

ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)
NITROGEN OXIDES) R11-24
EMISSIONS AMENDMENTS TO 35 ILL.) (Rulemaking-
ADM. CODE PART 217) Air

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS held in the
above entitled cause before Hearing Officer Daniel
Robertson, called by the Illinois Pollution
Control Board, taken by Steven Brickey, CSR, for
the State of Illinois, 100 West Randolph Street,
Chicago, Illinois, on the 2nd day of June, 2011,
commencing at the hour of 1:00 p.m.

A P P E A R A N C E S

MR. DANIEL ROBERTSON, Hearing Officer
MR. ANAND RAO,
MS. ANDREA MOORE
MS. CARRIE ZALEWSKI
MR. THOMAS JOHNSON
MR. GARY BLANKENSHIP

HODGE, DWYER & DRIVER
BY: MS. MONICA T. RIOS
3150 Roland Avenue
Springfield, Illinois 62705
(217) 523-4900

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY GROUP
BY: MR. ALEC M. DAVIS
215 East Adams Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701
(217) 522-5512

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY GROUP
BY: MS. GINA ROCCAFORTE
1021 North Grand Avenue East
Springfield, Illinois 62794
(217) 782-5544

ALSO PRESENT: MR. ROBERT J. KALEEL

REPORTED BY:

Steven J. Brickey, CSR
CSR License No. 084-004675

1 MR. ROBERTSON: Good afternoon, all.
2 My name is Daniel Robertson and I have been
3 appointed by the Board to serve as Hearing Officer
4 in this proceeding entitled In The Matter of
5 Nitrogen Oxides Emissions Amendments to 35 Ill.
6 Adm. Code 217 listed as R11-24 in the Board's
7 docket.

8 This case has been consolidated
9 with Docket R11-26 which is titled In The Matter
10 of Illinois Environmental Regulatory Groups
11 Emergency Rulemaking Nitrogen Oxides Emissions
12 Amendments to 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 217.

13 With me today on my left is the
14 presiding Board Member Gary Blankenship. Next to
15 him we also have Board Member Tom Johnson. On my
16 other side from the Board's technical unit, we
17 have Anand Rao and besides him we have Board
18 Member's Andrea Moore and Carrie Zalewski.

19 The purpose of today's hearing
20 is to hear testimony from the proponent, the
21 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. This
22 testimony was pre-filed on May 19th, 2011, and has
23 been made publicly available on the Board's
24 website. To date, no other testimony has been

1 filed.

2 Unless there's any objection,
3 the testimony will be taken as if read and we will
4 begin with questions immediately. If you do have
5 any questions, I'll ask that you please state your
6 name and whom you represent before you begin your
7 questions. It is important to only speak one at a
8 time to ensure the court reporter is able to get
9 all of the questions on the record and also note
10 that any questions asked by a Board Member or
11 staff is intended to help build a complete record
12 for the Board's decision and not to express any
13 preconceived notion or bias.

14 If there is time at the end of
15 the day, the Board will allow any person who did
16 not pre-file testimony to have an opportunity to
17 testify if they so wish to. At this point, would
18 the proponent like to introduce themselves and
19 their witness for the record?

20 MS. ROCCAFORTE: Good afternoon.

21 I'm Gina Roccaforte with the Illinois
22 Environmental Protection Agency and with me today
23 is Mr. Robert Kaleel, manager of the Air Quality
24 Planning Section in the Bureau of Air and I'd ask

1 that he be sworn in at this time.

2 WHEREUPON:

3 ROBERT KALEEL

4 called as a witness herein, having been first duly
5 sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:

6 MR. ROBERTSON: Would the Agency
7 have any opening statements before proceeding to
8 testimony?

9 MS. ROCCAFORTE: No.

10 MR. ROBERTSON: Did anyone else have
11 any opening statements before we proceed to the
12 Agency's testimony? Mr. Kaleel, is that a current
13 and correct copy of your testimony that's been
14 pre-filed?

15 MS. KALEEL: Yes, it is.

16 THE COURT: And do we have any
17 objection to admitting the testimony as if read?
18 Great. At this point, I will enter the testimony
19 of Robert Kaleel as Exhibit 1 to this proceeding.

20 (Document marked as Hearing
21 Exhibit No. 1 for
22 identification.)

23 MR. ROBERTSON: Are there any
24 questions regarding Mr. Kaleel's testimony?

1 MR. DAVIS: Yes. My name is Alec
2 Davis. I represent the Illinois Environmental
3 Regulatory Group. I have a few questions for
4 Mr. Kaleel.

5 Mr. Kaleel, on page four of the
6 Agency's statement of reasons filed with the
7 rulemaking proposal, the Agency states, and this
8 is a direct quote, new non-attainment areas are
9 expected to be designated in 2012 and as a result
10 the Illinois EPA expects that NOx RACT will likely
11 be required by the beginning of the 2015 ozone
12 season, end quote.

13 Does the Illinois EPA still
14 expect that NOx RACT will likely be required by
15 the beginning of the 2015 ozone season?

16 MR. KALEEL: We believe the date
17 that NOx RACT would ultimately be required is
18 uncertain right now. The date of implementation
19 of NOx RACT is dependant on several actions on the
20 part of the US EPA and none of those actions have
21 happened yet. Primarily, what needs to happen is
22 US EPA needs to finalize the ozone air quality
23 standard that they proposed in January of 2010.
24 That starts a regulatory process of the state

1 recommending non-attainment boundaries for areas
2 not meeting the standard for US EPA to adopt those
3 as final and once they've adopted the designations
4 as final that sets in motion hardwired dates that
5 are in the Clean Air Act as to when RACT would be
6 required.

7 Since EPA hasn't acted on the
8 ozone standard yet, we don't know exactly what the
9 date will be. What we put in our statement of
10 reasons is just our expectation of EPA's schedule
11 based on public statements that EPA has made.

12 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. I guess then
13 it would be safe to say you don't know when you'll
14 know for certain when the final date will be known
15 for certain?

16 MR. KALEEL: Yeah. I guess just
17 passing along the information that we've heard
18 from US EPA, including a talk that I heard from
19 Gina McCarthy, who I forget exactly her title, but
20 she is one of the top air pollution people within
21 US EPA made a statement just this past week here
22 in Chicago that they expect to publish the ozone
23 standard in July of this year, July 29th of this
24 year.

1 Of course, they've made those
2 statements before and they've missed those dates
3 before, but they seemed quite certain that will be
4 in July of this year and they also intend to issue
5 what is called an implementation rule as a
6 proposal and that implementation rule should
7 provide states with the information about the
8 schedule for recommending non-attainment area
9 boundaries, the schedule for finalizing those and
10 other matters such as how EPA will categorize
11 non-attainment whether it be a moderate area, a
12 serious area, severe area. Those are all issues
13 that EPA needs to make clear with the
14 implementation rule so we think July of this year.

15 MR. DAVIS: Thanks. If it becomes
16 apparent that NOx RACT will not be required until
17 a date later than the 2015 ozone season, would the
18 Agency be willing to propose another extension?

19 MR. KALEEL: I think we'd be willing
20 to discuss it. I think we'd wait to see what EPA
21 does before we'd say whether or not we're actually
22 willing to make a proposal, but we'll certainly be
23 willing to discuss it.

24 MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

1 MS. RIOS: I have a follow-up
2 question. I'm Monica Rios. I'm here from Hodge,
3 Dwyer & Driver on behalf of Exxon Mobil Oil
4 Corporation. If Illinois EPA is uncertain as to
5 when implementation of the new ozone standard will
6 be required, why include January 1st, 2015, as the
7 date of compliance?

8 MR. KALEEL: Well, there is a
9 rationale behind the 2015 date, but the easy
10 answer is that it's a date that we worked out when
11 we were approached by the Illinois Environmental
12 Regulatory Group as a reasonable date.

13 It was always considered to be a
14 soft date, but given the uncertainty with the
15 status of the ozone standard and the need to make
16 this proposal as quickly as possible, I think both
17 sides mutually agreed that would be a reasonable
18 date.

19 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Kaleel, if future
20 ozone or PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality
21 Standards are promulgated that result in
22 non-attainment areas in Illinois with a different
23 geographic scope than the current non-attainment
24 areas, will a rulemaking before the Board be

1 required to effectuate those changes and the
2 applicability of any NOx RACT rules?

3 MR. KALEEL: I would expect so. I
4 guess the premise of the question would be that
5 the non-attainment areas would have a -- be
6 categorized as moderate or above, classified as
7 moderate above, which is the trigger for the NOx
8 RACT requirement, but assuming that was the basis
9 of your question, we would clearly need to amend
10 the rule to make it applicable to the new areas.

11 MR. DAVIS: Okay.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Alec, do you mean some
13 place other than East St. Louis or Chicago?

14 MR. DAVIS: Yes. Or if the
15 boundaries were different.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

17 MR. KALEEL: That's the way I
18 interpreted the question, too.

19 MR. DAVIS: Similarly, Mr. Kaleel,
20 are you aware of any reason why the provisions in
21 Part 217 that are subject to this rulemaking might
22 not be federally approvable to satisfy the NOx
23 RACT SIP requirement for some future ozone or PM
24 2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standard?

