

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)	
)	
PETITION OF CITGO PETROLEUM)	AS 26-1
CORPORATION FOR AN ADJUSTED)	(Adjusted Standard – Air)
STANDARD FROM 35 ILL. ADM. CODE)	
SECTION 216.121)	

NOTICE

TO: Don Brown, Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board
60 E. Van Buren St., Suite 630
Chicago, IL 60605
don.brown@illinois.gov

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that I have today electronically filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board the RECOMMENDATION of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, a copy of which is herewith served upon you.

Respectfully submitted,

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY

By: /s/ Sarah McKavetz
Sarah McKavetz
Assistant Counsel
Division of Legal Counsel

DATED: October 27, 2025

2520 W. Iles Ave.
PO Box 19276
Springfield, IL 62794-9276
217/782-5544
sarah.mckavetz@illinois.gov

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)	
)	
PETITION OF CITGO PETROLEUM)	AS 26-1
CORPORATION FOR AN ADJUSTED)	(Adjusted Standard – Air)
STANDARD FROM 35 ILL. ADM. CODE)	
SECTION 216.121)	

RECOMMENDATION

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (“Illinois EPA” or “Agency”) by one of its attorneys, and pursuant to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.416, hereby submits the Agency’s Recommendation to the Illinois Pollution Control Board (“Board”) in response to the Petition of CITGO Petroleum Corporation (“CITGO”) regarding its petroleum refinery located in Will County, near Lemont, Illinois. Specifically, CITGO requests an adjusted standard from the standard for carbon monoxide (“CO”) emissions set forth in 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121 for certain fuel combustion emission sources during periods of startup and shutdown. For the reasons stated below, Illinois EPA does not object to the Board granting CITGO’s request. In support of its Recommendation, the Illinois EPA states as follows.

I. BACKGROUND

On September 10, 2025, CITGO filed a Petition for Adjusted Standard (“Petition”) from the provisions of 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121. Petition at P-6. CITGO states that an adjusted standard is needed for its refinery located in Will County to allow for compliance with an alternative emission limitation (“AEL”) in lieu of the Section 216.121 CO standard during periods of startup and shutdown of select fuel combustion emission sources at the refinery. Petition at P-6-7.

Illinois EPA must make a recommendation to the Board as to the disposition of the Petition within 45 days after the filing of the petition or at least 30 days before a hearing, unless otherwise ordered by the hearing officer or Board. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.416. Here, the Board has ordered the Agency to file its Recommendation by October 27, 2025. Board Order (October 2, 2025).

II. PETITIONER'S REQUESTS

CITGO seeks an adjusted standard for its refinery located in Will County to allow for compliance with an AEL in lieu of the Section 216.121 CO standard during periods of startup and shutdown of select fuel combustion emission sources at the refinery. Specifically, CITGO seeks an adjusted standard for seven emission units equipped with continuous emission monitoring systems (CEMS), with actual heat input greater than 10 MMBtu/hr. Petition at P-17. The seven units CITGO indicates that would be subject to the adjusted standard include: Auxiliary Boiler (430B1), South Boiler (430B24), North Boiler (431B25), Steam Methane Reformer Heater (109B62), Crude Atmospheric Heater (111B1A), Crude Atmospheric Heater (111B1B), and the Crude Vacuum Heater (111B2). TSD at P-42-43. The proposed AEL consists of incorporating by reference federal provisions containing alternative standards during periods of startup and shutdown from the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAP") for Major Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters at 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart DDDDD, that was promulgated by the United States Environmental Protection

Agency ("USEPA") in 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 72790 (Nov. 20, 2015)).¹ Petition at P-8-11. Additional information regarding Petitioner's requested relief is set forth below.

III. REQUIRED ADJUSTED STANDARD ANALYSIS

Illinois EPA's Recommendation must set forth the rationale for the Agency's position and may present any information which the Agency believes is relevant to the Board's consideration of the proposed adjusted standard. 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.416(a). At a minimum, the Agency must address and respond to the petition with respect to each issue raised by the requirements of Section 104.406(a) through (j). 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.416(b).

Section 104.406(a)

A statement describing the standard from which an adjusted standard is sought. This must include the Illinois Administrative Code citation to the regulation of general applicability imposing the standard as well as the effective date of that regulation.

