BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE HEARING in the above-captioned case before HEARING OFFICER CHLOE SALK, Illinois Pollution Control Board, at 160 North LaSalle Street, Room N505, Chicago, Illinois, taken before Janet L. Brown, CSR, on April 15, 2024, at 10:00 AM.

PRESENT:

MICHELLE GIBSON, Lead Board Member JENNIFER VAN WIE, Board Member ANAND RAO, Board Staff

ALSO PRESENT:

TIM FOX, Board Member

DANA VETTERHOFFER, IEPA

KYLE SOTTORIVA, IEPA

DAVID LORING, Rain Carbon

BYRON TAYLOR, East Dubuque Nitrogen Fertilizer

ANDREW SAWULA, Midwest Generation & Dynergy
MELISSA BROWN, Environmental Regulatory Group
ALEC MESSINA, American Petroleum Institute
JASON E. JAMES, Illinois Attorney General's Office
MOLLY KORDAS, Illinois Attorney General's Office
JUSTIN BERTSCHE, Illinois Attorney General's Office



	Electronic Filling. Received, Clerk's Office 04/21/2024	
		Page 2
1	I N D E X	
2		
	WITNESS RORY DAVIS	
3		
	EXAMINATION BY: Page	Line
4		
	MR. JAMES 9	13
5	MS. BROWN14	18
6	WITNESS STEPHEN NORFLEET	
7	EXAMINATION BY:	
8	MR. MESSINA20	16
	MS. KORDAS25	5
9		
	WITNESS BRYAN HIGGINS	
10		
	EXAMINATION BY:	
11		
	MR. BERTSCHE27	13
12		
13	EXHIBITS:	
14	Hearing Officer Exhibit A 9	3
	Hearing Officer Exhibit B 24	20
15	Hearing Officer Exhibit C 27	6
16	(Exhibits retained by Hearing Officer.)	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		



Page 3 HEARING OFFICER: Good morning everyone and 1 2. welcome to the Illinois Pollution Control Board 3 hearing. 4 My name is Chloe Salk, and I am the 5 hearing officer for this rulemaking proceeding entitled Amendments to 35 Illinois Administrative 6 Code 201, 202, and 212. The Board docket number for this rulemaking is R23-18(A). 8 9 To get started, I want to quickly go through three preliminary items: Introductions, 10 11 the procedure to date, and then housekeeping, 12 including the order in which we'll plan to proceed. 13 First, introductions. Present 14 today from the Board are Board Member Michelle 15 Gibson, the lead board member assigned to this 16 docket, and Board Member Jennifer VanWie. And then 17 present from the Board staff are Anand Rao of the 18 Board's technical staff, and Tim Fox, who is in the 19 audience today. 20 Second, the Board's procedure to The Board held the first meeting in this 21 date. matter on September 27th, 2023, and the second 22 hearing on November 1st, 2023. 23 On October 26th, 2023, the Illinois 24



- 1 Attorney General's Office filed a motion requesting
- 2 a third hearing in this sub docket. On November
- 3 16th, 2023, the Board granted the Attorney
- 4 General's Office motion requesting a third hearing.
- 5 Today we are holding the third
- 6 hearing in this matter.
- 7 In the order scheduling this
- 8 hearing, the hearing officer directed participants
- 9 to file responses to the Illinois Environmental
- 10 Protection Agency, or IEPA's request for
- 11 information and any pre-filed testimony no later
- 12 than March 15th.
- On March 15th, the Board received
- 14 responses to IEPA's request for information from
- 15 Dynegy and Midwest Generation, American Petroleum
- 16 Institute, or API, and Citgo Petroleum, Rain
- 17 Carbon, and East Dubuque Nitrogen Fertilizer, or
- 18 EDNF.
- 19 Also on March 15th, Dynegy and
- 20 Midwest Generation filed the testimony of Stephen
- 21 Norfleet, and Rain Carbon filed the testimony of
- 22 Bryan Higgins.
- 23 On March 22nd, Dynegy and Midwest
- 24 Generation filed a final comment in response to



Page 5 IEPA's request for information and filed the 1 2. supplemental testimony of Stephen Norfleet. On April 2nd, IEPA filed the 3 testimony of Rory Davis. 4 The hearing officer also directed 5 participants to pre-file questions based on 6 7 responses to IEPA's request and pre-filed testimony by April 8th. 8 On that date, the Board received 9 pre-filed questions from the Attorney General's 10 11 Office, the Illinois Environmental Regulatory 12 Group, or IERG, and API and Citgo. In a hearing office order on that date, the Board also submitted 13 14 a question. 15 On April 12th, EDNF filed written 16 responses to these questions. These response were 17 not required, but they are helpful in expediting 18 the hearing, and the Board appreciates the time and 19 effort of the participants' staff and counsel. 20 The Board posted all these documents to its Clerk's Office On-Line, or COOL, 21 under this docket number R23-18(A) as they were 22 filed. 23 And on to our housekeeping for the 24



- 1 hearing. This hearing is governed by the Board's
- 2 procedural rules. Under Section 102.426 of those
- 3 rules, all information that is relevant and not
- 4 repetitious or privileged will be admitted by the
- 5 hearing officer into the record.
- 6 Please bear in mind that any
- 7 questions posed today by the Board and its staff
- 8 are intended solely to help develop a clear and
- 9 complete record for the Board's decision, and those
- 10 questions do not reflect any determination or
- 11 judgment on the proposal, testimony, or questions.
- 12 For the sake of our court reporter,
- 13 please speak clearly and avoid speaking at the same
- 14 time as another person so that we can help produce
- 15 a clear transcript. If you are asking a question,
- 16 please state your name and the organization you
- 17 represent prior to any questions.
- 18 Also, if talking about sections of
- 19 the rules, please spell out the section letter such
- 20 as 620.101(D), as in dog.
- 21 Ms. Court Reporter, please feel
- 22 free to stop me or anyone else at any point if we
- 23 are going too fast, talking too softly, or if you
- 24 need something repeated.



- 1 There is a sign-in sheet over by
- 2 the door for anyone who wants to sign up for public
- 3 comments. So if there are any members of the
- 4 public in person here today, please go ahead and
- 5 write your name on the list.
- As a reminder, anyone can submit
- 7 written public comments on the Board's Clerk's
- 8 Office On-Line system. The board weighs oral and
- 9 written public comments equally.
- 10 As to the order of today's
- 11 proceeding, we'll call the following witnesses in
- 12 this order. First will be Rory Davis with IEPA,
- 13 then Steven Norfleet with Dynegy and Midwest
- 14 generation, then Bryan Higgins with Rain Carbon,
- 15 and then EDNF's witness.
- 16 After being duly sworn in, the
- 17 pre-filed testimony will be entered into the record
- 18 as if read under Section 102.424(f) of the Board's
- 19 procedural rules.
- 20 We will then turn to questions for
- 21 each witness, with pre-filed questions from the
- 22 Attorney General's Office first, then IERG, API and
- 23 Citgo's, any questions from any other participants,
- 24 and then the Board's questions.



```
Page 8
1
                     At the end of the hearing, I'll ask
 2.
    if there are any public comments from members of
 3
    the public.
 4
                     I anticipate breaking for an hour
    for lunch, if we're still going by then, from 12:30
 5
    to 1:30, and another short afternoon break around
7
    3:00 if we're still going at that point. And if we
    haven't finished with questions and public
8
    questions already, we'll end today around 5:00 PM.
9
10
                     Are there any questions about the
11
    order of proceeding? Seeing none, we will turn to
12
    testimony and questions.
                     All right. We will start with Rory
13
14
    Davis with IEPA. If you could please come and sit
15
    up in the front row.
16
                     Good morning. Okay. Would the
17
    court reporter please swear in the witness.
18
           COURT REPORTER: Would you raise your right
19
    hand, please.
20
                      (Witness sworn.)
21
                         RORY DAVIS,
    having been first duly sworn, was examined and
22
    testified as follows:
23
           HEARING OFFICER: As mentioned earlier, this
24
```



```
Page 9
    witness's testimony is entered into the record as
1
    if read and is entered as Hearing Exhibit A.
 3
                      (Hearing Exhibit A identified.)
           HEARING OFFICER: All right. We will
 4
    proceed with questions first from the Attorney
 5
    General's Office. If you would like to step up to
 6
7
    the podium.
8
                    And then please state your name for
    the court reporter.
9
10
           MR. JAMES: Good morning. I'm Jason James
11
    from the Illinois Attorney General's office.
12
                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
    BY MR. JAMES:
14
           MR. JAMES: Good morning, Mr. Davis.
15
           MR. DAVIS: Good morning.
16
           MR. JAMES: We pre-filed a couple of
    questions ahead of time, and hopefully you've had a
17
    chance to take a look at those.
18
19
           MR. DAVIS: Yes.
20
           MR. JAMES: Great. So I'll just basically
21
    paraphrase what we have written and then please
22
    provide your answer.
23
                     In your written testimony
    concerning IERG's proposal --
24
```