1 MR. KALEEL: We are aware that US
2 EPA has indicated that we would need to revise the
3 Part 217 regulations to be federally approvable.

4 MR. DAVIS: Would that require a
5 rulemaking before the Board?

6 MR. KALEEL: We believe so, yes.

7 MS. RIOS: What issues with the NOx
8 RACT rule has US EPA identified?

9 MR. KALEEL: They identified several
10 and I don't recall specifically what they all are.
11 Some of their issues were requesting
12 clarification. So there might be some things that
13 could be worked out, but at least a few things
14 come to mind. One was the fact that the NOx RACT
15 rule in Illinois had a compliance date of January
16 1st, 2012, which was several years after US EPA
17 required it.

18 So that for US EPA was a
19 nonstarter which makes it very critical that in
20 the future we have a compliance date for NOx RACT
21 that is consistent with US EPA's deadline and we
22 not push that date beyond when it's required so we
23 don't end up in the same situation of the rule not
24 being approvable. There were other things that

1 they noticed.

2 One being provisions in the way
3 the averaging plan that the Agency proposed and
4 has been adopted into the rule, they want some
5 corrections on the averaging. They also didn't
6 like the fact that the rule allowed for a
7 compliance time or an averaging time of seasonal
8 and annual. US EPA would prefer that averaging
9 time be a 30 day average, not seasonal average.
10 Those are the ones that come to mind. I think
11 there may be others.

12 MS. RIOS: Has US EPA provided
13 anything to Illinois EPA in writing on those
14 issues?

15 MR. KALEEL: We do have a letter
16 from US EPA.

17 MS. RIOS: Could the Illinois EPA
18 enter that letter into the record at a later date
19 if possible or provide that to the participants?

20 MR. KALEEL: Perhaps at a later date
21 certainly we could provide that to anyone who
22 wants it, but I'm not sure we're prepared to do it
23 today, but we could certainly make it part of this
24 record.

1 MR. RAO: Would you just submit it
2 into the record, that way anybody interested will
3 have access to it?

4 MR. KALEEL: Sure.

5 MS. RIOS: Does this rulemaking
6 resolve issues that US EPA has identified in that
7 letter?

8 MR. KALEEL: It does not.

9 MS. RIOS: So, in the future, will
10 Illinois EPA propose at another rulemaking to
11 address those issues?

12 MR. KALEEL: That's what we
13 anticipate. We are aware of some of the issues
14 that US EPA had identified. The Agency doesn't
15 believe it's appropriate to pursue those in this
16 present rulemaking for a couple of reasons.

17 One is we wanted to be able to
18 change this compliance date as soon as possible.
19 So we would want it to be a noncontroversial rule
20 and it was our understanding that it is a
21 noncontroversial rule so the companies could
22 receive the relief of the extended compliance
23 date. Also, we wanted to wait until the ozone
24 standard is, in fact, finalized and we know what

1 the NOx RACT deadline and requirements will be.
2 So it's premature at this point and in this
3 rulemaking to try to deal with those deficiencies.

4 MR. ROBERTSON: I saw a hand in the
5 back earlier.

6 THE AUDIENCE: She asked it.

7 MR. ROBERTSON: Okay.

8 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Kaleel, paragraph 15
9 on page four the Agency's motion for expedited
10 review filed with this rulemaking proposal states
11 and I quote here "So as to avoid compliance
12 requirements and unreasonable and unnecessary
13 expenditures on the regulated community, prior to
14 the imposition of federal requirements, this
15 rulemaking proposal amending the compliance date
16 needs to be adopted in an expedited manner."

17 Could you please elaborate some
18 to the best of your knowledge regarding the
19 unreasonable and unnecessary expenditures upon the
20 regulated community prior to the imposition of
21 federal requirements?

22 MR. KALEEL: I guess the first thing
23 to comply with the regulations in Part 217,
24 regardless of the compliance date, will require

1 expenditures on the part of the regulated
2 communities so perhaps the language is a little
3 misreading because we don't believe the
4 expenditures are unreasonable or unnecessary. In
5 fact, they are necessary and reasonable as we have
6 proposed, but the issue is when do these expenses
7 or do these costs have to be spent by the
8 regulated community and given US EPA's waiver of
9 the NOx RACT requirement and, more importantly,
10 given the fact that both non-attainment areas in
11 Illinois are currently meeting the ozone and PM
12 2.5 Air Quality Standards, we agreed with IERG
13 that these controls might not be needed right now
14 or by January 1st, 2012. So we think these
15 expenditures will be needed at some point, but
16 it's not necessary to do it right now.

17 MR. DAVIS: You mentioned controls
18 as one of the things in the context of
19 expenditures. Could you maybe elaborate a little
20 more on that the specifics of what it would take,
21 what types of expenditures there would be?

22 MR. KALEEL: Sure. And this was the
23 subject, of course, of an extensive rulemaking a
24 couple years ago, but to comply with the

1 requirements of 217, many industries would need to
2 install control equipment.

3 So there's certainly costs and
4 expenditures for the installation of controls.
5 There's also monitoring and testing provisions in
6 the rule which will require money, including the
7 requirement for continuous emissions monitors.
8 There's also reporting expenses and I'm sure on
9 the part of the industries the engineering, the
10 planning that would go into the installation of
11 controls as well as the construction activities of
12 that equipment. So there's a number of things
13 that will cost money.

14 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. There's some
15 overlap here, but on page 13 of the Agency's
16 statement of reasons under the subheading
17 Technical Feasibility and Economic Reasonableness
18 the Agency states "By extending the compliance
19 date for the NOx requirements, affected sources
20 gain an economic benefit by delaying
21 implementation costs and associated expenses, such
22 as installation, monitoring and recordkeeping and
23 reporting costs.

24 Do you agree that affected

1 sources must plan in advance to ensure compliance
2 with environmental regulations such as those
3 contained in Part 217 that are subject to this
4 rulemaking?

5 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

6 MR. DAVIS: Do you happen to know
7 whether some affected sources would be required to
8 undertake costly and lengthy changes to their
9 operations in implementing their plan to ensure
10 compliance with the current requirements contained
11 in Part 217?

12 MR. KALEEL: Well, as I've stated
13 before, and we believe that the costs that are
14 imposed by requirements of 217 are reasonable and
15 we've made several efforts in that rulemaking.
16 The Board has approved several things that helped
17 mitigate the expenses, but we do agree that the
18 sources need to be able to plan and depending on
19 the nature of the operations some sources might
20 have pretty extensive planning requirements to be
21 able to comply.

22 MR. DAVIS: Would you agree that
23 affected sources could potentially face liability
24 if they deferred taking any action to plan or

1 implement in advance to be able to ensure
2 compliance?

3 MR. KALEEL: Well, liability is not
4 necessarily my area of expertise since I'm a
5 meteorologist, but generally speaking, though,
6 it's pretty safe to say that a company that isn't
7 complying with a state regulation is potentially
8 facing some sort of an enforcement action.

9 MR. DAVIS: Do you agree that the
10 economic benefit to be gained by the proposed
11 compliance date extension is reduced the longer
12 the affected sources must wait to know with
13 certainty whether the compliance states contained
14 in Part 217 will be extended?

15 MR. KALEEL: I think that's probably
16 true especially for sources that haven't already
17 made those commitments. The compliance date in
18 the rule was January 1st, 2012. I would expect
19 most companies are already pretty far along with
20 their planning, if not their construction, but
21 certainly the closer we are to that date the more
22 critical it becomes for the industries.

23 MR. DAVIS: My final question. Has
24 the Agency estimated how much the potential

1 economic benefit has been reduced by the Board's
2 denying both IERG's motion for emergency rule and
3 the Agency's motion for expedited review filed in
4 these consolidated dockets?

5 MR. KALEEL: No, we have not.

6 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. That's all
7 I've got.

8 MS. RIOS: I have a few more
9 questions.

10 MR. ROBERTSON: Go ahead.

11 MS. RIOS: I want to ask first a few
12 questions on the basis of the original NOx RACT
13 rule. Was the NOx RACT rule promulgated to
14 satisfy the Section 182 (c) and (f) requirements
15 of the Clean Air Act for NOx RACT for major
16 sources located in the areas designated as
17 non-attainment for the 1997 8-hour Standard?

18 MR. KALEEL: I think that was at
19 least one of the motivations for adopting the
20 rule, yes.

21 MS. RIOS: Is that basis still
22 applicable?

23 MR. KALEEL: US EPA granted a waiver
24 from the NOx RACT requirement in Section 182 for

1 the 1997 ozone standard. So for the time being,
2 there is not a federal mandate for NOx RACT.

3 MS. RIOS: Was the NOx RACT rule
4 promulgated to satisfy the requirements of Section
5 172(b)1 of the Clean Air Act for areas designated
6 non-attainment under the 1997 PM 2.5 standard?

7 MR. KALEEL: That was, again, part
8 of the motivation. I mean, the primary motivation
9 is improving air quality and since we're now
10 meeting those standards, that perhaps is less of a
11 an issue right now.

12 MS. RIOS: So would you say that
13 that basis is still applicable?

14 MR. KALEEL: For the 1997 standard,
15 no, it's not.

16 MS. RIOS: Was the NOx RACT rule
17 promulgated to satisfy future RACT requirements
18 for areas designated under the 2006 PM 2.5
19 standard?

