 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Okay. Great. See |
| w is | 18 | as there are none, what I thought we would do no |
| of | 19 | proceed first with opening statements on behalf |
| ar | 20 | the parties, and then we'll go through the regul |
| е | 21 | routine of the hearing. First, starting with th |
| | 22 | petitioner, if you have an opening statement. |
| | 23 | MR. ZABEL: I'll make a brief opening |
| | 24 | statement. Thank you, madam hearing officer. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |

1 As I said, I'm Sheldon Zabel. I represent
2 Ford Motor Company. We're here on the petition of
3 Ford Motor Company concerning the Chicago assembly

| m | 4 | plant, the petition for an adjusted standard fro |
|------|----|--|
| e | 5 | the VOM regulations in 35 Illinois Administrativ |
| | 6 | Code 218.986. |
| | 7 | The assembly plant, which was first in |
| in | 8 | operation in 1924, is located on Torrence Avenue |
| 700 | 9 | the city of Chicago. It employs approximately 2 |
| | 10 | people. As the name implies, it assembles |
| mber | 11 | automobiles and in the process of doing so, a nu |
| | 12 | of the processes in that in assembling an |
| nts, | 13 | automobile will involve the use of paints, solve |
| | 14 | et cetera. |
| are | 15 | The particular matter of concern here |
| from | 16 | emissions of volatile organic materials or VOMs |
| | 17 | nine solvent cleaning operations, which as their |
| the | 18 | name implies, are the clean-up processes used at |
| m | 19 | plant. For example, cleaning up spilt paint fro |
| | 20 | the painting operations. |

| | 21 | The existing regulatory requirement, |
|----|----|--|
| it | 22 | 218.986, which applies to VOM emissions from, as |
| to | 23 | says, other emission sources would be applicable |
| r | 24 | these operations. Other emission limitations fo |

| in | 1 | VOMs also apply at the plant and the company is |
|-----|---|--|
| s. | 2 | compliance with all of those emission limitation |
| ly | 3 | 218.986 provided so far, as the assemb |
| ans | 4 | plant was concerned, two possible alternative me |
| it | 5 | of compliance for these clean-up operations when |
| | 6 | was determined that they applied to the clean-up |
| s | 7 | operations. Based on Ford's investigation and a |

| d | 8 | demonstrated in the materials in the petition an |
|------|----|--|
| Ford | 9 | accompanying the petition, it was determined by |
| | 10 | that those two alternatives in 218.986 were not |
| It | 11 | technically feasible or economically reasonable. |
| | 12 | was also determined in that investigation that |
| | 13 | the |
| е | 14 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Could we go off th |
| | 15 | record just for a second? |
| | 16 | MR. ZABEL: Sure. |
| ion | 17 | (Whereupon, a discuss |
| rd.) | 18 | was had off the reco |
| d | 19 | MR. ZABEL: As I was saying, Ford determine |
| able | 20 | that the two alternate standards that were avail |
| le | 21 | to it under 218.986 were not economically feasib |
| hat | 22 | or technically reasonable, and also determined t |
| of | 23 | when that regulation was promulgated, the kinds |
| here | 24 | clean-up operations involved in Ford's petition |

10 had not been considered in the adoption of the r ule. 2 I suspect they hadn't even thought of it at the time that rule was adopted. As a result, Ford determ 3 ined 4 to proceed under Section 28.1 of the Illinois 5 Environmental Protection Act and seek an alterna te 6 standard to the ones in 218.986, and that is the 7 purpose of the petition here, which was filed on October 6th, 1999, docketed as AS 00-6. 8 9 October 18th, according to the Board's 10 rules, notice of the petition was published in t he Chicago Tribune and the certificate of publicati 11 on was filed with the Board on October 21st. 12

ot 13 going to reiterate the specific alternate standa rd, 14 as it's detailed and complex, necessarily so bec ause 15 we're dealing primarily with work standards for 16 controlling the VOMs from these, what are somewh at, 17 sporadic operations of clean-up. They are set f orth 18 from pages 11 to 13 in the petition. They deal with 19 limiting those VOM emissions, monitoring the compliance with a limitation so that the Agency 20 will 21 have the information to determine the compliance as 22 being met. 23 On a related track, the same issue has