CITGO seeks an adjusted standard from 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121 (carbon monoxide emission standards for fuel combustion emission sources). Petition at P-12. Section 216.121 (then Rule 206(a)) was adopted in PCB R71-23 with an effective date of April 14, 1972. Final Order and Opinion, PCB R71-23, at p. 4-255 (April 13, 1972). Petition at P-12.

Section 104.406(b)

A statement that indicates whether the regulation of general applicability was promulgated to implement, in whole or in part, the requirements of the CWA (33 USC 1251 et seq.), Safe Drinking Water Act (42 USC 300(f) et seq.), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 USC 9601 et seq.), CAA (42 USC 7401 et seq.), or the State programs concerning RCRA, UIC, or NPDES (see 415 ILCS 5/28.1).

¹ NESHAP Subpart DDDDD is publicly available at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2024-title40-vol15/pdf/CFR-2024-title40-vol15-part63-subpartDDDDD.pdf>. Relevant excerpts are attached to the Petition at Exhibit 4.

CITGO provided a statement responsive to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.406(b) indicating that the Board promulgated Section 216.121 in 1972 as a regulation of general applicability to ensure that the State meets the recently adopted federal air quality standards for CO. Petition at P-12-13, citing Opinion and Order of the Board, PCB R71-23, 4-299 (April 13, 1972).

The Agency agrees that the CO standard from which CITGO seeks an adjusted standard was required to be adopted to satisfy the Clean Air Act ("CAA").

Section 104.406(c)

The level of justification as well as other information or requirements necessary for an adjusted standard as specified by the regulation of general applicability or a statement that the regulation of general applicability does not specify a level of justification or other requirements.

Illinois EPA agrees with CITGO that since Section 216.121 does not specify a level of justification for an adjusted standard, the factors identified in Section 28.1(c) of the Act are applicable, 415 ILCS 5/28.1(c). Petition at P-13. Section 28.1 of the Act states that the Board may grant individual adjusted standards from rules of general applicability whenever the Board determines that an applicant can justify an adjustment and may impose any conditions that may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act. In adopting a rule of general applicability, the Board may specify the level of justification required of a petitioner for an adjusted standard. If a rule of general applicability does not contain a level of justification that the petitioner must meet to obtain an adjusted standard, the requirements of Section 28.1(c) of the Act apply. Section 28.1(c) states that the Board may grant individual adjusted standards whenever the Board determines that: (1) Factors relating to that petitioner are substantially and significantly different from the factors relied upon by the Board in adopting the general regulations applicable to that petitioner; (2) The existence of those factors justifies an adjusted standard; (3) The

requested standard will not result in environmental or health effects substantially and significantly more adverse than the effects considered by the Board in adopting the rule of general applicability; and (4) The adjusted standard is consistent with any applicable federal law.

415 ILCS 5/28.1(c); 35 Ill. Adm. Code 104.426.

Section 104.406(d)

A description of the nature of the petitioner's activity that is the subject of the proposed adjusted standard. The description must include the location of, and area affected by, the petitioner's activity. This description must also include the number of persons employed by the petitioner's facility at issue, age of that facility, relevant pollution control equipment already in use, and the qualitative and quantitative description of the nature of emissions, discharges or releases currently generated by the petitioner's activity.

CITGO provides a thorough description of its Lemont Refinery, including its location, number of employees, and nature of emissions. Regarding its emission units, CITGO indicates that it operates twenty refining process units supported by four boilers, thirty-one process heaters and one air heater. Petition at P-13-14. Of the thirty-one process heaters, twenty-eight are rated greater than 10 MMBtu/hr, meaning that, depending on actual firing rate, they are potentially subject to the CO standard in Section 216.121. Petition at P-14. Seven of the boilers and process heaters subject to 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121 are equipped with CEMS for CO and oxygen ("O₂"). Petition at P-14.

The Agency agrees that CITGO provided a sufficient description of the facility, operations, emissions, discharges, and releases currently generated by its activities in its Petition and TSD. CITGO's TSD contained the necessary data regarding excess emissions in recent years and detailed modeling to demonstrate emission consequences of the requested adjusted standard.

Section 104.406(e)

A description of the efforts that would be necessary if the petitioner was to comply with the regulation of general applicability. All compliance alternatives, with the corresponding costs for each alternative, must be discussed. The discussion of costs must include the overall capital costs as well as the annualized capital and operating costs.