Page 10 COURT REPORTER: Concerning? 1 2. MR. JAMES: Sure. IERG, which is an 3 abbreviation for Illinois Environmental Regulatory 4 Group, IERG. You testified that their proposal 5 6 failed to specify sources or units that have an 7 actual need for regulatory relief. How does the lack of specificity 8 prevent you from determining which facilities could 9 be affected by the proposal and how could they be 10 11 affected? 12 MR. DAVIS: The lack of specificity would not prevent the Agency from determining the 13 14 universe of sources that could be potentially 15 affected by the proposal. IERG's proposal would 16 affect all fuel combustion emission sources greater than 10 million BTU. 17 18 Based on the information available 19 to the Agency, approximately 3,900 units at approximately 1,500 sources across Illinois would 20 21 potentially be impacted. This statement in the 22 Agency's testimony concerned our inability to assess whether relief from currently applicable 23 emission standards is even necessary, and to the 24



- 1 extent it is, for which sources and what the
- 2 individual and cumulative impact on air quality
- 3 would be.
- 4 Absent this information, the Agency
- 5 cannot ensure or represent to USEPA that there will
- 6 be no adverse impact on air quality. The Agency
- 7 also pointed out that the proposal is so broad it
- 8 does not appear to satisfy USEPA's criteria for
- 9 review of AELs, or alternative emission limits,
- 10 concerning specific narrowly defined source
- 11 categories.
- 12 MR. JAMES: Thank you. I'll move on to part
- 13 (b) of that question.
- 14 So how did you suggest to IERG how
- 15 to more specifically describe the affected
- 16 facilities or otherwise change to improve their
- 17 proposal, and how did they respond?
- MR. DAVIS: The Agency communicated the same
- 19 concerns to IERG as were conveyed to the Board
- 20 about the proposal, and those communications began
- 21 prior to the initial filings in this proceeding.
- Most recently, the Agency
- 23 reiterated to IERG that it should narrow the scope
- 24 of its rulemaking proposal to those facilities that



- 1 are actually in need of relief as supporting data
- 2 could be ascertained from those facilities and
- 3 emissions impact could be assessed.
- 4 Generally, representatives of IERG
- 5 indicated that they would consider the suggestions,
- 6 but would likely not be identifying specific
- 7 facilities in need of relief or providing
- 8 facility-specific information.
- 9 MR. JAMES: Thank you. Then I'll go to
- 10 Number 2. You also testified IERG failed to
- 11 provide sufficient technology support justifying
- 12 the proposal, including technical support
- 13 demonstrating impact of emissions that would be
- 14 allowed under the proposal.
- 15 How would the additional info that
- 16 you requested help measure the emissions allowed
- 17 under IERG's proposal?
- 18 MR. DAVIS: The additional information would
- 19 presumably include analysis of worst-case emission
- 20 scenarios and impact on air quality. These
- 21 analyses would be similar to those provided by
- 22 other proponents in this rulemaking and include
- 23 data indicating what worst-case emissions are
- 24 during startup and shutdown of affected units and



- 1 an analysis of the impacts of those episodes on air
- 2 quality.
- 3 MR. JAMES: Thank you. Then 2(b), Without
- 4 this additional support, is it possible to
- 5 determine the extent to which IERG's proposal is
- 6 effective in reducing emissions?
- 7 MR. DAVIS: No, it is not possible to
- 8 determine emissions impact from the large number of
- 9 sources that would be affected by the proposal.
- 10 MR. JAMES: Thank you. And my last question
- 11 is Number 3. In February of this year, the U.S.
- 12 Environmental Protection Agency, that's USEPA,
- 13 strengthened the National Ambient Air Quality
- 14 Standards, that's NAAQS, N-A-A-Q-S, for particulate
- 15 matter, also known as PM. So that rule I'll call
- 16 the PM NAAQS, spelled P-M N-A-A-Q-S.
- 17 USEPA's new PM NAAOS lowered the
- 18 primary annual particulate matter 2.5 standard down
- 19 to 9 ug/m. I'll skip that citation.
- 20 Will this new more stringent PM
- 21 NAAQS affect any determination made by IEPA from
- 22 your testimony which you submitted prior to the
- 23 finalization of the new PM NAAQS that the proposed
- 24 AEL will not interfere with any NAAQS either now or



- 1 in the future?
- 2 MR. DAVIS: The Agency did consider the new
- 3 2.5 NAAQS, or National Ambient Air Quality
- 4 Standards, when evaluating the impacts of the
- 5 proposal. The new standard should not impact any
- 6 determinations that have been conveyed to the
- 7 Board. States' obligations under the new NAAQS are
- 8 still in the process of being assist -- assessed.
- 9 It is always possible that rule
- 10 revisions may be needed in the future to meet this
- 11 or subsequent NAAQS, but it should not have any
- 12 impact on the current proceeding.
- MR. JAMES: Thank you. That's all my
- 14 questions.
- 15 HEARING OFFICER: All right. We will have
- 16 IERG come up next for questions.
- 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MS. BROWN:
- 19 MS. BROWN: Good morning. Melissa Brown of
- 20 the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group, also
- 21 known as IERG, I-E-R-G.
- Thank you for being here,
- 23 Mr. Davis. Good morning.
- 24 So going to the first question. Is



- 1 the Agency aware of the U.S. Court of Appeals for
- 2 the District of Columbia's decision issued on
- 3 March 1st, 2024, which involved petitions for
- 4 review of USEPA's startup, shutdown, and
- 5 malfunction, abbreviated as SSM, State
- 6 Implementation Plan, abbreviated as S-I-P or SIP,
- 7 SIP call?
- 8 MR. DAVIS: Yes. Yes, we are.
- 9 MS. BROWN: Has the Agency had any
- 10 discussions with USEPA about the March 1st, 2024,
- 11 decision?
- MR. DAVIS: We have had brief discussions,
- 13 yes.
- 14 MS. BROWN: And what do those discussions
- 15 entail?
- MR. DAVIS: That is a follow-up to what was
- 17 in here. In general, those discussions have been
- 18 regarding what USEPA thinks the impact is on
- 19 Illinois. The ruling has a number of categories.
- 20 We have asked what category they believe we may
- 21 have fallen into, although we're not -- Illinois
- 22 was not party to the suit, and so we're in
- 23 discussions with USEPA as to how the decision
- 24 impacts us now and possibly in the future, if at



- 1 all.
- 2 MS. BROWN: And so just to follow up, at
- 3 this time have -- so those discussions are ongoing,
- 4 or have they come to a conclusion as to how
- 5 proceedings might be impacted?
- 6 MR. DAVIS: They are ongoing.
- 7 MS. BROWN: And just another follow-up.
- 8 Have -- are those discussions still ongoing as to
- 9 which category Illinois' provisions might fall in,
- 10 or is that still ongoing?
- MR. DAVIS: Yeah. They are general
- 12 discussions. I don't know that exactly which
- 13 category we might fall into is relevant at this
- 14 time because we weren't a party to the suit. We --
- 15 and I don't know how much I should speak to legal
- 16 conclusions.
- 17 She says I shouldn't.
- But, yeah, general discussions as
- 19 to, you know, how the decision may impact how they
- 20 view things in the future about what we may be
- 21 doing in the SSM realm, I guess.
- MS. BROWN: 3, Is the Agency aware of what
- 23 USEPA may do as a result of the March 1st, 2024,
- 24 decision? For example, petition for rehearing,



- 1 appeal the decision, or reissue the SSM SIP, S-I-P,
- 2 call.
- 3 MR. DAVIS: No, we are not.
- 4 MS. BROWN: 4, Do you agree that the 2015
- 5 SSM SIP call and the 2022 finding of failure were
- 6 the basis of the Agency's proposal and the Board's
- 7 decision to adopt the Agency's proposal in
- 8 PCB R23-18?
- 9 MR. DAVIS: Yes.
- 10 MS. BROWN: Number 5, Did the Agency submit
- 11 the amendments adopted in PCB R23-18 to USEPA for
- 12 approval as a SIP revision? And if so, what is the
- 13 status of that submittal and USEPA's approval of
- 14 the submittal?
- 15 MR. DAVIS: Yes, we did submit them.
- 16 Region 5 is working toward a proposed approval of
- 17 the SIP submittal.
- 18 MS. BROWN: Number 6, Will the D.C. Circuit
- 19 Court's March 1st, 2024, opinion impact USEPA's
- 20 approval of the Illinois SIP revision?
- 21 MR. DAVIS: The Agency is not in a position
- 22 to opine on what, if any, impact the decision may
- 23 have on USEPA's approval of Illinois' R23-18 SIP
- 24 submittal, but we would note that to the Agency's