24

tes

L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292

been raised and dealt with before the United Sta

| gh | 1 | Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Throu |
|------|----|--|
| nd | 2 | it's enforcement authority, Ford Motor Company a |
| in a | 3 | USEPA reached an agreement, which was reflected |
| | 4 | consent decree entered in federal court here in |
| f | 5 | Chicago in February of 1997. The requirements o |
| te | 6 | that federal decree are identical to the alterna |
| | 7 | standard proposed to the Board here. The |
| e | 8 | fundamental affect of the alternate standard her |
| trol | 9 | will, of course, be pollution prevention and con |
| | 10 | of the VOM emissions from these clean-up sources |
| | 11 | In addition, unlike the existing rule, |
| | 12 | from which an alternate standard is sought, the |
| or | 13 | proposed alternate standard sets an annual cap f |
| | 14 | the facility on emissions of VOM. |
| | 15 | Finally, these emissions are virtually |
| ty | 16 | non-discernible in their impact on the air quali |

| ich | 17 | in the area. If we took the 81 percent rule, wh |
|------|----|--|
| al | 18 | is one of the alternatives in 218.986, the initi |
| | 19 | difference would be something on the order of |
| in | 20 | seven-tenths of one percent of the VOM emissions |
| | 21 | the Chicago region. |
| ed a | 22 | I would note that the Illinois EPA fil |
| has | 23 | recommendation favoring the grant of this, which |
| | 24 | not been allowed to be filed as of this morning. |

12

1 My -- we have no objections and no problems with the
2 recommendation with one slight qualification. T here
3 is a related pending permit appeal and we would
4 withdraw that permit appeal as suggested by the

| W | 5 | Agency, but we would prefer to do it once the ne |
|------|----|--|
| | 6 | permit is granted rather than merely when |
| as | 7 | assuming the Board grants the adjusted standard |
| in | 8 | suggested by the Agency. It simply leaves a gap |
| an | 9 | the coverage if we withdraw it upon the grant of |
| | 10 | adjusted standard, but not with a new permit in |
| | 11 | hand. |
| | 12 | I think that will conclude my opening |
| ted | 13 | remarks. The extensive evidence that was submit |
| | 14 | with the petition was submitted under oath by |
| tend | 15 | Mr. Baguzis, who is with us today, so I don't in |
| | 16 | to have to tender him I will tender him as a |
| d be | 17 | witness if anyone has questions for him. I woul |
| | 18 | happy to do that, but I think it would be |
| У | 19 | unnecessary to clutter the Board's records simpl |
| r | 20 | reiterating what has already been submitted unde |
| m | 21 | oath, and with that I have nothing further, mada |
| | 22 | hearing officer. |

| h, | 23 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Thank you very muc |
|------|----|--|
| | 24 | Mr. Zabel. I just note for the record that one |
| | | |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| 1.2 | | |
| 13 | | |
| | 1 | member of the public has joined us during |
| g of | 2 | Mr. Zabel's opening statement and he is Karl Kar |
| у. | 3 | the United States Environmental Protection Agenc |
| ing | 4 | Now we'll proceed with the IEPA's open |
| | 5 | statement if they have any. |
| f | 6 | MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. I just have a few brie |
| is | 7 | remarks for the administrative record. My name |
| е | 8 | Debbie Williams and I'm assistant counsel for th |
| | 9 | Bureau of Air at the Illinois EPA, and today I'm |
| | 10 | representing the Agency in this matter in the |

| | 11 | matter of petition of Ford Motor Company for an |
|------|----|--|
| е | 12 | adjusted standard from 35 Illinois Administrativ |
| | 13 | Code 218.986. |
| he | 14 | The Board's procedural rules require t |
| ard | 15 | Agency to file a response to each adjusted stand |
| | 16 | petition that's presented to the Board. This |
| with | 17 | process enables the Agency to present the Board |
| е | 18 | the technical information necessary to facilitat |
| То | 19 | the Board's rendering of a final determination. |
| f | 20 | my left is Chris Romaine of the permit section o |
| | 21 | the Bureau of Air and the Agency has brought |
| | 22 | Mr. Romaine today as our technical witness to |
| onse | 23 | provide a brief statement in support of our resp |
| may | 24 | and to answer any lingering questions the Board |

| rd | 1 | have regarding this petition for adjusted standa |
|------|----|--|
| | 2 | and the Agency's response. |
| | 3 | As the Agency's response states, we |
| ord | 4 | recommend that the Board grant the petition of F |
| | 5 | Motor Company for an adjusted standard for its |
| o 35 | 6 | solvent cleaning operations, which are subject t |
| | 7 | Illinois Administrative Code 218.986, subject to |
| the | 8 | certain conditions, which have been agreed to by |
| | 9 | parties. |
| the | 10 | There is one additional condition that |
| the | 11 | Agency included in its response and that is that |
| ted | 12 | Board conditioned the effectiveness of any adjus |
| the | 13 | standard granted in this case in a withdrawal by |
| eal | 14 | petitioner of its permit appeal in permit app |
| | 15 | docketed as PCB 93-32. |