20 MR. KALEEL: It was not adopted with
21 respect to the 2006 standard. The entire state
22 was classified as an attainment area for the 2006
23 standard.

24 MS. RIOS: Was the NOx RACT rule

1 promulgated to satisfy future RACT requirements
2 for areas designated non-attainment under the 2008
3 ozone standard?

4 MR. KALEEL: It was not, no. The US
5 EPA has not implemented the 2008 standard. I
6 believe that all areas of the state at least as of
7 today's air quality are meeting the 2008 standard.
8 Subsequent to the adoption of the standard, we did
9 recommend that certain portions of the state would
10 be non-attainment, the same portions of the state
11 that are non-attainment today for the 1997
12 standard because at that time we were not meeting
13 the standard, but the most recent air quality data
14 would suggest we're meeting the standard, but EPA
15 chose not to move forward with the 2008 ozone
16 standard because they intended to revise the
17 standard and make it more stringent and that's
18 what they're in the process of doing right now.

19 MS. RIOS: Is the NOx RACT rule
20 currently required by the Clean Air Act?

21 MR. KALEEL: It is not currently
22 required.

23 MS. RIOS: Have the Chicago and
24 Metro East areas attained the 1997 ozone standard?

1 MR. KALEEL: Yes, they are still
2 designated non-attainment, but they have attained.

3 MS. RIOS: Was the NOx RACT rule
4 required for the attainment of the 1997 ozone
5 standard?

6 MR. KALEEL: At the time we proposed
7 it, we thought it would help with attainment, but
8 we achieved attainment without full implementation
9 of these requirements.

10 MS. RIOS: What effect has the NOx
11 RACT waiver had on the basis for the rule?

12 MR. KALEEL: I'm not quite sure I
13 understand the question.

14 MS. RIOS: Let me see if I can
15 clarify it. US EPA, as you previously testified,
16 approved a NOx RACT waiver for the 1997 ozone
17 standard. How has that waiver changed the basis
18 for the promulgation of the original rule?

19 MR. KALEEL: The waiver removes the
20 federal obligation for NOx RACT. The waiver is
21 based on a finding by US EPA that the standard
22 was, in fact, met by the 2009 deadline for
23 attainment of the standard. So it was based on a
24 clean data finding, but I presume that if we had a

1 real bad ozone season and the area has not been
2 redesignated, before that happens that the waiver
3 could be removed.

4 MS. RIOS: When did Illinois EPA
5 determine that it would request a waiver from US
6 EPA for the NOx RACT requirements?

7 MR. KALEEL: Our request was
8 projected by our efforts last year in 2010 to get
9 the two areas redesignated to attainment. We knew
10 at that point in time that the area was attaining
11 the standard and we believed at that time that we
12 had met all of the State Implementation Plan
13 requirements that US EPA requires us to address
14 and we were seeking a redesignation and for some
15 good reasons we wanted that to occur in 2010.

16 EPA notified us last summer that
17 our VOC RACT rules were not approvable and we're
18 in the process working with the -- through the
19 Pollution Control Board to amend those rules to
20 address those deficiencies. EPA had also
21 mentioned and we talked about that already in
22 earlier questions that our NOx RACT rule was not
23 fully approvable and given that we're still
24 seeking a redesignation and we had the opportunity

1 to request a waiver based on the clean data
2 finding that US EPA had made we asked for the
3 waiver. So that was some time late summer while
4 we were seeking a redesignation.

5 MS. RIOS: Did Illinois EPA discuss
6 the NOx RACT waiver request with the public prior
7 to application in the Federal Register?

8 MR. KALEEL: I don't recall.

9 MS. RIOS: Do you recall when the
10 regulated community was informed that Illinois EPA
11 had submitted a RACT waiver request?

12 MR. KALEEL: I don't recall when the
13 public was made aware of that. The waiver request
14 was just a letter from the Agency to US EPA. It
15 didn't require any kind of a regulatory process or
16 public process. It was just a letter.

17 MS. RIOS: Do you know what the
18 purpose was for not informing the regulated
19 community that Illinois EPA believed that NOx RACT
20 requirements were no longer necessary?

21 MR. KALEEL: I don't believe there's
22 any intent on our part one way or the other. I
23 think it was just another step in trying to get
24 the area redesignated which we thought was a large

1 benefit to the regulated community.

2 MS. RIOS: In the statement of
3 reasons on page 12 for this rulemaking, Illinois
4 EPA states that the extension to the compliance
5 date is to fulfill the NOx RACT requirements under
6 the Clean Air Act for the 8-hour ozone standard
7 that the US EPA is currently considering.

8 MR. KALEEL: I see it here.

9 MS. RIOS: Do you know if NOx RACT
10 will be required under the new standard for the
11 Chicago area?

12 MR. KALEEL: I don't know for
13 certain it will be required, but it is my belief
14 that it will be required and my strong belief. US
15 EPA has indicated last January, January 2010, that
16 they intend to strengthen the ozone standard.
17 What they proposed was a range between 60 and 70
18 parts per billion, which is significantly stronger
19 than the 1997 standard. The 1997 standard was the
20 equivalent of 85 parts per billion. So it is much
21 more stringent. So it is our expectation that the
22 Chicago area and the Metro East area will be
23 non-attainment and these control measures will, in
24 fact, be necessary.

1 MS. RIOS: You testified earlier,
2 though, that Illinois EPA won't know what the
3 implementation schedule will be until US EPA
4 finalizes its new ozone standard. So can you
5 provide a clarification on why Illinois EPA has
6 chosen the January 1st, 2015, deadline at this
7 point when we don't know what the implementation
8 schedule will be?

9 MR. KALEEL: As I mentioned before,
10 the date was mutually agreed to with the Illinois
11 Environmental Regulatory Group. I think both
12 groups, the Agency and IERG, recognized it at the
13 time we were having those discussions that there
14 was no clear data out there because US EPA had
15 delayed finalizing the ozone standard, but in
16 order to expedite this rulemaking, both sides
17 recognized the need to settle on a date. The
18 rationale for the date, and I think it's still a
19 sound rationale, but it was based on the
20 assumption that EPA would finalize the air quality
21 standard in 2011 and would finalize non-attainment
22 designations in 2012.

23 The Clean Air Act requires that
24 for moderate, non-attainment areas that the

1 standard be met within six years, which would mean
2 projecting out, and this is speculation, but I
3 think fairly sound that we would need to attain a
4 standard by sometime in 2018. To show attainment
5 of the standard in 2018, you need three clean
6 years of data. So backing up from '18, we were
7 seeking the control measures in 2015. So we would
8 achieve clean air by 2018.

9 MS. RIOS: That schedule, however,
10 would be based on if the Chicago area was
11 designated non-attainment?

12 MR. KALEEL: Yes, it would have to
13 be a moderate, non-attainment area and the Metro
14 East area as well.

15 MS. RIOS: Has Illinois EPA
16 communicated with US EPA regarding the schedule
17 for promulgation and implementation of the new
18 standard, new ozone standard?

19 MR. KALEEL: We have talked with EPA
20 about it and we have heard EPA give public
21 presentations on what they expect, but as we've
22 indicated, they have not made these dates final
23 yet. These rules are not yet final and EPA has
24 had a fairly poor track record over the past 12

1 months of adopting the standard when they
2 announced that they would adopt it.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Bob, because you work
4 for the Environmental Protection Agency, when you
5 refer to the EPA in your testimony, you're
6 referring to the US EPA?

7 MR. KALEEL: Yes, that's right.
8 Thank you. US EPA.

9 MS. RIOS: Until EPA takes action
10 and issues an implementation rule for the new
11 ozone standard, how can Illinois EPA know what the
12 timeline for compliance will be?

13 MR. KALEEL: Some of the timeline is
14 hardwired in the Clean Air Act. The timeline
15 depends, however, on when US EPA designates -- in
16 final, designates an area as non-attainment.
17 There are other requirements in the Clean Air Act.
18 Once that designation is final, the state has a
19 certain amount of time to submit a SIP, a State
20 Implementation Plan, and RACT would have to be
21 implemented in a certain amount of time after
22 that. So those intervals or time intervals are
23 known, but what we don't know is what the starting
24 date is, when does the area become non-attainment.

1 MS. RIOS: How are the official
2 implementation schedule and compliance timeline
3 communicated to the states?

4 MR. KALEEL: Through the
5 implementation rule typically.

6 MS. RIOS: Do you know when that
7 implementation rule will be finalized?

8 MR. KALEEL: Again, we're on federal
9 time here. The announcement from US EPA was they
10 would propose, not finalize, but propose an
11 implementation schedule at the same time they
12 finalize the ozone standard. So we would expect
13 that to be July of this year.

14 MR. RAO: And you would propose a
15 rule to the Board based on that schedule or is
16 that a notification that everybody will follow?