- 1 knowledge, Illinois' SIP call is still in effect.
- 2 MS. BROWN: And as a follow-up to that, is
- 3 any potential impact to USEPA's approval of
- 4 Illinois' SIP revision part of the discussions
- 5 between Illinois EPA and USEPA?
- 6 MR. DAVIS: We did discuss that generally.
- 7 I don't think we have specific knowledge. I would
- 8 expect that it would not have much impact as we
- 9 submitted a -- submitted revisions that had
- 10 adequately addressed the original SIP call.
- MS. BROWN: Number 7, Has the Agency
- 12 considered potentially withdrawing the SIP
- 13 submittal concerning the amendments adopted in
- 14 PCB R23-18 as a result of the D.C. Circuit Court's
- 15 March 1st, 20 -- that should be 2024 decision?
- 16 If yes, has the Agency considered
- 17 potentially submitting a proposal to the Board to
- 18 reinstate the startup, malfunction, and breakdown
- 19 provisions that were removed and revised in
- 20 PCB R23-18?
- 21 MR. DAVIS: The Agency does not intend to
- 22 withdraw its SIP submittal or to propose
- 23 regulations to the Board seeking repromulgation of
- 24 the previous SSM provisions. To the Agency's



- 1 knowledge, Illinois' SIP call is still in effect.
- 2 Regardless, though, the Board
- 3 repealed SSM provisions in 23-18 in compliance with
- 4 all applicable regulatory requirements. The rules
- 5 are final and effective and will remain so unless
- 6 and until amendments are adopted in a future
- 7 rulemaking proceeding. SIP approval of the rules
- 8 will ensure consistency at the state and federal
- 9 levels.
- MS. BROWN: Number 8, Has the Agency
- 11 considered whether the D.C. Circuit Court's
- 12 decision will have any impact on the seven criteria
- 13 for AELs outlined by USEPA in the 2015 SIP call,
- 14 and 2013 proposed rule, which references a 1999
- 15 USEPA guidance document?
- MR. DAVIS: The Agency is not in a position
- 17 to opine on what, if any, impact the decision may
- 18 have on USEPA's AEL criteria. As noted in the
- 19 question, however, the bulk of the AEL criteria
- 20 USEPA set forth as part of its SSM policy,
- 21 including the criteria regarding narrowly defined
- 22 source categories and worst-case emissions
- 23 analysis, has been in existence for decades. The
- 24 SSM policy was simply updated in USEPA's 2015 SIP



- 1 call action.
- 2 The SSM policy is considered
- 3 nonbinding guidance. It's possible that the USEPA
- 4 will amend its SSM policy in response to the D.C.
- 5 Court's decision or will implement its SSM policy
- 6 in such a way that takes into consideration
- 7 relevant aspects of the decision, but the Agency's
- 8 current understanding is that USEPA will be
- 9 utilizing the same or similar criteria previously
- 10 identified in assessing alternative emission
- 11 limits.
- MS. BROWN: Thank you very much.
- 13 HEARING OFFICER: Next we'll have API and
- 14 Citgo.
- 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MR. MESSINA:
- 17 MR. MESSINA: Good morning. My name is Alec
- 18 Messina, A-L-E-C M-E-S-S-I-N-A, on behalf of both
- 19 API and Citgo. And I will thank my law partner,
- 20 Melissa Brown, for covering most of the D.C.
- 21 Circuit questions. So I'll just focus on the first
- 22 three questions that were included in the pre-filed
- 23 questions.
- Mr. Davis, on page 15 of your



- 1 pre-filed testimony, it indicated that based on the
- 2 additional technical support and justification that
- 3 had been provided, the Agency does not object to
- 4 the adoption of the rule proposal as set forth in
- 5 API's March 15, 2024, filing with the Board.
- 6 As our March 15, 2024, proposal, or
- 7 filing, included the most up-to-date proposed
- 8 alternate emission limitation language in
- 9 216.361(d), as in David, but did not set forth
- 10 API's proposed revisions to Sections 216.103 and
- 11 216.104.
- Does the Agency also not object to
- 13 API's proposal in relation to those sections?
- MR. DAVIS: That's correct.
- 15 MR. MESSINA: Thank you. The second
- 16 question, API requests that the Agency elaborate on
- 17 its statement that it does not object to the
- 18 adoption of the rule proposal. So I will refer to
- 19 (a), (b), and (c) included in the pre-filed
- 20 questions.
- 21 Does this statement imply that the
- 22 Agency believes that USEPA's criteria for AEL are
- 23 met as to the proposal?
- MR. DAVIS: The Agency does not object if



- 1 the Board decides to adopt the proposed language,
- 2 the current proposal, along with the additional
- 3 support provided as the Agency has not identified
- 4 problematic emissions impacts from the proposal and
- 5 is not aware of any potential issues with USEPA
- 6 approval.
- 7 So to part (a), yes, based on our
- 8 current understanding of those criteria, yes, that
- 9 statement does imply.
- 10 MR. MESSINA: Thank you very much.
- 11 Does this statement imply that the
- 12 Agency's statement on page 12 of its October 23rd,
- 13 2023, comment that the proposal by API has
- 14 significant issues, would you now say that that
- 15 concern has been resolved based upon those
- 16 responses and further review by the Agency?
- 17 MR. DAVIS: Yes.
- MR. MESSINA: Is the Agency's statement
- 19 based in part on any conversations that they have
- 20 had with USEPA?
- 21 MR. DAVIS: Yes. The Agency has not had
- 22 detailed discussions with USEPA regarding the
- 23 individual proposals. However, the Agency did
- 24 request any comments USEPA Region 5 staff could



- 1 provide on the most recent proposals and support
- 2 that have been shared with the Agency and submitted
- 3 to the Board.
- To date there has been no response,
- 5 but Region 5 staff are aware that the Agency
- 6 believes that certain proposals and support satisfy
- 7 USEPA's AEL criteria.
- 8 MR. MESSINA: Thank you very much.
- 9 And then finally my last question.
- 10 If the Board chooses to adopt ATI's and Citgo's
- 11 proposal, does the Agency intend to submit API's
- 12 AEL language to USEPA for approval as a State
- 13 implementation plan revision?
- 14 MR. DAVIS: Yes. However, Region 5 has not
- 15 yet identified whether the proposed AEL is likely
- 16 approvable. If the Agency learns that the AEL is
- 17 likely not approvable, the Agency may reassess
- 18 submitting it to the USEPA as a SIP revision.
- 19 MR. MESSINA: Okay. Thank you.
- 20 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. All right.
- 21 Before we go to the Board's question, I just want
- 22 to check if there are any other questions from any
- 23 other participants for this witness.
- Okay. Seeing none, we'll go to the



Electronic Filing: Received, Clerk's Office 04/21/2024 Page 24 Board's question. 1 2. MR. RAO: I think the Board's question has 3 been answered in response to Ms. Brown's series of 4 questions. So I don't think there's any need to 5 repeat it. 6 HEARING OFFICER: All right. Then we'll 7 just move on. Thank you guys so much. So the next witness is Stephen 8 Norfleet with Dynegy and Midwest Generation. If 9 10 you could please come up to the front first row. 11 Would the court reporter please 12 swear in the witness. 13 COURT REPORTER: Would you raise your right 14 hand, please. 15 (Witness sworn.) 16 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. As mentioned 17 earlier, the witness's testimony is entered into 18 the record as if read and is entered as Hearing Exhibit B. 19 20 (Hearing Exhibit B identified.) 21 HEARING OFFICER: All right. We'll proceed 22 with questions first from the Attorney General's



Office.