| | 16 | In developing its response, which was |
|------|----|--|
| | 17 | officially filed today, the Agency applied the |
| | 18 | factors contained in Section 28.1 of the |
| r an | 19 | Environmental Protection Act to determine whethe |
| | 20 | adjusted standard is warranted in this case. |
| at | 21 | The first two of those factors looked |
| е | 22 | whether the factors related to the petitioner ar |
| ose | 23 | substantially or significantly different from th |
| tors | 24 | contemplated by the Board, and whether these fac |

15

nd

1 justify an adjusted standard.

The record demonstrates that there is no

specific control technology guideline rule which

applies to Ford's solvent cleaning operations, a

| t | 5 | therefore, these processes are subject to Subpar |
|------|----|--|
| eds. | 6 | TT, Part 218, which applies to other emission ne |
| су | 7 | From a technical standpoint, the Agen |
| | 8 | has stated that it agrees with the petitioner's |
| | 9 | contention that the solvent cleaning processes |
| oard | 10 | conducted by Ford were not contemplated by the B |
| ion. | 11 | in adoption of this general miscellaneous provis |
| | 12 | With regards to the third factor of |
| | 13 | environmental harm and whether this was the type |
| ral | 14 | contemplated by the Board in developing the gene |
| | 15 | rule as stated by the petitioner, Subpart TT |
| ion | 16 | requires 81 percent overall efficiency in reduct |
| | 17 | of VOMs. |
| 0 | 18 | The record shows that Ford is unable t |
| | 19 | meet this overall reduction in a technically |
| 81 | 20 | feasible way. However, Subpart TT only requires |
| | 21 | percent reduction from total emissions with no |

| ise | 22 | limitation on how high the total emissions can r |
|------|----|--|
| ard, | 23 | to. Whereas, in the petition for adjusted stand |
| | 24 | Ford has voluntarily agreed to a cap on its |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| 16 | | |
| | 1 | emissions of 390 tons of VOM per year from its |
| | 2 | solvent cleaning processes. |
| | 3 | The Agency feels this cap will protect |
| | 4 | against future environmental harm in the Chicago |
| by | 5 | zone not retained in areas beyond that provided |
| | 6 | law. |
| ary | 7 | And finally, today's hearing is necess |
| | 8 | to fulfill the fourth requirement of 28.1 of the |
| | 9 | Act, which is that this adjusted standard be |
| | 10 | consistent with federal law. |

| | 11 | In order to be consistent with federal |
|------|----|--|
| | 12 | law, this adjusted standard must be approved by |
| plan | 13 | USEPA as a revision to the state implementation |
| | 14 | for Illinois or also known as SIP. |
| res | 15 | Section 110 of the Clean Air Act requi |
| ted | 16 | that a properly noticed public hearing be conduc |
| | 17 | on all SIP revisions. |
| | 18 | As the adjusted standard language in |
| | 19 | Ford's proposal closely tracks the language in a |
| s | 20 | consent decree agreed to by Ford and USEPA, it i |
| d | 21 | likely that USEPA will approve a similar adjuste |
| | 22 | standard when submitted by the Illinois EPA. |
| ends | 23 | In conclusion, the Illinois EPA recomm |
| rom | 24 | that the Board grant Ford an adjusted standard f |

- 1 35 Illinois Administrative Code 218.986 to Ford
- 2 Motor Company for its solvent cleaning operation s at
- 3 its Chicago assembly plant with the conditions
 - 4 stated. Thank you.
 - 5 HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Thank you.
 - 6 Mr. Karg, did you have any opening
 - 7 statement or anything you wanted to present?
 - 8 MR. KARG: I don't have any remarks at all.
 - 9 Thank you.
 - 10 HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Okay. That's fine
 - 11 Thank you very much.
- 12 Now, we will just proceed with -- just for
 - 13 the sake of formality here with -- back to the
- 14 petitioner, is there any other additional commen ts
 - 15 or testimony they would like to present?
- 16 MR. ZABEL: Just to be clear, we don't obje
- $\,$ 17 $\,$ to the additional condition on the dismissal of the