CITGO states, in part, “as a result of the Board’s removal of the SMB [startup, malfunction, and breakdown] relief provisions in Part 201, CITGO must comply with the CO standard in Section 216.121 during all modes of operation of the fuel combustion emission sources subject to the standard, including periods of startup and shutdown.” Petition at P-15. The Agency disagrees with CITGO’s stated interpretation of the Board’s now-repealed SMB regulations (here, and in other portions of the Petition). Even when the now-repealed Part 201 SMB regulations were in effect, owners or operators of subject units were generally required to comply with the CO standard in Section 216.121 during all modes of operation, including during startup and shutdown. As explained by the Agency below in subsection (f), the Part 201 SMB regulations established only a potential affirmative defense for a source if emissions during SMB periods violated emissions standards and enforcement was pursued against the source for such exceedances.²

CITGO’s Petition asserts, “There is no known technology to aid in controlling CO emissions of these fuel combustion emission sources during startup, as well as gradual shutdown. There is no feasible engineering control option during startups and shutdowns to continuously meet the Section 216.121 standard other than the work practices proposed by this Adjusted Standard.” Petition at P-15.

² See R23-18, *In the Matter of: Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code Parts 201, 202, and 212*, Board Order (July 20, 2023); R23-18, *Illinois EPA’s Post-Hearing Comments* (March 7, 2023).

The Agency reviewed the information presented in CITGO's TSD regarding CEMS-measured CO emission rates during startup of one of the seven units included in the Adjusted Standard Petition. Specifically, the graph in Appendix B, Figure 1 to the TSD demonstrates that during periods of operation in which the affected fuel combustion emission units are unable to maintain a temperature at which CO auto-ignition occurs, CO emissions will exceed the standard in Section 216.121. The Agency, like CITGO, is unaware of any control technologies or operational limitations that could limit CO emissions during startup or shutdown periods with decreased combustion temperature to below the standard in Section 216.121.

Section 104.406(f)

A narrative description of the proposed adjusted standard as well as proposed language for a Board order that would impose the standard. Efforts necessary to achieve this proposed standard and the corresponding costs must also be presented.

CITGO states that, "prior to the amendments to Part 201, CITGO was authorized to exceed the CO standards in Section 216.121 during periods of SMB for select fuel combustion emission units, as long as the permit conditions concerning startup were complied with, including minimizing duration of startups and minimizing emissions during these periods." Petition at P-26-27. The Agency disagrees with CITGO's stated interpretation of the Board's now-repealed SMB regulations (here, and in other portions of the Petition). As described in detail by the Agency in the Board's R23-18 rulemaking, the Board's repeal of SMB provisions did not amend the CO standards in Section 216.121 or change their applicability to subject units; the Part 201 SMB regulations established only a potential affirmative defense for a source should emissions during SMB periods violate emissions standards and should enforcement be pursued against the source for such exceedances. The regulations did not excuse or authorize excess emissions during SMB

events, they did not create exceptions to emissions standards, and they did not render excess emissions “non-violations”; they established only a potential affirmative defense, as specified in the regulations themselves.³

The proposed adjusted standard would apply to select boilers and process heaters at the source that are equipped with and operate CO and O₂ CEMS. It would apply during periods of startup and shutdown of these fuel combustion emission units. During these periods of operation, the adjusted standard would require compliance with select work practice standards from NESHAP Subpart DDDDD in lieu of the CO standards in Section 216.121. Petition at P-16. Those work practices include the requirements to operate the units’ CO and O₂ CEMS during periods of startup and shutdown, combust only “clean fuels” as defined in Subpart DDDDD, and operate and maintain the affected units in a manner consistent with safety and good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. Petition at P-18-19. Compliance with these work practice standards is intended to minimize CO emissions from the subject units during periods of startup and shutdown. Petition at P-19.

CITGO asserts that it will not need to alter its operation of the subject units and the associated monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting currently required for them under NESHAP Subpart DDDDD to comply with the proposed adjusted standard. In other words, utilizing the proposed adjusted standard would not impact the operation and compliance procedures for the subject units that are currently in place. Petition at P-26-27. This is because CITGO currently complies with the work practice standards in Subpart DDDDD that will be utilized under the proposed adjusted standard during periods of startup and shutdown. Petition at P-27. As such,

³ See R23-18, *Illinois EPA’s Post-Hearing Comments* (March 7, 2023), at p. 21-22.