17 MR. KALEEL: To clarify, I guess,
18 the steps. US EPA would finalize the standard.
19 If we just play along, they'll finalize the
20 standard in July of 2011. The Clean Air Act
21 requires that the state make a recommendation to
22 US EPA as to what areas of the state are meeting
23 and are not meeting the standard typically that --
24 the state would have a year to do that and then US

1 EPA would take another year after that to finalize
2 so that will be the longest that that process from
3 finalizing the standard to having final
4 non-attainment could be. As long as two years.
5 January of 2010 US EPA announced in their
6 proposal -- not a final, in their proposal, they
7 announced an expedited schedule that would make
8 that entire two year process happen in one year.

9 So given that that was in their
10 proposal that this would be a one year process,
11 not a two year process, it makes the
12 implementation of RACT to be highly uncertain, but
13 it would be forgotten exactly what we projected,
14 but it could be as early as 2014 when a RACT rule
15 is due to EPA. I mean, fully approved rule.
16 Backing up a year from that or something like that
17 for a regulatory process, we would certainly need
18 to be back here talking to the Board by sometime
19 in late 2012, early 2013, to address the
20 deficiencies of US EPA and make whatever
21 modifications are necessary. If the process to
22 make an area non-attainment stretches out for the
23 entire two years, that is typically the case, our
24 RACT SIP might not be due until sometime in 2015.

1 So it stretches things out a little bit. It's all
2 hopefully as you can appreciate very speculative.
3 It depends on what US EPA announces this July.

4 MS. RIOS: Have -- I'm sorry. Have
5 you had any indication from US EPA that it intends
6 to propose the expedited schedule that it did for
7 the January 2010 standard?

8 MR. KALEEL: What we've heard is a
9 little bit of a mixed message. When US EPA
10 announced or proposed the expedited schedule for
11 designating non-attainment areas, there was a lot
12 of pushback in the form of comments to the Federal
13 Register, pushback from the states that indicated
14 that timeframe was just too short. That it would
15 be too much of a burden on the states to do the
16 analyses that are required to make the
17 recommendations and for them to do an adequate
18 public process to finalize.

19 EPA said we heard the states and
20 they told us this publicly that they heard those
21 comments and they don't expect a 12 month
22 designation process this next go around, but they
23 have also clearly said that it won't be two years
24 either. So maybe somewhere in the middle, maybe

1 18 months. Again, that's speculation on my part,
2 but consistent with what we've heard from US EPA.

3 MS. RIOS: Are you aware that US EPA
4 has indicated that the date for implementation of
5 NOx RACT requirements for compliance with the new
6 ozone standard could be the end of 2017?

7 MR. KALEEL: I am aware of that and
8 that is certainly one of the possibilities given
9 the range of scenarios that I just described.

10 MS. RIOS: How recently has that
11 communication occurred?

12 MR. KALEEL: I believe our bureau
13 chief got an e-mail from US EPA I want to say a
14 few weeks ago or a month ago. I don't recall the
15 specific date.

16 MS. RIOS: If NOx RACT compliance at
17 the source will be not be required until the end
18 of 2017, should -- would it be prudent to include
19 an extended compliance date in this rulemaking
20 rather than the 2015?

21 MR. KALEEL: It seems to be we'll be
22 backtalking to the Board anyway. If we were to
23 assume a 2017 implementation date and US EPA
24 ultimately stretched it for two years and RACT

1 wasn't due until 2018, I'm quite certain that we'd
2 receive a request to push it back another year.
3 As I described, the 2015 date was the soft date.
4 It was a good rationale. It was something that
5 was mutually agreed to between IERG and the
6 Illinois EPA as a reasonable date. I'd also
7 mention in terms of when RACT is due, the Clean
8 Air Act using terms like as expeditiously as
9 practicable, but not later than.

10 I might have got that language a
11 little bit wrong, but when we're talking about
12 when RACT is due the sense I'm getting from the
13 questions is what would be the absolute latest
14 that it could be due and not when it would be most
15 expeditious to do it.

16 So really expeditious could mean
17 January 1st, 2012, given that that's the timeframe
18 that our rule already requires or some date
19 between January 1st, 2012, and the very last date
20 EPA would accept anywhere in there.

21 MS. RIOS: Should US EPA finalize
22 the ozone standard and implementation schedule so
23 that the end of 2017 is the day when NOx RACT will
24 be required at sources, should the compliance date

1 be extended to at least January 1st, 2018, or the
2 beginning of the ozone season in 2018?

3 MR. KALEEL: I don't think we're
4 prepared to support that right now. I think we
5 would need to see what US EPA comes out with in
6 July.

7 MS. RIOS: Are you familiar with
8 Exhibit B to IERG's motion for emergency rule?
9 It's the Illinois EPA's letter to IERG. It's
10 dated January 12th, 2011.

11 MR. KALEEL: I have the exhibit here
12 in front of me.

13 MS. RIOS: Does Illinois EPA's
14 position remain the same as to its statement that
15 the NOx RACT rule imposes compliance requirements
16 on the regulated community prior to when they will
17 be necessary?

18 MR. KALEEL: I think what it's
19 referring to is the current January 1st, 2012,
20 compliance date and I think as we've indicated it
21 isn't necessary both for the reasons of the waiver
22 received from EPA and the fact that the area is
23 currently meeting the air quality standards. So
24 we don't believe that January 1st, 2012, date is

1 necessary.

2 MS. RIOS: Has Illinois EPA
3 withdrawn its pending request to approve the NOx
4 RACT rule as part of the SIP?

5 MR. KALEEL: Yes, we have.

6 MS. RIOS: When did Illinois EPA do
7 so?

8 MR. KALEEL: I don't have the
9 specific date, but it would have been within the
10 last couple of months that we made that request of
11 US EPA.

12 MS. RIOS: In Exhibit B, Illinois
13 EPA states it will support IERG and its members in
14 requesting relief from the NOx RACT rules
15 obligations that may exist prior to January 1st,
16 2015. Will Illinois EPA continue to support
17 relief from the rules requirement should Illinois
18 EPA propose to extend the compliance deadline past
19 2015?

20 MR. KALEEL: This letter was written
21 with respect to the January 1st, 2015, date and is
22 consistent with the understanding that we had with
23 IERG at the time this letter was written. I'm not
24 aware or know that we have any position about a

1 date beyond 2015 at this time. Again, pending US
2 EPA's action with the ozone standard.

3 MS. RIOS: You testified earlier
4 that US EPA -- you had heard from US EPA that they
5 will finalize the new ozone standard later this
6 year?

7 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

8 MS. RIOS: Has US EPA delayed
9 promulgation in the past on the ozone standard?

10 MR. KALEEL: Several times, yes.

11 MS. RIOS: Is it possible that the
12 issuance of the new standard will be delayed?

13 MR. KALEEL: It's certainly
14 possible.

15 MS. RIOS: Do you have any
16 indication from Illinois -- US EPA what the new
17 standard will be?

18 MR. KALEEL: We have no indication
19 other than US EPA has announced that they will
20 adopt a standard somewhere in the range of 60 to
21 70 parts per billion.

22 MS. RIOS: Do you know when the area
23 designations for the new standards will be made?

24 MR. KALEEL: As we've talked, it

1 will be somewhere within 12 months and 24 months
2 of the standard becoming final.

3 MS. RIOS: Do you know what data
4 period will be used to support the designations?

5 MR. KALEEL: I don't know for sure.
6 We're required to make our recommendation based on
7 the three most recent years of air quality data.
8 I would expect and, again, this is just more of an
9 informed speculation right now, but I would expect
10 that the data that we would be using to make our
11 recommendation would be 2009, 2010, 2011 data.
12 That three year period which would include this
13 ozone season. Depending on how long US EPA allows
14 itself to finalize the recommendations, it may be
15 that the 2009 data would be no longer used and it
16 would be 2010, 2011, 2012.

17 MS. RIOS: Have non-attainment areas
18 been designated for the 2008 standard?

19 MR. KALEEL: No.

20 MS. RIOS: Do you know how the
21 Chicago area would be designated under the 2008
22 standard based on the last three years of data?

23 MR. KALEEL: Based on the last three
24 years of data, I believe we are meeting that 75

1 parts per billion standard.

2 MS. RIOS: Do you know what the
3 Chicago area will be designated under the new
4 standard?

5 MR. KALEEL: I have no idea.

6 MS. RIOS: Will the geographic area
7 be the same as for the 1997 standard?

8 MR. KALEEL: I don't know that.

9 MS. RIOS: Is there anything to
10 prevent a county or a portion of a county from
11 being carved out of the non-attainment area?

12 MR. KALEEL: It's a complicated
13 process for establishing the boundaries for a
14 non-attainment area. US EPA has guidance of how
15 you go about doing that, but the presumptive
16 starting point is the entire metropolitan area and
17 for Chicago, the metropolitan -- I think it's --
18 I'm trying to remember the terminology right now
19 that the census bureau uses, but it includes
20 Kankakee County, DeKalb County, it includes areas
21 that are not currently a portion of the
22 non-attainment area.

23 The guidance does allow you to
24 make the area bigger than the metropolitan area or

1 make it smaller and, historically, we've
2 recommended and US EPA agreed that the full
3 metropolitan area need not be included, but
4 there's a demonstration that has to go along with
5 it. I would expect and, again, depending on the
6 level of the standard, that the area we make it
7 bigger and not smaller.