23

24

Page 25 1 STEPHEN NORFLEET, called as a witness herein, having been first duly 2. sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MS. KORDAS: 5 6 MS. KORDAS: Good morning. I'm Molly Kordas, M-O-L-L-Y K-O-R-D-A-S, with the Illinois 7 Attorney General's Office. 8 We have just one question, and this 9 is a follow-up from a previous hearing and 10 11 comments. 12 The joint proposal in part relies upon compliance with work practices as a condition 13 14 to using an alternative averaging period. 15 Specifically can you explain what is meant by, 16 quote, good engineering practices, end quote? 17 MR. SAWULA: This is Andrew Sawula, 18 S-A-W-U-L-A, from Arentfox Schiff, A-R-E-N-T-F-O-X, 19 second word is S-C-H-I-F-F, on behalf of Dynegy and Midwest Generation. 20 21 That question was asked in 22 identical wording at the first hearing and answered 23 at that time. And it's also a question, a topic



24

that our expert -- that our technical consultant

- 1 did not opine on or was answered by both of the
- 2 companies at that time.
- 3 MS. KORDAS: Okay. Just one follow-up on
- 4 that. JCAR did specifically request in their email
- 5 filed on September 7th, 2023, specifically
- 6 requested of the Board, please incorporate by
- 7 reference the standard to be enforced.
- 8 Can you elaborate on that at all?
- 9 MR. SAWULA. Yes. As I indicated at this
- 10 first hearing, we would address that comment and
- 11 respond in our post-hearing comments.
- MS. KORDAS: Thank you. That's all of our
- 13 questions.
- 14 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
- 15 other questions from any other participants? No.
- Then we'll go to the Board's
- 17 questions. Or unless you still want to skip it.
- 18 Okay. Then we're all set for that.
- 19 Thank you.
- Okay. Next we have Bryan Higgins
- 21 with Rain Carbon.
- 22 Good morning. Will the court
- 23 reporter please swear in the witness.
- 24 COURT REPORTER: Would you raise your right



```
Page 27
    hand, please.
1
 2.
                      (Witness sworn.)
 3
           HEARING OFFICER: As mentioned earlier, the
    witness's testimony is entered the into the record
 4
    as if read and is entered as Hearing Exhibit C.
 5
                      (Hearing Exhibit C identified.)
 6
7
           HEARING OFFICER: We will again proceed with
    questions first from the Attorney General's Office.
8
                       BRYAN HIGGINS,
9
    called as a witness herein, having been first duly
10
    sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
11
12
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
    BY MR. BERTSCHE:
14
           MR. BERTSCHE: Good morning. My name is
15
    Justin Bertsche, B-E-R-T-S-C-H-E, with the Illinois
16
    Attorney General's Office. Thank you for being
17
    here.
18
                     I'll begin by reading Question 1.
    IEPA's comments filed on October 23rd, 2023, note
19
    that, quote, Rain Carbon did not sufficiently
20
21
    demonstrate why a three-hour averaging period would
22
    be necessary to comply with the opacity standard,
23
    unquote.
                     In response, Rain Carbon noted the
24
```



- 1 difference between typical startup conditions and
- 2 the conditions during the July 2023 engineering
- 3 study. Rain Carbon did not otherwise demonstrate
- 4 why a three-hour averaging period would be
- 5 necessary to comply with the opacity standard.
- Does Rain Carbon believe further
- 7 demonstrations needed to justify its proposed AEL
- 8 for opacity? If not, please explain.
- 9 MR. HIGGINS: Further demonstration is not
- 10 needed to support the proposed standard. The July
- 11 2023 engineering study was conducted during a
- 12 representative startup, but that does not mean that
- 13 future startups will be identical to the July 2023
- 14 engineering study.
- 15 As we have previously explained,
- 16 startups can begin at temperatures lower than what
- 17 occurred during the engineering study. Opacity
- 18 levels are higher at these lower temperatures,
- 19 between 400 and 600 degrees Fahrenheit, and, as
- 20 demonstrated in the supplemental technical support
- 21 document, could require multiple hours before
- 22 compliance with the opacity standard occurs.
- 23 Therefore, the proposed three-hour averaging period
- 24 is necessary to accommodate reasonably likely



- 1 future startup scenarios.
- 2 MR. BERTSCHE: Question 2, and relating to
- 3 this first question: Given that Rain Carbon's July
- 4 2023 engineering study differed from typical
- 5 operating conditions, (a) can Rain Carbon discuss
- 6 why the July 2023 engineering study was conducted
- 7 under what I call atypical conditions?
- 8 MR. HIGGINS: It is incorrect to
- 9 characterize the July 2023 engineering test as
- 10 atypical. The engineering study was conducted
- 11 under a representative startup, as previously
- 12 noted, and further testing is not necessary to
- 13 support any of the proposed alternative emission
- 14 limits.
- 15 As detailed in a supplemental
- 16 technical support document, the data collected
- 17 during the engineering test was sufficient to
- 18 develop a strong correlation between temperature
- 19 and volatile organic matter emissions. That
- 20 allowed extrapolation of that data to determine
- 21 representative emission rates at 400 degrees
- 22 Fahrenheit.
- 23 Similarly, the collected data was
- 24 sufficient to develop a strong correlation between



- 1 temperature and particulate matter that allowed
- 2 interpolation between known emission rates at known
- 3 temperatures to determine representative emission
- 4 rates between 1370 and 1800 degrees Fahrenheit.
- 5 These correlations allowed Rain
- 6 Carbon to utilize emissions data from one
- 7 representative startup to determine emissions that
- 8 would occur during all reasonably likely startup
- 9 events. This ensured that the NAAQS
- 10 noninterference demonstration supporting Rain
- 11 Carbon's proposed alternative emission limits was
- 12 representative of all foreseeable startup events.
- MR. BERTSCHE: Part (b), Does Rain Carbon
- 14 believe the differences between the July 2023
- 15 engineering study and typical operating conditions
- 16 justify a new engineering study conducted under
- 17 typical operating conditions? If not, please
- 18 explain.
- 19 MR. HIGGINS: No, and I believe I've already
- 20 explained.
- 21 MR. BERTSCHE: Question 3, In calculating
- 22 its AEL for PM, Rain Carbon includes the variable,
- 23 quote, malfunction --
- 24 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you speak



- 1 up?
- 2 MR. BERTSCHE: Yes. Rain Carbon includes
- 3 the variable malfunction remainder hours, which
- 4 Rain Carbon defines as, quote, the difference
- 5 between 24 hours and the actual duration of each
- 6 malfunction/breakdown event, unquote.
- 7 Previously Rain Carbon noted that,
- 8 quote, kiln malfunctions and breakdowns occur
- 9 periodically at the facility generally taking the
- 10 pyroscrubber between 1800 degrees Fahrenheit for
- 11 shorter periods of time; e.g., four to five hours.
- 12 Please explain why malfunction
- 13 remainder hours should be defined as the difference
- 14 between 24 hours and the actual duration of each
- 15 malfunction or breakdown event rather than the
- 16 difference between four to five hours and the
- 17 actual duration of each malfunction or breakdown
- 18 event.
- 19 MR. HIGGINS: The approach used by Rain
- 20 Carbon is correct to ensure that the proposed limit
- 21 accommodates potential future malfunction and
- 22 breakdown events. It is possible that malfunction
- 23 or breakdown events last up to 24 hours.
- 24 By permit, Rain Carbon can operate



- 1 up to 24 hours while the pyroscrubber inlet
- 2 temperature is below 1800 degrees Fahrenheit on a
- 3 three-hour rolling average. Thus, to account for
- 4 potential future operating scenarios and the
- 5 proposed alternative emission limit, it was
- 6 appropriate to extrapolate historic malfunction
- 7 breakdown hours up to the potential 24-hour length
- 8 of those events.
- 9 MR. BERTSCHE: One follow-up to that
- 10 response. In Rain Carbon's April 8th, 2024,
- 11 filing, which is titled Rain Carbon's second
- 12 supplemental response to Illinois EPA's comments,
- 13 there's a table on page -- I forgot the number. I
- 14 guess it would be of the PDF page 1, 2, 3, 4 -- 5
- 15 of the PDF.
- 16 The table includes five malfunction
- 17 and breakdown events, historical malfunction and
- 18 breakdown events at the facility, none of which are
- 19 24 hours. They last I think -- the longest
- 20 duration was 8.75 hours.
- 21 Does Rain Carbon believe that a
- 22 24-hour breakdown event is possible, or is Rain
- 23 Carbon aware of any 24-hour breakdown or
- 24 malfunction event?



```
Page 33
           MR. HIGGINS: Yeah, that's possible.
1
 2.
           MR. BERTSCHE: Okay. Thank you. That's all
 3
    my questions.
 4
           HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. All right.
    Are there any other questions from any other
 5
 6
    participants?
7
                    Okay. And we're going to skip the
    Board's question again. So thank you guys so much.
8
9
                    And before calling up EDNF, I just
10
    wanted to check since they did file written
    responses if there are any follow-up questions
11
12
    anyone has.
13
                    No? All right. Then we will skip
14
    that and go to public comments.
15
                    Is there anyone here who would like
16
    to provide a public comment? If so, please raise
    your hand or say something.
17
18
                    Okay. I'm not seeing any. Okay.
19
                    All right. Then I would like to go
    off the record for just a minute just to address a
20
21
    few procedural issues before we adjourn.
                      (Discussion off the record.)
22
           HEARING OFFICER: All right. We're back on
23
    the record after a brief discussion of procedural
24
```



- 1 matters.
- 2 Copies of the transcript are
- 3 expected to be available at the Board by Monday,
- 4 April 22nd. Once it's filed with the Board, the
- 5 transcript will be posted promptly to the Board's
- 6 website under this docket number R23-18(A).
- 7 Before it takes action on the
- 8 proposals, the Board will hold open a post-hearing
- 9 comment period. Post-hearing comments will be due
- 10 30 days after the Board receives this transcript.
- 11 When the Board receives the
- 12 transcript, we will issue a hearing officer order
- 13 confirming this deadline for post-hearing comments.
- 14 Filings with the Board, whether
- 15 paper or electronic, must also be served on the
- 16 hearing officer and those persons on the service
- 17 list. Before filing please check on COOL or with
- 18 the Board's Clerk to ensure that you have the most
- 19 recent version of the service list.
- 20 Are there any other matters that
- 21 need to be addressed at this time?
- Okay. Seeing none, thank you
- 23 everyone for participating. The third hearing is
- 24 adjourned.