CITGO does not anticipate any new or additional cost for CITGO to operate under the proposed adjusted standard. Petition at P-27.

The proposed adjusted standard language is as follows:

1. Pursuant to Section 28.1 of the Environmental Protection Act ("Act") (415 ILCS 5/28.1), the Board grants CITGO Petroleum Corporation ("CITGO") and its successors an adjusted standard from 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121, effective as of the date of this order. The adjusted standard applies to the emissions of carbon monoxide ("CO") into the atmosphere from fuel combustion emission sources with actual heat input greater than 10 mmbtu/hr subject to 35 Ill. Adm. Code Section 216.121 and equipped with continuous emissions monitoring systems ("CEMS") for CO and oxygen ("O₂") at the petroleum refinery located near Lemont Illinois, at 135th Street & New Avenue, DuPage Township, Will County, Illinois (collectively, the "Affected Units").
2. During periods of startup and shutdown of the Affected Units, CITGO and its successors must comply with either the standard in 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121 or the requirements applicable to fuel combustion emission sources during startup and shutdown in 40 CFR 63 Subpart DDDDD Table 3 Items 5 and 6, 40 CFR 63.7500(a)(3) and (f), 40 CFR 63.7505(e), 40 CFR 63.7535(b), and 40 CFR 63.7555(d)(9)-(12) as to those Affected Units.
3. If electing to comply with the requirements in 40 CFR Subpart DDDDD referenced in Paragraph 2 above during startup and shutdown of the Affected Units, the CO standard in 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121 does not apply.
4. The definitions of "startup," "shutdown," and "useful thermal energy" in 40 CFR 63.7575 apply to this adjusted standard.

The Agency agrees with CITGO's assertions that the proposed adjusted standard will not impact its current operation and procedures or result in increased costs. The Agency does not object to CITGO's proposed adjusted standard language.

Section 104.406(g)

The quantitative and qualitative description of the impact of the petitioner's activity on the environment if the petitioner were to comply with the regulation of general applicability as compared to the quantitative and qualitative impact on the environment if the petitioner were to comply only with the proposed adjusted standard. To the extent applicable, cross-media impacts must be discussed. Also, the petitioner must compare the qualitative and quantitative nature of

emissions, discharges or releases that would be expected from compliance with the regulation of general applicability as opposed to that which would be expected from compliance with the proposed adjusted standard.

CITGO provided robust and adequate technical support within the TSD included with the proposed adjusted standard Petition. Specifically, CITGO performed dispersion modelling of CO emissions from the subject units under worst-case operating (utilizing statistical worse-case values for CO emission rate, stack temperature, and flow rate), weather, and background CO concentration conditions. TSD at P-49-54. This modelling demonstrates that even under these worst-case conditions, the maximum impact on ambient air concentrations from operation of the subject units does not exceed 15% of the applicable CO National Ambient Air Quality Standard ("NAAQS"), including the worst-case background CO concentration. With background concentration not taken into consideration, the modelling demonstrates that the worst-case ambient impacts from the units' startup and shutdown emissions will not exceed 3% of the applicable CO NAAQS for any of the units. These minimal modelled worst-case impacts on ambient air quality, both considering and not considering background CO concentrations, demonstrate that emissions under the proposed adjusted standard will not interfere with maintenance of the CO NAAQS. TSD at P-53-54. CITGO's Petition also asserts that emissions of CO under the proposed adjusted standard will not differ from the source's current and recent emissions due to its current compliance with the work practice standards in NESHAP Subpart DDDDD during periods of startup and shutdown in lieu of the CO standards in Section 216.121. Petition at P-27.

The Agency does not anticipate an increase or decrease in emissions from the units should the adjusted standard be granted. The Agency agrees that CITGO provided with its Petition

sufficient information regarding the specific emissions impacts of the SMB events including worst-case quantification, modeling, and information related to modeling including the data inputs and considers this sufficient evidence that operation under the proposed adjusted standard will not result in air quality impacts that are harmful or violate federal air quality standards. USEPA staff also reviewed the technical support provided by CITGO and agreed with this conclusion.

Section 104.406(h)

A statement that explains how the petitioner seeks to justify, under the applicable level of justification, the proposed adjusted standard.