8 MS. RIOS: Does Illinois EPA know
9 what the Chicago area will be classified?

10 MR. KALEEL: I have no idea.

11 MS. RIOS: Is it possible that the
12 Chicago area will be classified as an attainment?

13 MR. KALEEL: For a standard between
14 the range of 60 and 70 parts per billion, there's
15 no reason to think the area would be attainment.
16 The most recent three year design value, the ozone
17 value that we used to compare to the standard, is
18 above 70. I believe it's 73 or 74 parts per
19 billion right now. So it's just below 75. It's
20 above 70, which would be the highest. We would
21 expect EPA to set the standard.

22 MS. RIOS: Is it possible that the
23 Chicago area will be classified as marginal
24 non-attainment?

1 MR. KALEEL: It's possible.

2 MS. RIOS: Can you explain the basis
3 for a difference in classification of marginal
4 versus moderate?

5 MR. KALEEL: US EPA has
6 established -- I think the initial cut points were
7 the Clean Air Act and they had different cut
8 points based on the measured design value for an
9 area. I don't remember exactly what the areas
10 were, but there's different values for marginal
11 versus moderate versus serious, severe. All the
12 different types of classification they're based on
13 the level of air quality that is achieved or the
14 amount that the area is above the standard.

15 In the 1997 standard, EPA was
16 forced to adopt a different scheme, a different
17 sets of cut points because the 1997 standard was
18 an 8-hour ozone standard and it had a different
19 level than the standard set back in 1990 which was
20 then a 1-hour standard.

21 So because of the different
22 level and because of the different averaging times
23 EPA had to establish different cut points for
24 those classifications. I would expect they would

1 have to do the same thing again now since the
2 level of the standard would be reduced.

3 MS. RIOS: If the Chicago area is
4 designated as attainment or as marginal
5 non-attainment, will NOx RACT be required?

6 MR. KALEEL: NOx RACT wouldn't be
7 required by the Clean Air Act. There may still be
8 a need based on what is needed for attainment in
9 the Chicago, Metro East area and in downwind
10 states there may still be a need to implement the
11 control measures.

12 MS. RIOS: Does the Illinois EPA
13 know when NOx RACT requirement will be required to
14 be implemented at the sources under the new
15 standard?

16 MR. KALEEL: We've talked about that
17 several times. We know -- we have some
18 speculations and we've talked about those as to
19 the latest possible date and as I mentioned also
20 the earliest possible date as expeditiously as
21 practicable is also in play.

22 So it's really a range of dates.
23 It's just not the uncertainty of the final
24 requirement based on US EPA's final action, but

1 also what the state deems to be a reasonable
2 compliance date.

3 MS. RIOS: Do you know what RACT
4 will be under the new standard?

5 MR. KALEEL: We don't know what RACT
6 would be, but we believe that the measures
7 contained in Part 217 will satisfy the NOx RACT
8 requirement for a future ozone standard and I, in
9 fact, testified to that point before.

10 MS. RIOS: If the Chicago area is
11 designated non-attainment, do you know what the
12 attainment date will be for the new standard?

13 MR. KALEEL: The attainment dates
14 are set by the Clean Air Act based on the level of
15 the classification asking. If the area becomes a
16 moderate, non-attainment area, it would be six
17 years after the air quality standard is finalized.
18 I'm sorry. Six years after the non-attainment has
19 been designated, the designation has been
20 finalized.

21 If it's a lower classification
22 marginal, I believe it's three years. If it's a
23 serious, I believe it's three years and it goes
24 all the way up. I recall for the 1-hour standard

1 after the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the
2 Chicago area was classified a severe 17, which
3 gave it 17 years for attainment. So I guess the
4 attainment date depends on when the area is
5 classified as non-attainment and what the level of
6 classification is.

7 MS. RIOS: Are you familiar with the
8 emergency rulemaking that IERG filed recently?

9 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

10 MS. RIOS: Specifically, are you
11 familiar with the exhibits to the motion
12 explaining the cost of compliance for Citgo and US
13 Steel?

14 MR. KALEEL: I apologize, but I'm
15 familiar with these documents. I've looked at
16 them, but I've not looked at them recently.

17 MS. RIOS: Are you familiar with the
18 petition for variance that Exxon Mobil has filed
19 with the Board?

20 MR. KALEEL: I am aware they have
21 filed a petition.

22 MS. RIOS: Are you aware that NOx --
23 that Exxon Mobil explains that the cost of
24 compliance with the rule will be approximately \$28

1 million.

2 MR. KALEEL: I have heard that
3 number before.

4 MS. RIOS: Given the current
5 economic climate, what is the basis for requiring
6 facilities to invest substantial resources and
7 controls to comply with the rule which at this
8 time is not required and as you testified has
9 deficiencies that US EPA has identified and is not
10 needed for the original purpose for which it was
11 promulgated?

12 MR. KALEEL: We have agreed in our
13 proposal that those expenditures are not necessary
14 before January 1st, 2012, and had, in fact,
15 proposed a later date.

16 MS. RIOS: In the original R-819
17 rulemaking to adopt the NOx RACT rule, Illinois
18 EPA revised its original to include Appendix H.
19 Do you recall what the basis was for adding
20 Appendix H?

21 MR. KALEEL: I do recall Appendix H
22 and the basis -- the basis was an attempt to
23 accommodate the turnaround schedules for two of
24 the three refineries, petroleum refineries, that

1 were affected by the rulemaking and by
2 accommodating I mean providing later compliance
3 dates than January 1st, 2012.

4 MS. RIOS: Do you expect to revise
5 the compliance dates for the refineries in this
6 rulemaking?

7 MR. KALEEL: In the present
8 rulemaking, the compliance date would be January
9 1st, 2015. The Appendix H Exxon Mobil schedule of
10 December 31st, 2014, fits within that timeframe by
11 one day. The schedule for ConocoPhillips we did
12 not propose to change it. It would still extend
13 to the end of 2016 as was originally agreed to
14 with the companies.

15 MS. RIOS: Based on the
16 uncertainties that you've testified to regarding
17 the implementation of the new rule and the
18 compliance date for NOx RACT sources, would
19 Illinois EPA consider extending the compliance
20 dates for refineries as it did in its previous
21 rulemaking to be consistent with the
22 implementation schedule once it's issued?

23 MR. KALEEL: I think we'd always be
24 willing to talk with our industries about the

1 appropriate schedules for complying with the rule
2 as it has always been our practice. I would point
3 out and I think I mentioned this earlier one of
4 the reasons that US EPA indicated that they
5 couldn't approve our RACT rule the first time
6 around was because of compliance dates for
7 industries that extended beyond the Clean Air Act
8 deadline. I am quite certain that we would be
9 inflexible to extending dates beyond any schedule
10 that US EPA comes out in an implementation rule.
11 Whatever that date is we would just be asking for
12 US EPA to disapprove it again.

13 MS. RIOS: In the previous
14 rulemaking, the compliance deadlines were extended
15 as you said to be consistent with turnaround
16 schedules?

17 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

18 MS. RIOS: Wouldn't that same issue
19 arise here to prevent unplanned shutdowns of the
20 refineries?

21 MR. KALEEL: I guess the difference
22 being when we were negotiating in good faith
23 agreements with the industries that our RACT rule
24 would be approvable at the time that we were doing

1 those agreements and I think we know now from our
2 experience that those extended schedules would not
3 be approved.

4 MS. RIOS: Has Illinois EPA
5 considered including compliant states in the rule
6 that are based on the actions US EPA takes in
7 regards to the new ozone standard? For example,
8 requiring implementation of RACT for X number of
9 years after US EPA issued the designations and
10 classification?

11 MR. KALEEL: I think I missed the
12 very beginning part of your question if you don't
13 mind.

14 MS. RIOS: Has Illinois EPA
15 considered including compliant states in the rule
16 that are based on the actions that US EPA takes in
17 regard to the new ozone standard? For example,
18 requiring implementation of RACT X number of years
19 after the designations are issued or the
20 classifications are issued?

21 MR. KALEEL: We have not really
22 considered any serious changes to the proposal
23 that is now before the Board which is a compliance
24 date of January 1st, 2015, and we believe it's

1 important for the reasons that IERG brought to us
2 that this rulemaking proceed quickly. So there
3 may be an opportunity in a future rulemaking to
4 further adjust the dates, but we think it's
5 important to lock this in and allow the Board to
6 proceed as quickly as they can.

7 MS. RIOS: Did Illinois EPA perform
8 modeling for the basis for the NOx RACT rule?

9 MR. KALEEL: We did not model
10 specifically NOx RACT to look at its benefit in
11 isolation from other requirements. We did include
12 RACT in modeling that we had performed prior to
13 our attainment demonstration. This is my
14 recollection, but it would have included all
15 measures that would have been implemented as part
16 of an attainment demonstration, not just this
17 measure by itself.

18 MS. RIOS: Will Illinois EPA conduct
19 modeling prior to issuing designations for the new
20 ozone standard?

21 MR. KALEEL: No. Modeling is not
22 required for designations.

23 MS. RIOS: Will Illinois EPA conduct
24 modeling prior to the attainment date?

1 MR. KALEEL: We would be required to
2 prepare an attainment demonstration for an area as
3 designated as non-attainment if it's moderate or
4 above. I don't believe an attainment
5 demonstration is required for a marginal area, but
6 we would be doing modeling as part of an
7 attainment demonstration and all control measures
8 that we anticipate would be included in that.