1	Page 35 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2	COUNTY OF DU PAGE)
3	I, Janet L. Brown, CSR. No. 84-002176, do
4	hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the
5	proceedings in the above-entitled cause and that
6	the foregoing Report of Proceedings, Pages 1
7	through 35, inclusive, is a true, correct, and
8	complete transcript of my shorthand notes taken at
9	the time and place aforesaid.
10	I further certify that I am not counsel for
11	nor in any way related to any of the parties to
12	this suit, nor am I in any way, directly or
13	indirectly interested in the outcome thereof.
14	This certification applies only to those
15	transcripts, original and copies, produced under my
16	direction and control; and I assume no
17	responsibility for the accuracy of any copies which
18	are not so produced.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my
20	hand this 19th day of April, 2024.
21	
22	Janet L. Brown
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter
0.4	



A	17:11 18:13 19:6	Ambient	approvable
abbreviated	adoption	13:13 14:3	23:16,17
15:5,6	21:4,18	amend	approval
abbreviation	adverse	20:4	17:12,13,16,20,23
10:3	11:6	amendments	18:3 19:7 22:6
above-captioned	AEL	1:4 3:6 17:11 18:13	23:12
1:8	13:24 19:18,19 21:22	19:6	approximately
above-entitled	23:7,12,15,16 28:7	American	10:19,20
35:5	30:22	1:21 4:15	April
Absent	AELs	analyses	1:11 5:3,8,15 32:10
11:4	11:9 19:13	12:21	34:4 35:20
accommodate	affect	analysis	Arentfox
28:24	10:16 13:21	12:19 13:1 19:23	25:18
accommodates	aforesaid	Anand	ascertained
31:21	35:9	1:16 3:17	12:2
account	afternoon	Andrew	asked
32:3	8:6	1:20 25:17	15:20 25:21
accuracy	Agency	annual	asking
35:17	4:10 10:13,19 11:4,6	13:18	6:15
action	11:18,22 13:12 14:2	answer	aspects
20:1 34:7	15:1,9 16:22 17:10	9:22	20:7
actual	17:21 18:11,16,21	answered	assess
10:7 31:5,14,17	19:10,16 21:3,12,16	24:3 25:22 26:1	10:23
additional	21:22,24 22:3,16,21	anticipate	assessed
12:15,18 13:4 21:2	22:23 23:2,5,11,16	8:4	12:3 14:8
22:2	23:17	API	assessing
address	Agency's	4:16 5:12 7:22 20:13	20:10
26:10 33:20	10:22 17:6,7,24	20:19 21:16 22:13	assigned
addressed	18:24 20:7 22:12,18	API's	3:15
18:10 34:21	agree	21:5,10,13 23:11	assist
adequately	17:4	appeal	14:8
18:10	ahead	17:1	assume
adjourn	7:4 9:17	Appeals	35:16
33:21	air	15:1	ATI's
adjourned	11:2,6 12:20 13:1,13	appear	23:10
34:24	14:3	11:8	Attorney
ADMIN	Alec	applicable	1:22,22,23 4:1,3 5:10
1:4	1:21 20:17	10:23 19:4	7:22 9:5,11 24:22
Administrative	allowed	applies	25:8 27:8,16
3:6	12:14,16 29:20 30:1	35:14	atypical
admitted	30:5	appreciates	29:7,10
6:4	alternate	5:18	audience
adopt	21:8	approach	3:19
17:7 22:1 23:10	alternative	31:19	available
adopted	11:9 20:10 25:14	appropriate	10:18 34:3
	29:13 30:11 32:5	32:6	average
		i .	I



32:3	11:19 14:7 18:17,23	30:21	23:10
averaging	19:2 21:5 22:1 23:3	call	Circuit
25:14 27:21 28:4,23	23:10 26:6 34:3,4,8	7:11 13:15 15:7 17:2	17:18 18:14 19:11
avoid	34:10,11,14	17:5 18:1,10 19:1	20:21
6:13	Board's	19:13 20:1 29:7	citation
aware	3:18,20 6:1,9 7:7,18	called	13:19
15:1 16:22 22:5 23:5	7:24 17:6 23:21	25:2 27:10	Citgo
32:23	24:1,2 26:16 33:8	calling	4:16 5:12 20:14,19
A-L-E-C	34:5,18	33:9	Citgo's
20:18	break	Carbon	7:23 23:10
A-R-E-N-T-F-O-X	8:6	1:19 4:17,21 7:14	clear
25:18	breakdown	26:21 27:20,24 28:3	6:8,15
	18:18 31:15,17,22,23	28:6 29:5 30:6,13	clearly
B	32:7,17,18,22,23	30:22 31:2,4,7,20	6:13
b	breakdowns	31:24 32:21,23	Clerk
2:14 11:13 21:19	31:8	Carbon's	34:18
24:19,20 30:13	breaking	29:3 30:11 32:10,11	Clerk's
back	8:4	case	5:21 7:7
33:23	brief	1:8	Code
based	15:12 33:24	categories	1:4 3:7
5:6 10:18 21:1 22:7	broad	11:11 15:19 19:22	collected
22:15,19	11:7	category	29:16,23
basically	Brown	15:20 16:9,13	Columbia's
9:20	1:11,21 2:5 14:18,19	cause	15:2
basis	14:19 15:9,14 16:2	35:5	combustion
17:6	16:7,22 17:4,10,18	certain	10:16
bear	18:2,11 19:10 20:12	23:6	come
6:6	20:20 35:3	certification	8:14 14:16 16:4
began	Brown's	35:14	24:10
11:20	24:3	Certified	comment
behalf	Bryan	35:23	4:24 22:13 26:10
20:18 25:19	2:9 4:22 7:14 26:20	certify	33:16 34:9
believe	27:9	35:4,10	comments
15:20 28:6 30:14,19	BTU	chance	7:3,7,9 8:2 22:24
32:21	10:17	9:18	25:11 26:11 27:19
believes	bulk	change	32:12 33:14 34:9,13
21:22 23:6	19:19	11:16	communicated
Bertsche	BYRON	characterize	11:18
1:23 2:11 27:13,14	1:20	29:9	communications
27:15 29:2 30:13,21	B-E-R-T-S-C-H-E	check	11:20
31:2 32:9 33:2	27:15	23:22 33:10 34:17	companies
board		Chicago	26:2
1:1,9,15,15,16,18 3:2	C	1:10	complete
3:7,14,14,15,16,17	c	Chloe	6:9 35:8
3:21 4:3,13 5:9,13	2:15 21:19 27:5,6	1:8 3:4	compliance
5:18,20 6:7 7:8	calculating	chooses	19:3 25:13 28:22
	I	l	



	1	1	1
comply	correlation	9:14,15,19 10:12	14:6
27:22 28:5	29:18,24	11:18 12:18 13:7	determine
concern	correlations	14:2,23 15:8,12,16	13:5,8 29:20 30:3,7
22:15	30:5	16:6,11 17:3,9,15	determining
concerned	counsel	17:21 18:6,21 19:16	10:9,13
10:22	5:19 35:10	20:24 21:14,24	develop
concerning	COUNTY	22:17,21 23:14	6:8 29:18,24
9:24 10:1 11:10	35:2	day	differed
18:13	couple	35:20	29:4
concerns	9:16	days	difference
11:19	court	34:10	28:1 31:4,13,16
conclusion	6:12,21 8:17,18 9:9	deadline	differences
16:4	10:1 15:1 24:11,13	34:13	30:14
conclusions	26:22,24 30:24	decades	DIRECT
16:16	Court's	19:23	9:12 14:17 20:15
condition	17:19 18:14 19:11	decides	25:4 27:12
25:13	20:5	22:1	directed
conditions	covering	decision	4:8 5:5
28:1,2 29:5,7 30:15	20:20	6:9 15:2,11,23 16:19	direction
30:17	criteria	16:24 17:1,7,22	35:16
conducted	11:8 19:12,18,19,21	18:15 19:12,17 20:5	directly
28:11 29:6,10 30:16	20:9 21:22 22:8	20:7	35:12
confirming	23:7	defined	discuss
34:13	CSR	11:10 19:21 31:13	18:6 29:5
consider	1:11 35:3	defines	discussion
12:5 14:2	cumulative	31:4	33:22,24
consideration	11:2	degrees	discussions
20:6	current	28:19 29:21 30:4	15:10,12,14,17,23
considered	14:12 20:8 22:2,8	31:10 32:2	16:3,8,12,18 18:4
18:12,16 19:11 20:2	currently	demonstrate	22:22
consistency	10:23	27:21 28:3	District
19:8	D	demonstrated	15:2
consultant	$\frac{D}{D}$	28:20	docket
25:24	2:1	demonstrating	3:7,16 4:2 5:22 34:6
control	DANA	12:13	document
1:1,9 3:2 35:16	1:18	demonstration	19:15 28:21 29:16
conversations	data	28:9 30:10 demonstrations	documents 5:21
22:19	12:1,23 29:16,20,23	28:7	= :
conveyed 11:19 14:6	30:6	describe	dog 6:20
COOL	date	11:15	doing
5:21 34:17	3:11,21 5:9,13 23:4	detailed	16:21
copies	David	22:22 29:15	10.21 door
34:2 35:15,17	1:19 21:9	determination	7:2
correct	Davis	6:10 13:21	DU
21:14 31:20 35:7	2:2 5:4 7:12 8:14,21	determinations	35:2
21.1 4 31.20 33.7		ucici iiiiiaiiviis	33.4