As stated above, Section 28.1(c) of the Act provides that if a regulation of general applicability does not specify a level of justification required of a petitioner to qualify for an adjusted standard, the Board may grant individual adjusted standards whenever the Board determines, upon adequate proof by petitioner, that:

- (1) factors relating to that petitioner are substantially and significantly different from the factors relied upon by the Board in adopting the general regulation applicable to that petitioner;
- (2) the existence of those factors justifies an adjusted standard;
- (3) the requested standard will not result in environmental or health effects substantially and significantly more adverse than the effects considered by the Board in adopting the rule of general applicability; and
- (4) the adjusted standard is consistent with any applicable federal law.

415 ILCS 5/28.1(c).

- (1) **Factors are substantially and significantly different than those relied upon by the Board in adopting the general regulation.**

CITGO's statement of justification first includes a brief background on the Board's rulemaking in PCB R71-23 adopting emission standards and SMB provisions. CITGO relies on and restates the Board's reasoning provided in the Board's Final Order in R71-23; specifically, CITGO indicates that, "[n]o machine works perfectly all the time. Further, startup conditions may result in less than optimum emission control." Final Order and Opinion, R71-23, at p. 4-305 (April 13, 1972). CITGO's Petition sets forth the same reasoning the Board considered when originally adopting the SMB provisions; specifically, that sources may be unable to comply with the emission limits and standards during startup due to the specific conditions of startup. Petition at P-29. CITGO indicates that it previously relied on language from Construction Permit 17060030, which "authorized CO emissions exceeding the Section 216.121 standard during startup of those fuel combustion emission sources." Petition at P-29. CITGO further states that, "[it] is now unable to avail itself of the SMB provisions amended by the Board in PCB R23-18." Petition at P-29. It indicates that the factors related to CITGO are different from the factors relied upon the Board because, in adopting the CO standard, "[the Board] had the SMB provisions in mind." Petition at P-29.

The Agency continues to disagree with CITGO's contention that it was previously permitted to violate Section 216.121 under the now-repealed SMB provisions, but the Agency does not disagree with CITGO's contention that it cannot guarantee continued compliance with the generally applicable CO standard in Section 216.121 during periods of startup and shutdown. The Agency also does not disagree that when the Board adopted the CO standard, it also adopted SMB regulations.

(2) Existence of those factors justifies an adjusted standard.

CITGO's Petition indicates that the factors discussed above justify the need for an adjusted standard for CITGO to continuously comply with the applicable CO standard in 216.121. Specifically, CITGO states that, "No other control options exist to ensure continuous compliance with the Section 216.121 standard during each startup and shutdown." CITGO also indicates that USEPA recognized when promulgating NESHAP Subpart DDDDD that "the generally applicable emissions limitations may not be able to be met during periods of startup and shutdown of fuel combustion emission sources." Petition at P-31-32.

The Agency has no objection to the Board granting the adjusted standard.

(3) Requested adjusted standard will not result in environmental or health effects substantially and significantly more adverse than the effects considered by the Board in adopting the rule of general applicability.

CITGO asserts in its Petition that the proposed adjusted standard will not result in environmental or health effects more adverse than the effects considered by the Board in adopting the rule of general applicability. Petition at P-33. CITGO states it has been complying with the alternate standards in NESHAP Subpart DDDDD during periods of startup and shutdown since their promulgation. Petition at P-33. CITGO is likely unable to meet Section 216.121 during startup and shutdown and, during those times, CITGO will continue to comply with the alternate standards under NESHAP Subpart DDDDD applicable to startup and shutdown. Petition at P-33. CITGO's TSD provides additional support, such as modeling results in Tables 6, 7 and 8, to show that "the requested Adjusted Standard will not result in a significant impact to air quality and does not cause an exceedance of a NAAQs [*sic*]." Petition at P-34; TSD at P-51-54.

The Agency agrees that the proposed adjusted standard will not result in environmental or health effects substantially and significantly more adverse than those previously considered by the Board and will not result in a significant impact to air quality or an exceedance of a NAAQS.

(4) Requested adjusted standard is consistent with applicable federal law.

CITGO asserts, and the Agency agrees, that CITGO's proposed adjusted standard is consistent with applicable federal law, for the reasons set forth below.

Section 104.406(i)

A statement with supporting reasons that the Board may grant the proposed adjusted standard consistent with federal law. The petitioner must also inform the Board of all procedural requirements applicable to the Board's decision on the petition that are imposed by federal law and not required by this Subpart. Relevant regulatory and statutory authorities must be cited.

