

tion of the most noxious tapes with odor counteractants (R. 1097). Respondent also provided testimony that those noxious tapes could be run on one machine which would reduce the cost of odor nuisance abatement (R. 1120). Process modification and incineration were methods discussed in detail by Respondent. The sum and substance of that testimony was that Respondent was proceeding rapidly on an odor abatement program which would result in success.

To date, Respondent has offered no program as required by the Order. That Order reflects the Board's intention to not restrict Respondent's approach to its problem. It is too soon for Respondent to seek relief from that Order. We might consider granting a subsequent variance request after the program has been submitted, found appropriate and implemented if the completion date then appears impossible and is not the result of the Company's dilatory response. Respondent's motion, if granted, would be a complete repudiation of the Opinion, not a modification of the Order. We therefore deny the motion for reconsideration of the January 16, 1973 Opinion and Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

I, Christan Moffett, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, certify that the above Order was adopted on the 21st day of February, 1973, by a vote of to .

Christan Moffett