Dubuguo	emissions	8:22 25:3 27:11	fall
Dubuque 1:20 4:17			
	12:3,13,16,23 13:6,8	example 16:24	16:9,13 fallen
due	19:22 22:4 29:19		
34:9	30:6,7	Exhibit	15:21
duly	enforced	2:14,14,15 9:2,3	fast
7:16 8:22 25:2 27:10	26:7	24:19,20 27:5,6	6:23
duration	engineering	Exhibits	February
31:5,14,17 32:20	25:16 28:2,11,14,17	2:13,16	13:11
Dynegy	29:4,6,9,10,17	existence	federal
4:15,19,23 7:13 24:9	30:15,16	19:23	19:8
25:19	ensure	expect	feel
Dynergy	11:5 19:8 31:20	18:8	6:21
1:20	34:18	expected	Fertilizer
D.C	ensured	34:3	1:20 4:17
17:18 18:14 19:11	30:9	expediting	file
20:4,20	entail	5:17	4:9 33:10
	15:15	expert	filed
E	entered	25:24	4:1,20,21,24 5:1,3,15
E	7:17 9:1,2 24:17,18	explain	5:23 26:5 27:19
1:22 2:1	27:4,5	25:15 28:8 30:18	34:4
earlier	entitled	31:12	filing
8:24 24:17 27:3	3:6	explained	21:5,7 32:11 34:17
East	Environmental	28:15 30:20	filings
1:20 4:17	1:21 4:9 5:11 10:3	extent	11:21 34:14
EDNF	13:12 14:20	11:1 13:5	final
4:18 5:15 33:9	EPA	extrapolate	4:24 19:5
EDNF's	18:5	32:6	finalization
7:15	EPA's	extrapolation	13:23
effect	32:12	29:20	finally
18:1 19:1	episodes	e.g	23:9
effective	13:1	31:11	finding
13:6 19:5	equally	31.11	17:5
effort	l = - °	F	
5:19	7:9	facilities	finished
either	evaluating	10:9 11:16,24 12:2,7	8:8
13:24	14:4	facility	first
elaborate	event	31:9 32:18	3:13,21 7:12,22 8:22
21:16 26:8	31:6,15,18 32:22,24		9:5 14:24 20:21
electronic	events	facility-specific	24:10,22 25:2,22
	30:9,12 31:22,23	Fahrenheit	26:10 27:8,10 29:3
34:15	32:8,17,18		five
email	exactly	28:19 29:22 30:4	31:11,16 32:16
26:4	16:12	31:10 32:2	focus
emission	EXAMINATION	failed	20:21
10:16,24 11:9 12:19	2:3,7,10 9:12 14:17	10:6 12:10	follow
20:10 21:8 29:13,21	20:15 25:4 27:12	failure	16:2
30:2,3,11 32:5	examined	17:5	following
	I	1	I



7.11	1.15 2.15	holm	11.14 10 22 12.4 10
7:11 follows	1:15 3:15 Given	help	11:14,19,23 12:4,10
		6:8,14 12:16	14:16,21 IERG's
8:23 25:3 27:11	29:3	helpful	
follow-up	go	5:17	9:24 10:15 12:17
15:16 16:7 18:2	3:10 7:4 12:9 23:21	hereunto	13:5
25:10 26:3 32:9	23:24 26:16 33:14	35:19	ILL
33:11	33:19	Higgins	1:4
foregoing	going	2:9 4:22 7:14 26:20	Illinois
35:6	6:23 8:5,7 14:24 33:7	27:9 28:9 29:8	1:1,9,10,22,22,23 3:2
foreseeable	good	30:19 31:19 33:1	3:6,24 4:9 5:11 9:11
30:12	3:1 8:16 9:10,14,15	higher	10:3,20 14:20 15:19
forgot	14:19,23 20:17 25:6	28:18	15:21 16:9 17:20,23
32:13	25:16 26:22 27:14	historic	18:1,4,5 19:1 25:7
forth	governed	32:6	27:15 32:12 35:1
19:20 21:4,9	6:1	historical	impact
four	granted	32:17	11:2,6 12:3,13,20
31:11,16	4:3	hold	13:8 14:5,12 15:18
Fox	Great	34:8	16:19 17:19,22 18:3
1:18 3:18	9:20	holding	18:8 19:12,17
free	greater	4:5	impacted
6:22	10:16	hopefully	10:21 16:5
front	Group	9:17	impacts
8:15 24:10	1:21 5:12 10:4 14:20	hour	13:1 14:4 15:24 22:4
fuel	guess	8:4	implement
10:16	16:21 32:14	hours	20:5
further	guidance	28:21 31:3,5,11,13	implementation
22:16 28:6,9 29:12	19:15 20:3	31:14,16,23 32:1,7	15:6 23:13
35:10	guys	32:19,20	imply
future	24:7 33:8	housekeeping	21:21 22:9,11
14:1,10 15:24 16:20		3:11 5:24	improve
19:6 28:13 29:1	H		11:16
31:21 32:4	hand	I	inability
	8:19 24:14 27:1	identical	10:22
G	33:17 35:20	25:22 28:13	include
general	hearing	identified	12:19,22
15:17 16:11,18	1:4,7,8 2:14,14,15,16	9:3 20:10 22:3 23:15	included
generally	3:1,3,5,23 4:2,4,6,8	24:20 27:6	20:22 21:7,19
12:4 18:6 31:9	4:8 5:5,12,18 6:1,1	identifying	includes
General's	6:5 8:1,24 9:2,3,4	12:6	30:22 31:2 32:16
1:22,22,23 4:1,4 5:10	14:15 20:13 23:20	IEPA	including
7:22 9:6,11 24:22	24:6,16,18,20,21	1:18,19 5:3 7:12 8:14	3:12 12:12 19:21
25:8 27:8,16	25:10,22 26:10,14	13:21	inclusive
generation	27:3,5,6,7 33:4,23	IEPA's	35:7
1:20 4:15,20,24 7:14	34:12,16,23	4:10,14 5:1,7 27:19	
24:9 25:20	held	IERG	incorporate 26:6
Gibson	3:21	5:12 7:22 10:2,4	
Gibsui	J.21	3.12 1.22 10.2,4	incorrect



29:8	James	L	- 13:17
indicated	1:22 2:4 9:10,10,13	$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L}}$	lunch
12:5 21:1 26:9	9:14,16,20 10:2	1:11 35:3	8:5
indicating	11:12 12:9 13:3,10	lack	
12:23	14:13	10:8,12	M
indirectly	Janet	language	malfunction
35:13	1:11 35:3	21:8 22:1 23:12	15:5 18:18 30:23
individual	Jason		31:3,12,15,17,21,22
11:2 22:23	1:22 9:10	large 13:8	32:6,16,17,24
info	JCAR	LaSalle	malfunctions
12:15	26:4	1:10	31:8
information	Jennifer	law	malfunction/break
4:11,14 5:1 6:3 10:18	1:15 3:16	20:19	31:6
11:4 12:8,18	joint	lead	March
initial	25:12	1:15 3:15	4:12,13,19,23 15:3
11:21	judgment	learns	15:10 16:23 17:19
inlet	6:11	23:16	18:15 21:5,6
32:1	July		matter
Institute	28:2,10,13 29:3,6,9	legal	1:2 3:22 4:6 13:15,18
1:21 4:16	30:14	16:15	29:19 30:1
intend	justification	length 32:7	matters
18:21 23:11	21:2		34:1,20
intended	justify	letter	mean
6:8	28:7 30:16	6:19	28:12
interested	justifying	levels	meant
35:13	12:11	19:9 28:18	25:15
interfere	Justin	limit	measure
13:24	1:23 27:15	31:20 32:5	12:16
interpolation	1.23 27.13	limitation	meet
30:2	K	21:8	14:10
introductions	kiln	limits	meeting
3:10,13	31:8	11:9 20:11 29:14	3:21
involved	know	30:11	Melissa
15:3	16:12,15,19	Line	1:21 14:19 20:20
issue	knowledge	2:3	member
34:12	18:1,7 19:1	list	1:15,15,18 3:14,15
issued	known	7:5 34:17,19	3:16
15:2	13:15 14:21 30:2,2	longest	members
issues	Kordas	32:19	7:3 8:2
22:5,14 33:21	1:22 2:8 25:5,6,7	look	mentioned
,	26:3,12	9:18	8:24 24:16 27:3
items 3:10	KYLE	LORING	Messina
3:10 I-E-R-G	1:19	1:19	1:21 2:8 20:16,17,18
14:21	K-O-R-D-A-S	lower	21:15 22:10,18 23:8
14.21	25:7	28:16,18	23:19
J	23.1	lowered	met
			IIICt