As stated above, CITGO indicates that its proposed adjusted standard incorporates portions of the NESHAP under Subpart DDDDD. Petition at P-34. CITGO states that, "USEPA understood the concerns with meeting a generally applicable MACT [Maximum Achievable Control Technology] standard during periods of startup and shutdown. USEPA therefore promulgated alternative standards to apply during these periods consistent with the CAA." Petition at P-34. Therefore, by incorporating those provisions into the adjusted standard, CITGO asserts that the Board can grant the proposed adjusted standard consistent with the CAA and federal law. Petition at P-34.

USEPA has provided criteria for developing alternative emission limitations that apply during startup and shutdown, and such alternative emission limitations must meet CAA requirements. CITGO's TSD provides a detailed discussion of how its proposed adjusted standard meets the seven AEL criteria and is therefore consistent with the CAA and federal law. TSD at P-61-65.

The Agency agrees that the proposed adjusted standard is consistent with federal law. Additionally, at the Agency's request, USEPA reviewed the TSD for CITGO's Petition and did not identify any issues.

Section 104.406(j)

A statement requesting or waiving a hearing on the petition (under Section 104.422(a)(4) a hearing will be held on all petitions for adjusted standards filed under 35 Ill. Adm. Code 212.126).

CITGO did not request a hearing on this Petition. Petition at P-35.

IV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The relief sought by CITGO in this proceeding for certain fuel combustion emission sources subject to Section 216.121 is very similar to rule amendments proposed by the American Petroleum Institute ("API") and adopted by the Board in R23-18(A) for petroleum and petrochemical processes subject to Section 216.361 and located at ExxonMobil Oil Corp.'s Channahon Refinery, CITGO's Lemont Refinery, and Marathon Petroleum Co.'s Robinson Refinery. Final Order and Opinion, PCB R23-18(A), at p. 33 (August 22, 2024). Both involve similar CO limitations, and both involve incorporating similar standards established in NESHAPs to apply during certain modes of operation when compliance with otherwise applicable emission limitations might be problematic. The types of requirements for the applicable units in CITGO's proposed adjusted standard are similar to those in the rule revisions adopted by the Board in R23-18(A), though they reference two different federal regulations. While the R23-18(A) revisions reference 40 CFR 63 Subpart UUU for certain refinery units, CITGO's proposed adjusted standard references 40 CFR 63 Subpart DDDDD for boilers and process heaters. Nonetheless, the requirements during SSM periods are very similar under both federal NESHAPs.

The effect of both the rule revisions in R23-18(A) and CITGO's requested adjusted standard here is to provide specific emission units an option to comply with alternative standards for CO during certain modes of operation, such as periods of startup, hot standby, or shutdown so that such units can continue to operate in compliance during those periods.

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the above and foregoing reasons, the Illinois EPA does not object to the Board granting Petitioner's request for an adjusted standard from 35 Ill. Adm. Code 216.121.

Respectfully submitted,

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY

By: /s/ Sarah McKavetz
Sarah McKavetz
Assistant Counsel
Division of Legal Counsel

DATED: October 27, 2025

2520 W. Iles Ave.
PO Box 19276
Springfield, IL 62794-9276
217/782-5544
sarah.mckavetz@illinois.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, an attorney, state the following:

I have served the attached RECOMMENDATION by e-mail upon the following persons at the e-mail address of such persons:

Don Brown
Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board
60 E. Van Buren St., Suite 630
Chicago, IL 60605
don.brown@illinois.gov

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

My e-mail address is sarah.mckavetz@illinois.gov.

The number of pages in the e-mail transmission is 19.

The e-mail transmission took place before 4:30 p.m. on October 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY,

By: /s/ Sarah McKavetz
Sarah McKavetz
Assistant Counsel
Division of Legal Counsel

Dated: October 27, 2025

2520 W. Iles Ave.
PO Box 19276
Springfield, IL 62794-9276
217/782-5544
sarah.mckavetz@illinois.gov

SERVICE LIST

Bradley P. Halloran Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 60 E. Van Buren St., Suite 630 Chicago, Illinois 60605 (312) 814-8917 Brad.Halloran@Illinois.Gov	Alec Messina Melissa S. Brown HEPLERBROOM, LLC 4340 Acer Grove Drive Springfield, Illinois 62711 (217) 528-3674 Alec.Messina@heplerbroom.com Melissa.Brown@heplerbroom.com
---	---