9 MS. RIOS: So will Illinois EPA have
10 modeling complete that shows the NOx reductions
11 that will be needed to meet the new standard?

12 MR. KALEEL: It wouldn't necessarily
13 be NOx reductions. It would be NOx reductions and
14 VOC reductions both in the non-attainment area and
15 for upwind sources and the modeling process is
16 iterative. We would include control strategies in
17 the entire basin. We do this work in conjunction
18 with the other states around the Lake Michigan
19 basin. So all of the strategies that the states
20 identify would be included in the modeling.

21 MS. RIOS: Are you aware of any
22 facility shutdowns planned over the next few years
23 that would reduce NOx emissions in the Chicago
24 area, shutdowns or upgrades?

1 MR. KALEEL: I guess not
2 specifically at this time. I know that there are
3 always some.

4 MS. RIOS: Do you know if the State
5 Line Power Plant will close?

6 MR. KALEEL: That's been in the
7 paper recently. I'm aware of that, which is in
8 Indiana.

9 MS. RIOS: If Illinois EPA is
10 performing modeling for the new ozone standard,
11 will it include reductions from the refineries'
12 Consent Decrees?

13 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

14 MS. RIOS: Will it also include
15 reductions from any facility shutdowns or
16 upgrades?

17 MR. KALEEL: We would typically try
18 to include those. It's kind of a tricky area from
19 a policy perspective. The industries that are
20 shutting down typically like to hold their permits
21 with the expectation that, A, they could reopen at
22 some point in the future or sell those reductions
23 to offset to another industry perhaps seeking to
24 expand. So for us to include it in the modeling,

1 we would have to know that the source has
2 surrendered their permit and no one is seeking
3 those reductions as an offset. So we wouldn't
4 automatically put shutdowns in the model.

5 MS. RIOS: Will reductions from
6 mobile sources be included in the model?

7 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

8 MS. RIOS: Could I have just one
9 minute to speak with --

10 THE COURT: Sure. Why don't we just
11 take a five minute break.

12 (Whereupon, a break was taken
13 after which the following
14 proceedings were had.)

15 MR. ROBERTSON: Let's go back on the
16 record now and do you have any follow-up
17 questions?

18 MS. RIOS: I do. I just have a few
19 more follow-up questions. Mr. Kaleel, earlier you
20 testified that NOx RACT controls could be required
21 as expeditiously as practicable and possibly even
22 as soon as January 1st, 2012. Is it practicable
23 to have the NOx RACT implementation date prior to
24 the deadline for the NOx RACT rule?

1 MR. KALEEL: I guess I was using it
2 to try to make the point that expeditiously as
3 practicable, that language in the act means that
4 the state is supposed to consider how soon control
5 measures could be implemented and I use the
6 January 1st, 2012, date from the standpoint that
7 that is a state requirement and the companies are
8 planning. Hopefully they're planning on
9 compliance by January 1st, 2012, and have been
10 since the time that the Board first adopted the
11 rule.

12 So if it was practicable before
13 our motion to extend the date, then it's still
14 practicable. That doesn't mean that US EPA would
15 require NOx RACT by 2012. Clearly as we talked
16 about, they won't, but it's clearly practicable to
17 do it sooner than the very final date that US EPA
18 would allow for RACT and that was the point I was
19 trying to make.

20 MS. RIOS: Do you know if the new
21 ozone standard is likely to be challenged?

22 MR. KALEEL: Again, I'm a
23 metrologist, not a lawyer, but that's certainly
24 been the track record for about any US EPA action

1 these days. So it's very possible that it would
2 be challenged.

3 MS. RIOS: Historically, have
4 challenges to the ozone standards resulted in
5 delay of an implementation schedule or
6 designations?

7 MR. KALEEL: It certainly could.
8 I'm just trying to recall the recent history. EPA
9 had adopted the prior 8-hour standard in 1997 and
10 it wasn't until, I believe, 2004 or 2005 that they
11 issued their implementation rule. So it could
12 certainly delay it.

13 MS. RIOS: Going back to several of
14 the questions on the geographic area of the
15 classification for the new ozone standard and if
16 the geographic area is bigger, larger than the
17 current non-attainment area, will more sources be
18 subject to NOx RACT?

19 MR. KALEEL: I believe so. I
20 haven't looked at the emissions inventory for
21 counties surrounding the current non-attainment
22 area. So I don't know what major NOx sources are
23 in those counties, what industries they belong to,
24 what the applicability thresholds might apply.

1 I'd say it's certainly likely that additional
2 sources would need to comply with NOx RACT, but I
3 don't have any specifics on that right now.

4 MS. RIOS: Would those sources be
5 required to install controls consistent with the
6 existing rule?

7 MR. KALEEL: That would be our
8 intent, yes.

9 MS. RIOS: If the geographic area is
10 determined to be smaller than the current area
11 that's non-attainment, would the NOx RACT rule
12 controls not be required at those sources in that
13 area?

14 MR. KALEEL: I mean, that's real
15 speculation. I can't conceive of a circumstance
16 where the area would be smaller. These boundaries
17 have existed at least since 1990 and probably
18 earlier than that.

19 MS. RIOS: Earlier, you testified
20 regarding the designations and this schedule for
21 that could be anywhere from 12 to 24 months. Is
22 there a possibility that there could be an
23 additional one year extension for designations?

24 MR. KALEEL: Beyond 24 months, I'm

1 not aware of an approach that would -- anything in
2 the law that would allow them more than 24 months
3 to complete that process. I could be wrong. Gina
4 had pointed out a citation, and I'm not familiar
5 with the document that we're looking at, but there
6 does appear to be a provision for an extension of
7 a year if the administrator has insufficient
8 information. I haven't looked at this language
9 before, but it's possible what they're looking at
10 are areas that don't have monitoring data.

11 MS. RIOS: Going back to the
12 questions and testimony regarding the modeling and
13 whether to include facility shutdowns or upgrades
14 in that effort. You testified that they probably
15 wouldn't be included for several reasons, but
16 wouldn't the shutdowns or the upgrades at those
17 facilities impact the monitors, show improvements
18 at the monitoring?

19 MR. KALEEL: They certainly would.

20 MS. RIOS: Do you know where in
21 proximity to Illinois the State Line Power Plant
22 facility is?

23 MR. KALEEL: Yes.

24 MS. RIOS: Does it impact the air

1 quality in Illinois?

2 MR. KALEEL: Certainly, it does,
3 yes.

4 MS. RIOS: Are you aware of other
5 continued reductions independent of this rule that
6 impact the air quality in the Chicago area?

7 MR. KALEEL: Yes. I'm familiar with
8 several that will provide reductions beyond the
9 current date including mobile source control
10 measures. One of your questions asked about that.
11 We expect continued reductions of VOC, volatile
12 organic compounds, and NOx emissions from mobile
13 sources. Both on road and off road mobile
14 sources.

15 We know that there's an
16 agreement with many of the largest utilities in
17 the State of Illinois to implement multipollutant
18 controls. That was part of the requirement of
19 Illinois's mercury rule that the Board had
20 approved and many of those reductions are yet to
21 occur. I believe for NOx emissions all those
22 controls have to be in place by 2012. So there's
23 still another year before all those measures are
24 in place. Those are some examples. There may be

1 others.

2 MS. RIOS: Is it possible that
3 knowing whether NOx RACT is required and if it is
4 receiving a firm answer on the implementation
5 schedule from US EPA that the deadline will need
6 to be extended beyond 2013?

7 MR. KALEEL: The deadline for 2013?

8 MS. RIOS: For example, the NOx RACT
9 2013 deadline for implementation of sources?

10 MR. KALEEL: I'm a little confused
11 by the question. 2013 is what is confusing me.

12 MS. RIOS: Or 2015. 2015.

13 MR. KALEEL: As I mentioned or
14 responded to an earlier question, I think the
15 Agency would be willing to consider alternate
16 dates once we have some clarity from US EPA as to
17 to what the requirements will be.

18 MS. RIOS: And if the deadline did
19 need to be extended or additional revisions to the
20 NOx RACT rule are required in order to achieve --
21 to comply with the new standard, how will Illinois
22 EPA go about implementing those?

23 MR. KALEEL: Our usual approach is
24 to initiate some sort of a dialogue with state

1 holders to try to identify issues to try to share
2 information to try to resolve any issues prior to
3 filing a proposal with the Pollution Control Board
4 and then the following steps obviously are to make
5 the proposal and to do the rulemaking.

6 MS. RIOS: I think I'm finished.

7 MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you. Did
8 anybody else have any questions today? Seeing
9 none, any members of the Board have questions?
10 Okay. Is there anyone else that would like to
11 testify on any other matter in this proceeding
12 today? Seeing none, at this point, I would like
13 to go off the record to discuss the next set of
14 dates for this proceeding.

15 (Whereupon, a discussion was had
16 off the record.)

17 MR. ROBERTSON: So the next hearing
18 is set for June 28th at 1:00 p.m. in the County
19 Boardroom, No. 203, at the Madison County
20 Administration Building in Edwardsville.