| We | 18 | permit appeal. It was only a question of time. |
|------|----|--|
| | 19 | certainly intend to do that once the if the |
| | 20 | standard is granted and a new permit is issued |
| | 21 | reflecting the standard. I have nothing else. |
| very | 22 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Great. Thank you |
| | 23 | much. |
| If | 24 | Now we'll proceed back to the Agency. |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| 18 | | |
| mony | 1 | they have any other additional comments or testi |
| | 2 | they would like to present in regards to this |
| | 3 | particular adjusted standard petition. |
| d | 4 | MS. WILLIAMS: I believe Chris Romaine woul |
| | 5 | like to make a brief statement. |
| | 6 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Thank you. Please |
| | 7 | proceed Mr Romaine |

| | 8 | (Witness sworn.) |
|------|----|--|
| | 9 | MR. ROMAINE: Good afternoon. My name is |
| A in | 10 | Christopher Romaine. I work for the Illinois EP |
| he | 11 | the air permit section. Even though I work in t |
| | 12 | permit section, I was involved in Illinois' rule |
| n | 13 | making for volatile organic material emissions i |
| e | 14 | the late '80s and early 1990s. This included th |
| of | 15 | Illinois EPA's oversight of USEPA's development |
| | 16 | its federal implementation plan for the Chicago |
| is | 17 | area. This federal implementation plant or FIP |
| of | 18 | the foundation in Illinois' subsequent adoption |
| are | 19 | Part 218, Subpart TT, which is the rule that we |
| | 20 | discussing today. |
| | 21 | Subpart TT is certainly the newest of |
| | 22 | Illinois' generic rules for volatile organic |
| | 23 | material emissions that establishes reasonably |
| es | 24 | available control technology. We have other rul |

19 in operations and categories specific, but Subpa 1 rt 2 TT is generic in that it is sort of a catchall f or 3 everything that is not otherwise subject to 4 requirements for reasonably available control 5 technology. б As applied to Ford Motor Company's sol vent 7 clean-up operations, I am not aware personally o f 8 any specific consideration that was given to its 9 operations when Subpart TT was developed. 10 Accordingly, I think it would be 11 reasonable to adopt an adjusted standard which specifically considers the nature of Ford's 12 13 operations when establishing what reasonably available control technology is, and in addition 14

Page 30

00-006tr012700.txt

| al | 15 | Ford clean-up operations volatile organic materi |
|------|----|--|
| if | 16 | emissions are best minimized by work practices, |
| | 17 | those are feasible and effective, to prevent |
| irst | 18 | emissions of volatile organic materials in the f |
| | 19 | place. |
| er | 20 | For that background, I am here to answ |
| for | 21 | further questions that might be made as a basis |
| h. | 22 | the Agency's recommendation. Thank you very muc |
| h, | 23 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Thank you very muc |
| | 24 | Mr. Romaine. |

L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292

- Does anyone have any questions for
- 2 Mr. Romaine?
- 3 MR. ZABEL: No questions.

| you. | 4 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: All right. Thank | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| lf | 5 That concludes, I presume, your comments f | | | | | | |
| | 6 | of the Agency. Thank you very much, Mr. Romaine | | | | | |
| t | 7 | Now we will proceed with whether or no | | | | | |
| nt | 8 | anyone has any other additional comments they w | | | | | |
| | 9 to make with regard to this adjusted standar | | | | | | |
| 10 petition, and if not | | | | | | | |
| can | 11 | MS. WILLIAMS: Maybe just for the record I | | | | | |
| nt | 12 | ask Sheldon, I think you had said that the cons | | | | | |
| | 13 decree was entered into in February, 1997? | | | | | | |
| e | 14 | MR. ZABEL: February 10th, 1997, is when th | | | | | |
| | 15 | judge signed the order. I think it's it is | | | | | |
| | 16 | actually pending | | | | | |
| ybe | 17 | MS. WILLIAMS: I was wondering if really ma | | | | | |
| | 18 | that was an error and it's February, '98? | | | | | |
| | 19 | MR. ZABEL: No, I think | | | | | |
| in | 20 | MR. BAGUZIS: There was a typo in there | | | | | |

| was | 21 | the order. It was there was some stuff that |
|------|----|--|
| t | 22 | signed in '97, earlier in the year like in Augus |
| ge, | 23 | and put by the time it finally got to the jud |
| | 24 | it was '98. I believe you're correct. |
| | | |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| | | |
| 21 | | |
| | 1 | MR. ZABEL: Yeah, that is correct past the |
| | 2 | you're quite right. Thank you. |
| | 3 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: So the date is |
| | 4 | February |
| | 5 | MR. ZABEL: Tenth, 1998. It had been left |
| been | 6 | blank, as you can imagine forms are, and it had |
| | 7 | filled in, but the year had been typed. |
| nk | 8 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Okay. Great. Tha |
| | 9 | you for that clarification. |