21:23	nooggony	000111	8:11 34:12
Michelle	necessary 10:24 27:22 28:5,24	occur 30:8 31:8	
1:15 3:14	29:12		organic 29:19
Midwest	need	occurred 28:17	
1:20 4:15,20,23 7:13	6:24 10:7 12:1,7 24:4		organization 6:16
24:9 25:20	34:21	occurs 28:22	
24:9 25:20 million			original 18:10 35:15
	needed	October	
10:17	14:10 28:7,10	3:24 22:12 27:19	outcome
mind	new	office	35:13
6:6	13:17,20,23 14:2,5,7	1:22,22,23 4:1,4 5:11	outlined
minute	30:16	5:13,21 7:8,22 9:6	19:13
33:20	Nitrogen	9:11 24:23 25:8	P
Molly	1:20 4:17	27:8,16	
1:22 25:6	nonbinding	officer	page 2:3 20:24 22:12
Monday	20:3	1:8 2:14,14,15,16 3:1	
34:3	noninterference	3:5 4:8 5:5 6:5 8:24	32:13,14 35:2
morning	30:10	9:4 14:15 20:13	Pages
3:1 8:16 9:10,14,15	Norfleet	23:20 24:6,16,21	35:6
14:19,23 20:17 25:6	2:6 4:21 5:2 7:13	26:14 27:3,7 33:4	paper
26:22 27:14	24:9 25:1	33:23 34:12,16	34:15
motion	North	Okay	paraphrase
4:1,4	1:10	8:16 23:19,24 24:16	9:21
move	note	26:3,18,20 33:2,7	part
11:12 24:7	17:24 27:19	33:18,18 34:22	11:12 18:4 19:20
multiple	noted	Once	22:7,19 25:12 30:13
28:21	19:18 27:24 29:12	34:4	participants
M-E-S-S-I-N-A	31:7	ongoing	4:8 5:6,19 7:23 23:23
20:18	notes	16:3,6,8,10	26:15 33:6
M-O-L-L-Y	35:8	On-Line	participating
25:7	November	5:21 7:8	34:23
	3:23 4:2	opacity	particulate
N	number	27:22 28:5,8,17,22	13:14,18 30:1
N	3:7 5:22 12:10 13:8	open	parties
2:1	13:11 15:19 17:10	34:8	35:11
NAAQS	17:18 18:11 19:10	operate	partner
13:14,16,17,21,23,24	32:13 34:6	31:24	20:19
14:3,7,11 30:9	N-A-A-Q-S	operating	PARTS
name	13:14,16	29:5 30:15,17 32:4	1:4
3:4 6:16 7:5 9:8	N505	opine	party
20:17 27:14	1:10	17:22 19:17 26:1	15:22 16:14
narrow		opinion	PCB
11:23	0	17:19	17:8,11 18:14,20
narrowly	object	oral	PDF
11:10 19:21	21:3,12,17,24	7:8	32:14,15
National	obligations	order	period
13:13 14:3	14:7	3:12 4:7 5:13 7:10,12	25:14 27:21 28:4,23
	l		ĺ



34:9 31:22 32:22 33:1 pyroscrubber proceeding periodically 3:5 7:11 8:11 11:21 31:10 32:1 possibly 31:9 15:24 14:12 19:7 P-M proceedings periods posted 13:16 31:11 5:20 34:5 1:7 16:5 35:5,6 0 permit post-hearing process quality 31:24 26:11 34:8,9,13 14:8 11:2,6 12:20 13:2,13 potential produce person 14:3 18:3 22:5 31:21 32:4 6:14 7:4 6:14 question persons 32:7 produced 5:14 6:15 11:13 35:15,18 34:16 potentially 13:10 14:24 19:19 petition 10:14,21 18:12,17 promptly 21:16 23:9,21 24:1 16:24 practices 34:5 24:2 25:9,21,23 petitions 25:13,16 proponents 27:18 29:2,3 30:21 preliminary 15:3 12:22 33:8 Petroleum 3:10 proposal questions 1:21 4:15.16 present 6:11 9:24 10:5.10.15 5:6,10,16 6:7,10,11 place 1:14,17 3:13,17 10:15 11:7,17,20,24 6:17 7:20,21,23,24 35:9 presumably 12:12,14,17 13:5,9 8:8,9,10,12 9:5,17 plan 12:19 14:5 17:6,7 18:17 14:14,16 20:21,22 3:12 15:6 23:13 prevent 21:4,6,13,18,23 20:23 21:20 23:22 please 10:9,13 22:2,4,13 23:11 24:4,22 26:13,15,17 6:6,13,16,19,21 7:4 previous 25:12 27:8 33:3,5,11 18:24 25:10 8:14,17,19 9:8,21 proposals quickly 24:10,11,14 26:6,23 previously 22:23 23:1,6 34:8 3:9 20:9 28:15 29:11 27:1 28:8 30:17 propose quote 18:22 31:12 33:16 34:17 31:7 25:16,16 27:20 30:23 \mathbf{PM} pre-file proposed 31:4.8 8:9 13:15,16,17,20 5:6 13:23 17:16 19:14 13:23 30:22 pre-filed 21:7,10 22:1 23:15 R podium 4:11 5:7,10 7:17,21 28:7,10,23 29:13 Rain 9:7 30:11 31:20 32:5 9:16 20:22 21:1,19 1:19 4:16.21 7:14 **Protection** point primary 26:21 27:20,24 28:3 6:22 8:7 4:10 13:12 13:18 28:6 29:3,5 30:5,10 prior pointed provide 30:13,22 31:2,4,7 11:7 6:17 11:21 13:22 9:22 12:11 23:1 31:19,24 32:10,11 policy privileged 33:16 32:21,22 19:20,24 20:2,4,5 6:4 provided raise problematic 12:21 21:3 22:3 **Pollution** 8:18 24:13 26:24 1:1,9 3:2 22:4 providing 33:16 posed procedural 12:7 Rao provisions 6:7 6:2 7:19 33:21,24 1:16 3:17 24:2 16:9 18:19,24 19:3 position procedure rates public 17:21 19:16 3:11,20 29:21 30:2,4 possible proceed 7:2,4,7,9 8:2,3,8 read 13:4,7 14:9 20:3 3:12 9:5 24:21 27:7 33:14,16



7:18 9:2 24:18 27:5	35:11	26:4	Rory
			•
reading	relating	requested	2:2 5:4 7:12 8:13,21
27:18	29:2	12:16 26:6	row
realm	relation	requesting	8:15 24:10
16:21	21:13	4:1,4	rule
reasonably	relevant	requests	13:15 14:9 19:14
28:24 30:8	6:3 16:13 20:7	21:16	21:4,18
reassess	relief	require	rulemaking
23:17	10:7,23 12:1,7	28:21	3:5,8 11:24 12:22
received	relies	required	19:7
4:13 5:9	25:12	5:17	Rulemaking-Air
receives	remain	requirements	1:4
34:10,11	19:5	19:4	rules
record	remainder	resolved	6:2,3,19 7:19 19:4,7
6:5,9 7:17 9:1 24:18	31:3,13	22:15	ruling
27:4 33:20,22,24	reminder	respond	15:19
reducing	7:6	11:17 26:11	R23-18
13:6	removed	response	17:8,11,23 18:14,20
refer	18:19	4:24 5:16 20:4 23:4	R23-18(A)
21:18	repealed	24:3 27:24 32:10,12	1:3 3:8 5:22 34:6
reference	19:3	responses	
26:7	repeat	4:9,14 5:7,16 22:16	S
references	24:5	33:11	sake
19:14	repeated	responsibility	6:12
reflect	6:24	35:17	Salk
6:10	repetitious	result	1:9 3:4
regarding	6:4	16:23 18:14	satisfy
15:18 19:21 22:22	Report	retained	11:8 23:6
Regardless	1:7 35:6	2:16	Sawula
19:2	reported	review	1:20 25:17,17 26:9
Region	35:4	11:9 15:4 22:16	says
17:16 22:24 23:5,14	reporter	revised	16:17
regulations	6:12,21 8:17,18 9:9	18:19	scenarios
18:23	10:1 24:11,13 26:23	revision	12:20 29:1 32:4
regulatory	26:24 30:24 35:23	17:12,20 18:4 23:13	scheduling
1:21 5:11 10:3,7	represent	23:18	4:7
14:20 19:4	6:17 11:5	revisions	Schiff
	representative	14:10 18:9 21:10	25:18
rehearing 16:24	28:12 29:11,21 30:3		scope
	,	right	11:23
reinstate	30:7,12	8:13,18 9:4 14:15	second
18:18	representatives	23:20 24:6,13,21	3:20,22 21:15 25:19
reissue	12:4	26:24 33:4,13,19,23	32:11
17:1	repromulgation	rolling	section
reiterated	18:23	32:3	
11:23	request	Room	6:2,19 7:18
related	4:10,14 5:1,7 22:24	1:10	sections