21 As the previous Hearing Officer
22 order noted, the pre-filing deadline for that
23 deadline is June 20th. Before adjourning, I'd
24 just like to note in introductions earlier I

1 inadvertently left two people off. We've also
2 been joined by two of the Board's interns today,
3 Ethan Pressly and Erica Yee. My apologies for
4 that and with that I'd just like to thank you all
5 for taking the time to come out today and we are
6 adjourned.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 STATE OF ILLINOIS)

1) SS.

2 COUNTY OF COOK)

3

4 I, Steven Brickey, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in
6 shorthand the proceedings had at the trial
7 aforesaid, and that the foregoing is a true,
8 complete and correct transcript of the proceedings
9 of said trial as appears from my stenographic
10 notes so taken and transcribed under my personal
11 direction.

12 Witness my official signature in and for
13 Cook County, Illinois, on this 7th day of
14 June, A.D., 2010.

15

16

17

18

19

Steven Brickey
STEVEN BRICKEY, CSR
8 West Monroe Street
Suite 2007
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Phone: (312) 419-9292
CSR No. 084-004675

20

21

22

23

24

A	54:1,23	39:5 41:1	allowed 12:6	anyone 5:10	43:24
able 4:8	57:19	46:12 52:22	allows 37:13	12:21 58:10	area 8:8,11
13:17 17:18	address	Agency 3:21	along 7:17	anything	8:12,12
17:21 18:1	13:11 23:13	4:22 5:6 6:7	18:19 29:19	12:13 38:9	18:4 20:22
about 8:7	23:20 30:19	8:18 12:3	39:4	55:1	23:1,10
23:21 27:20	adequate	13:14 16:18	already	anyway	24:24 25:11
33:11 35:24	31:17	18:24 24:14	18:16,19	32:22	25:22,22
38:15 41:16	adjourned	26:12 28:4	23:21 33:18	anywhere	27:10,13,14
41:18 45:24	59:6	57:15	alternate	33:20 54:21	28:16,24
52:16,24	adjourning	Agency's	57:15	apologies	30:22 34:22
56:10 57:22	58:23	5:12 6:6	always 9:13	59:3	36:22 37:21
above 1:7	adjust 48:4	14:9 16:15	45:23 46:2	apologize	38:3,6,11
10:6,7	Adm 1:3 3:6	19:3	50:3	43:14	38:14,16,22
39:18,20	3:12	ago 15:24	Ambient	apparent	38:24,24
40:14 49:4	Administr...	32:14,14	9:20 10:24	8:16	39:3,6,9,12
absolute	58:20	agree 16:24	amend 10:9	appear 55:6	39:15,23
33:13	administra...	17:17,22	23:19	appears 60:9	40:9,14
accept 33:20	55:7	18:9	amending	Appendix	41:3,9
access 13:3	admitting	agreed 9:17	14:15	44:18,20,21	42:10,15,16
accommod...	5:17	15:12 26:10	amendments	45:9	43:2,4 49:2
44:23	adopt 7:2	33:5 39:2	1:3 3:5,12	applicability	49:5,14,24
accommod...	28:2 36:20	44:12 45:13	43:1	10:2 53:24	50:18 53:14
45:2	40:16 44:17	agreement	amount	applicable	53:16,17,22
achieve 27:8	adopted 7:3	56:16	28:19,21	10:10 19:22	54:9,10,13
57:20	12:4 14:16	agreements	40:14	20:13	54:16 56:6
achieved	20:20 52:10	46:23 47:1	analyses	application	areas 6:8 7:1
22:8 40:13	53:9	ahead 19:10	31:16	24:7	9:22,24
act 7:5 19:15	adopting	air 1:3 4:23	Anand 2:3	apply 53:24	10:5,10
20:5 21:20	19:19 28:1	4:24 6:22	3:17	appointed	15:10 19:16
25:6 26:23	adoption	7:5,20 9:20	Andrea 2:3	3:3	20:5,18
28:14,17	21:8	10:24 15:12	3:18	appreciate	21:2,6,24
29:20 33:8	advance 17:1	19:15 20:5	announced	31:2	23:9 26:24
40:7 41:7	18:1	20:9 21:7	28:2 30:5,7	approach	29:22 31:11
42:14 43:1	affected	21:13,20	31:10 36:19	55:1 57:23	37:17 38:20
46:7 52:3	16:19,24	25:6 26:20	announce...	approached	40:9 55:10
acted 7:7	17:7,23	26:23 27:8	29:9	9:11	arise 46:19
action 17:24	18:12 45:1	28:14,17	announces	appropriate	around 31:22
18:8 28:9	aforesaid	29:20 33:8	31:3	13:15 46:1	46:6 49:18
36:2 41:24	60:7	34:23 37:7	annual 12:8	approvable	asked 4:10
52:24	after 11:16	40:7,13	another 8:18	10:22 11:3	14:6 24:2
actions 6:19	28:21 30:1	41:7 42:14	13:10 24:23	11:24 23:17	56:10
6:20 47:6	42:17,18	42:17 43:1	30:1 33:2	23:23 46:24	asking 42:15
47:16	43:1 47:9	46:7 55:24	50:23 56:23	approve 35:3	46:11
activities	47:19 51:13	56:6	answer 9:10	46:5	associated
16:11	afternoon	Alec 2:9 6:1	57:4	approved	16:21
actually 8:21	3:1 4:20	10:12	anticipate	17:16 22:16	assume 32:23
Adams 2:10	again 20:7	allow 4:15	13:13 49:8	30:15 47:3	assuming
adding 44:19	29:8 32:1	38:23 48:5	anybody	56:20	10:8
additional	36:1 37:8	52:18 55:2	13:2 58:8	approxima...	assumption

26:20	32:22	21:6 24:21	4:12 19:1	52:23 53:7	10:6 20:22
attain 27:3	bad 23:1	32:12 34:24	59:2	53:12 54:1	39:9,12,23
attained	based 7:11	37:24 39:18	Bob 28:3	55:19 56:2	43:2,5
21:24 22:2	22:21,23	42:6,22,23	both 9:16	certainty	clean 7:5
attaining	24:1 26:19	47:24 49:4	15:10 19:2	18:13	19:15 20:5
23:10	27:10 29:15	53:10,19	26:11,16	Certified	21:20 22:24
attainment	37:6,22,23	56:21	34:21 49:14	60:4	24:1 25:6
20:22 22:4	40:8,12	believed	56:13	certify 60:5	26:23 27:5
22:7,8,23	41:8,24	23:11 24:19	boundaries	challenged	27:8 28:14
23:9 27:4	42:14 45:15	belong 53:23	7:1 8:9	52:21 53:2	28:17 29:20
39:12,15	47:6,16	below 39:19	10:15 38:13	challenges	33:7 40:7
41:4,8	basin 49:19	benefit 16:20	54:16	53:4	41:7 42:14
42:12,13	basis 10:8	18:10 19:1	break 51:11	change 13:18	43:1 46:7
43:3,4	19:12,21	25:1 48:10	51:12	45:12	clear 8:13
48:13,16,24	20:13 22:11	besides 3:17	Brickey 1:9	changed	26:14
49:2,4,7	22:17 40:2	best 14:18	2:17 60:4	22:17	clearly 10:9
attempt	44:5,19,22	between	60:19	changes 10:1	31:23 52:15
44:22	44:22 48:8	25:17 33:5	brought 48:1	17:8 47:22	52:16
AUDIENCE	49:17	33:19 39:13	build 4:11	Chicago 1:11	climate 44:5
14:6	become	beyond 11:22	Building	7:22 10:13	close 50:5
automatica...	28:24	36:1 46:7,9	58:20	21:23 25:11	closer 18:21
51:4	becomes 8:15	54:24 56:8	burden 31:15	25:22 27:10	Code 1:3 3:6
available	18:22 42:15	57:6	bureau 4:24	37:21 38:3	3:12
3:23	becoming	bias 4:13	32:12 38:19	38:17 39:9	come 11:14
Avenue 2:7	37:2	bigger 38:24	<hr/>	39:12,23	12:10 59:5
2:13	before 1:7	39:7 53:16	C	41:3,9	comes 34:5
average 12:9	4:6 5:7,11	billion 25:18	c 2:1 19:14	42:10 43:2	46:10
12:9	8:2,3,21	25:20 36:21	called 1:8 5:4	49:23 56:6	commencing
averaging	9:24 11:5	38:1 39:14	8:5	60:21	1:12
12:3,5,7,8	17:13 23:2	39:19	Carrie 2:4	chief 32:13	comments
40:22	26:9 42:9	bit 31:1,9	3:18	chose 21:15	31:12,21
avoid 14:11	44:3,14	33:11	carved 38:11	chosen 26:6	commitme...
aware 10:20	47:23 52:12	Blankenship	case 3:8	circumstan...	18:17
11:1 13:13	55:9 56:23	2:5 3:14	30:23	54:15	communic...
24:13 32:3	58:23	Board 1:1,9	categorize	citation 55:4	27:16 29:3
32:7 35:24	begin 4:4,6	3:3,14,15	8:10	Citgo 43:12	communic...
43:20,22	beginning	3:17 4:10	categorized	clarification	32:11
49:21 50:7	6:11,15	4:15 9:24	10:6	11:12 26:5	communities
55:1 56:4	34:2 47:12	11:5 17:16	cause 1:7	clarify 22:15	15:2
A.D 60:14	behalf 9:3	23:19 29:15	census 38:19	29:17	community
<hr/>	behind 9:9	30:18 32:22	certain 7:14	clarity 57:16	14:13,20
B	being 11:24	43:19 47:23	7:15 8:3	classification	15:8 24:10
B 34:8 35:12	12:2 20:1	48:5 52:10	21:9 25:13	40:3,12	24:19 25:1
back 14:5	38:11 46:22	56:19 58:3	28:19,21	42:15,21	34:16
30:18 33:2	belief 25:13	58:9	33:1 46:8	43:6 47:10	companies
40:19 51:15	25:14	Boardroom	certainly	53:15	13:21 18:19
53:13 55:11	believe 6:16	58:19	8:22 12:21	classificati...	45:14 52:7
backing 27:6	11:6 13:15	Board's 3:6	12:23 16:3	40:24 47:20	company
30:16	15:3 17:13	3:16,23	18:21 30:17	classified	18:6
backtalking			32:8 36:13		