Any other comments that anyone else wo

| uld | | | | | | |
|------|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| ng | 11 | like to make with regard to this petition? Seei | | | | |
| | 12 | as there are none, we will actually proceed with | | | | |
| t | 13 | closing statements, but before we do that, I jus | | | | |
| | 14 | thought I'd inquire whether or not there are any | | | | |
| ard | 15 | other motions, any other matters you want the Bo | | | | |
| dard | 16 | to consider when deliberating this adjusted stan | | | | |
| | 17 | petition? | | | | |
| | 18 | MR. ZABEL: Nothing for Ford. | | | | |
| | 19 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Okay. | | | | |
| | 20 | MS. WILLIAMS: The Agency has nothing else | | | | |
| | 21 | either. | | | | |
| | 22 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: All right. If the | | | | |
| | 23 | parties would like to make closing statements? | | | | |

MR. ZABEL: I think I'll waive closing

| 22 | | |
|------|----|--|
| s on | 1 | statements. I said all I think we need to say i |
| | 2 | the record. |
| As | 3 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Great. Thank you. |
| | 4 | well for the Agency, they will waive? |
| | 5 | MS. WILLIAMS: Same here. |
| to | 6 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Good. That seems |
| | 7 | me unless anyone else has any other comments |
| | 8 | we're going off the record just for a second. |
| ion | 9 | (Whereupon, a discuss |
| rd.) | 10 | was had off the reco |
| he | 11 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: We'll go back on t |
| | 12 | record. The transcript in this matter will be |
| | 13 | available on or about February 8th, 2000. It |
| o me | 14 | appears from what the parties have represented t |
| ed | 15 | while we were off the record that they have waiv |
| | 16 | their posthearing briefing schedule or formal |

00-006tr012700.txt

| | 17 | posthearing briefing schedule in this matter. |
|-----|----|--|
| | 18 | Accordingly, I will establish a brief |
| | 19 | public comment period of 14 days after the |
| | 20 | availability of the transcript. Therefore, the |
| d, | 21 | record in this matter will close on February 22r |
| | 22 | 2000. |
| | 23 | The transcript in this matter will be |
| and | 24 | available on February 8th, 2000, as I mentioned |
| | | L.A. REPORTING (312) 419-9292 |
| 23 | | |
| b | 1 | will also be accessible by way of our Board's we |
| | 2 | site at www.ipcb.state.il.us. |
| m | 3 | The parties here are not precluded fro |
| me | 4 | filing any comments as well during that time fra |
| | 5 | if they decide that they wish to do so. |
| | 6 | The mailbox rule as set forth at 35 |

| .144 | 7 | Illinois Administrative Code 101.102 (d) and 101 |
|------|----|--|
| | 8 | (c) will apply to all posthearing filings. All |
| | 9 | posthearing comments must be filed in accordance |
| | 10 | with Section 102.320 of the Board's procedural |
| | 11 | rules. |
| | 12 | Again, I state that the record in this |
| | 13 | matter will close on February 22nd, 2000. Okay. |
| ess | 14 | Any other matters that we have to addr |
| | 15 | with regard to this petition? |
| | 16 | MR. ZABEL: None that I'm aware of. |
| | 17 | MS. WILLIAMS: No. |
| e, I | 18 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Great. Seeing non |
| | 19 | thank all of you for your participation and |
| | 20 | attendance today. Have a great day. |
| | 21 | MR. ZABEL: Thank you. |
| | 22 | HEARING OFFICER FELTON: Thank you. |
| | 23 | MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. |
| | 24 | (No further proceedings were had.) |

24 STATE OF ILLINOIS 1) 2) SS. COUNTY OF C O O K 3 4 5 6 I, TERRY A. STRONER, CSR, do 7 hereby state that I am a court reporter doing business in the City of Chicago, County of Cook, 8 and 9 State of Illinois; that I reported by means of 10 machine shorthand the proceedings held in the 11 foregoing cause, and that the foregoing is a tru and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so 12 13 taken as aforesaid. 14 15 16 17 Terry A. Stroner, CSR

е

| , | Illinois | 18 | Notary | Public, | Cook | County |
|---|----------|----|--------|---------|------|--------|
| | | 19 | | | | |
| | | 20 | | | | |
| | | 21 | | | | |
| | | 22 | | | | |
| | | 23 | | | | |
| | | 24 | | | | |