6:18 21:10,13	18:12,22 19:1,7,13	27:22 28:5,10,22	7:6 17:10,15 23:11
seeing	19:24 23:18	standards	submittal
8:11 23:24 33:18	sit	10:24 13:14 14:4	17:13,14,17,24 18:13
34:22	8:14	start	18:22
seeking	skip	8:13	submitted
18:23	13:19 26:17 33:7,13	started	5:13 13:22 18:9,9
September	softly	3:9	23:2
3:22 26:5	6:23	startup	submitting
series	solely	12:24 15:4 18:18	18:17 23:18
24:3	6:8	28:1,12 29:1,11	subsequent
served	sorry	30:7,8,12	14:11
34:15	30:24	startups	sufficient
service	SOTTORIVA	28:13,16	12:11 29:17,24
34:16,19	1:19	state	sufficiently
set	source	6:16 9:8 15:5 19:8	27:20
19:20 21:4,9 26:18	11:10 19:22	23:12 35:1	suggest
35:19	sources	statement	11:14
seven	10:6,14,16,20 11:1	10:21 21:17,21 22:9	suggestions
19:12	13:9	22:11,12,18	12:5
shared	speak	States	suit
23:2	6:13 16:15 30:24	14:7	15:22 16:14 35:12
sheet	speaking	status	supplemental
7:1	6:13	17:13	5:2 28:20 29:15
short	specific	step	32:12
8:6	11:10 12:6 18:7	9:6	support
shorter	specifically	Stephen	12:11,12 13:4 21:2
31:11	11:15 25:15 26:4,5	2:6 4:20 5:2 24:8	22:3 23:1,6 28:10
shorthand	specificity 10:8,12	25:1 Storon	28:20 29:13,16
35:4,8,23 shutdown	specify	Steven 7:13	supporting 12:1 30:10
12:24 15:4	10:6	stop	Sure
12.24 13.4 sign	spell	6:22	10:2
7:2	6:19	Street	swear
significant	spelled	1:10	8:17 24:12 26:23
22:14	13:16	strengthened	sworn
sign-in	SS	13:13	7:16 8:20,22 24:15
7:1	35:1	stringent	25:3 27:2,11
similar	SSM	13:20	system
12:21 20:9	15:5 16:21 17:1,5	strong	7:8
Similarly	18:24 19:3,20,24	29:18,24	S-A-W-U-L-A
29:23	20:2,4,5	study	25:18
simply	staff	28:3,11,14,17 29:4,6	S-C-H-I-F-F
19:24	1:16 3:17,18 5:19 6:7	29:10 30:15,16	25:19
SIP	22:24 23:5	sub	S-I-P
15:6,7 17:1,5,12,17	standard	4:2	15:6 17:1
17:20,23 18:1,4,10	13:18 14:5 26:7	submit	
	ĺ	I	ĺ



	I	I	l
T	think	unquote	way
table	18:7 24:2,4 32:19	27:23 31:6	20:6 35:11,12
32:13,16	thinks	updated	website
take	15:18	19:24	34:6
9:18	third	up-to-date	weighs
taken	1:4 4:2,4,5 34:23	21:7	7:8
1:11 35:8	three	USEPA	welcome
takes	3:10 20:22	11:5 13:12 15:10,18	3:2
20:6 34:7	three-hour	15:23 16:23 17:11	weren't
talking	27:21 28:4,23 32:3	18:5 19:13,15,20	16:14
6:18,23	Tim	20:3,8 22:5,20,22	we'll
TAYLOR	1:18 3:18	22:24 23:12,18	3:12 7:11 8:9 20:13
1:20	time	USEPA's	23:24 24:6,21 26:16
technical	5:18 6:14 9:17 16:3	11:8 13:17 15:4	we're
3:18 12:12 21:2	16:14 25:23 26:2	17:13,19,23 18:3	8:5,7 15:21,22 26:18
25:24 28:20 29:16	31:11 34:21 35:9	19:18,24 21:22 23:7	33:7,23
technology	titled	utilize	WHEREOF
12:11	32:11	30:6	35:19
temperature	today	utilizing	WIE
29:18 30:1 32:2	3:14,19 4:5 6:7 7:4	20:9	1:15
temperatures	8:9	U.S	withdraw
28:16,18 30:3	today's	13:11 15:1	18:22
test	7:10	v	withdrawing
29:9,17	topic		18:12
testified	25:23	VAN	witness
8:23 10:5 12:10 25:3	transcript	1:15	2:2,6,9 7:15,21 8:17
27:11	6:15 34:2,5,10,12	VanWie	8:20 23:23 24:8,12
testimony	35:8	3:16	24:15 25:2 26:23
4:11,20,21 5:2,4,7	transcripts	variable 30:22 31:3	27:2,10 35:19
6:11 7:17 8:12 9:1	35:15	30:22 31:3 version	witnesses
9:23 10:22 13:22	true	34:19	7:11
21:1 24:17 27:4	35:7	VETTERHOFFER	witness's
testing	turn		9:1 24:17 27:4
29:12	7:20 8:11	1:18 view	word
thank	typical	16:20	25:19
11:12 12:9 13:3,10	28:1 29:4 30:15,17	volatile	wording
14:13,22 20:12,19	U	29:19	25:22
21:15 22:10 23:8,19	ug/m	29.19	work
23:20 24:7 26:12,14	13:19	\mathbf{W}	25:13
26:19 27:16 33:2,4	understanding	want	working
33:8 34:22	20:8 22:8	3:9 23:21 26:17	17:16
thereof	units	wanted	worst-case
35:13	10:6,19 12:24	33:10	12:19,23 19:22
things	universe	wants	write 7:5
16:20	10:14	7:2	· · ·
	10.17		written



5:15 7:7,9 9:21,23	4:12,13,19	212	5
33:10	16	1:5 3:7	5
	2:8	216.103	
X	16th	21:10	2:8 17:10,16 22:24
X	4:3	216.104	23:5,14 32:14 5:00
2:1	160	21:11	8:9
	1:9	216.361(d)	0.9
Y	18	21:9	6
yeah	2:5	22nd	6
16:11,18 33:1	1800	4:23 34:4	2:15 17:18
year	30:4 31:10 32:2	23rd	600
13:11	19th	22:12 27:19	28:19
	35:20	23-18	620.101(D)
1	1999	19:3	6:20
1	19:14	24	
27:18 32:14 35:6		2:14 31:5,14,23 32:1	7
1st	2	32:19	7
3:23 15:3,10 16:23	2	24-hour	18:11
17:19 18:15	12:10 29:2 32:14	32:7,22,23	7th
1,500	2nd	25	26:5
10:20	5:3	2:8	
1:30	2(b)	26th	8
8:6	13:3	3:24	8
10	2.5	27	19:10
10:17	13:18 14:3	2:11,15	8th
10:00	20	27th	5:8 32:10
1:12	2:8,14 18:15	3:22	8.75
102.424(f)	201		32:20
7:18	1:4 3:7	3	84-002176
102.426	2013	3	35:3
6:2	19:14	2:14 13:11 16:22	
12	2015	30:21 32:14	9
22:12	17:4 19:13,24	3,900	9
12th	202	10:19	2:4,14 13:19
5:15	1:4 3:7	3:00	
12:30	2022	8:7	
8:5	17:5	30	
13	2023	34:10	
2:4,11	3:22,23,24 4:3 22:13	35	
1370	26:5 27:19 28:2,11	1:4 3:6 35:7	
30:4	28:13 29:4,6,9		
14	30:14	4	
2:5	2024	4	
15	1:12 15:3,10 16:23	17:4 32:14	
1:11 20:24 21:5,6	17:19 18:15 21:5,6	400	
15th	32:10 35:20	28:19 29:21	
	I		I