compare 39:17	50:12	costly 17:8	13:18,23	deadlines 46:14	28:15,16
complete 4:11 49:10 55:3 60:8	consider 45:19 52:4 57:15	costs 15:7 16:3,21,23 17:13	14:15,24 16:19 18:11 18:17,21	deal 14:3	designating 31:11
compliance 9:7 11:15 11:20 12:7 13:18,22 14:11,15,24 16:18 17:1 17:10 18:2 18:11,13,17 25:4 28:12 29:2 32:5 32:16,19 33:24 34:15 34:20 35:18 42:2 43:12 43:24 45:2 45:5,8,18 45:19 46:6 46:14 47:23 52:9	considered 9:13 47:5 47:15,22	counties 53:21,23	25:5 26:10 26:17,18 28:24 32:4 32:15,19,23 33:3,3,6,18 33:19,24 34:20,24 35:9,21 36:1 41:19 41:20 42:2 42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	December 45:10	designation 28:18 31:22 42:19
compliant 47:5,15	considering 25:7	county 38:10	28:24 32:4 32:15,19,23 33:3,3,6,18 33:19,24 34:20,24 35:9,21 36:1 41:19 41:20 42:2 42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	decision 4:12	designations 7:3 26:22 36:23 37:4 47:9,19 48:19,22 53:6 54:20 54:23
complicated 38:12	consistent 11:21 32:2 35:22 45:21 46:15 54:5	course 8:1 15:23	42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	Decrees 50:12	determine 23:5
comply 14:23 15:24 17:21 44:7 54:2 57:21	consolidated 3:8 19:4	court 1:24 2:24 4:8 5:16 51:10	42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	DeKalb 38:20	determined 54:10
complying 18:7 46:1	contained 17:3,10 18:13 42:7	critical 11:19 18:22	42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	delay 53:5,12	dialogue 57:24
compounds 56:12	context 15:18	CSR 1:9 2:17 2:18 60:19 60:22	42:12 43:4 44:15 45:8 45:18 46:11 47:24 48:24 51:23 52:6 52:13,17 56:9	delayed 26:15 36:8 36:12	difference 40:3 46:21
conceive 54:15	continue 35:16	current 5:12 9:23 17:10 34:19 44:4 53:17,21 54:10 56:9	dated 34:10	delaying 16:20	different 9:22 10:15 40:7,10,12 40:16,16,18 40:21,22,23
conduct 48:18,23	continued 56:5,11	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	dates 7:4 8:2 27:22 41:22 42:13 45:3 45:5,20 46:6,9 48:4 57:16 58:14	demonstrat... 39:4 48:13 48:16 49:2 49:5,7	direct 6:8
confused 57:10	continuous 16:7	cut 40:6,7,17 40:23	Davis 2:9 6:1 6:2 7:12 8:15,24 9:19 10:11 10:14,19 11:4 14:8 15:17 16:14 17:6,22 18:9,23 19:6	denying 19:2	direction 60:11
confusing 57:11	control 1:1,9 16:2 23:19 25:23 27:7 41:11 49:7 49:16 52:4 56:9 58:3	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	D	dependant 6:19	disapprove 46:12
conjunction 49:17	controls 15:13,17 16:4,11	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	Daniel 1:7 2:2 3:2	depending 17:18 37:13 39:5	discuss 8:20 8:23 24:5 58:13
ConocoPhi... 45:11	control 1:1,9 16:2 23:19 25:23 27:7 41:11 49:7 49:16 52:4 56:9 58:3	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	data 21:13 22:24 24:1 26:14 27:6 37:3,7,10 37:11,15,22 37:24 55:10	denying 19:2	discussion 58:15
Consent	controls 15:13,17 16:4,11	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	date 3:24 6:16,18 7:9 7:14 8:17 9:7,9,10,12 9:14,18 11:15,20,22 12:18,20	deposeth 5:5	discussions 26:13
	cost 16:13 43:12,23	currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	day 1:11 4:15 12:9 33:23 45:11 60:13	described 32:9 33:3	docket 3:7,9 dockets 19:4
		currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	days 53:1	design 39:16 40:8	document 5:20 55:5
		currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21	deadline 11:21 14:1 22:22 26:6 35:18 46:8 51:24 57:5 57:7,9,18 58:22,23	designated 6:9 19:16 20:5,18 21:2 22:2 27:11 37:18 37:21 38:3 41:4 42:11 42:19 49:3	documents 43:15
		currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21		designates	doing 21:18 38:15 46:24 49:6
		currently 15:11 21:20 21:21 25:7 34:23 38:21			down 50:20 downwind

41:9	32:17 33:23	32:2,3,13	examples	explains	14:21 20:2
Driver 2:6	45:13	32:23 33:6	56:24	43:23	22:20 24:7
9:3	enforcement	33:20,21	exhibit 5:19	express 4:12	29:8 31:12
due 30:15,24	18:8	34:5,22	5:21 34:8	extend 35:18	federally
33:1,7,12	engineering	35:2,6,11	34:11 35:12	45:12 52:13	10:22 11:3
33:14	16:9	35:13,16,18	exhibits	extended	few 6:3 11:13
duly 5:4	ensure 4:8	36:4,4,8,16	43:11	13:22 18:14	19:8,11
Dwyer 2:6	17:1,9 18:1	36:19 37:13	exist 35:15	32:19 34:1	32:14 49:22
9:3	enter 5:18	38:14 39:2	existed 54:17	46:7,14	51:18
	12:18	39:8,21	existing 54:6	47:2 57:6	filed 4:1 6:6
E	entire 20:21	40:5,15,23	expand 50:24	57:19	14:10 19:3
E 2:1,1	30:8,23	41:12 44:9	expect 6:14	extending	43:8,18,21
earlier 14:5	38:16 49:17	44:18 45:19	7:22 10:3	16:18 45:19	filing 58:3
23:22 26:1	entitled 1:7	46:4,10,12	18:18 27:21	46:9	final 7:3,4,14
36:3 46:3	3:4	47:4,6,9,14	29:12 31:21	extension	18:23 27:22
51:19 54:18	environme...	47:16 48:7	37:8,9 39:5	8:18 18:11	27:23 28:16
54:19 57:14	2:9,12 3:10	48:18,23	39:21 40:24	25:4 54:23	28:18 30:3
58:24	3:21 4:22	49:9 50:9	45:4 56:11	55:6	30:6 37:2
earliest 41:20	6:2 9:11	52:14,17,24	expectation	extensive	41:23,24
early 30:14	17:2 26:11	53:8 57:5	7:10 25:21	15:23 17:20	52:17
30:19	28:4	57:16,22	50:21	Exxon 9:3	finalize 6:22
East 2:10,13	EPA 6:10,13	EPA's 7:10	expected 6:9	43:18,23	26:20,21
10:13 21:24	6:20,22 7:2	11:21 15:8	expects 6:10	45:9	29:10,12,18
25:22 27:14	7:7,11,18	34:9,13	expedite	e-mail 32:13	29:19 30:1
41:9	7:21 8:10	36:2 41:24	26:16		31:18 33:21
easy 9:9	8:13,20 9:4	equipment	expedited	F	36:5 37:14
economic	11:2,8,16	16:2,12	14:9,16	f 19:14	finalized
16:17,20	11:18 12:8	equivalent	19:3 30:7	face 17:23	13:24 29:7
18:10 19:1	12:12,13,16	25:20	31:6,10	facilities 44:6	42:17,20
44:5	12:17 13:6	Erica 59:3	expeditious	55:17	finalizes 26:4
Edwardsvi...	13:10,14	especially	33:15,16	facility 49:22	finalizing 8:9
58:20	19:23 21:5	18:16	expeditiously	50:15 55:13	26:15 30:3
effect 22:10	21:14 22:15	establish	33:8 41:20	55:22	finding 22:21
effectuate	22:21 23:4	40:23	51:21 52:2	facing 18:8	22:24 24:2
10:1	23:6,13,16	established	expenditures	fact 11:14	finished 58:6
effort 55:14	23:20 24:2	40:6	14:13,19	12:6 13:24	firm 57:4
efforts 17:15	24:5,10,14	establishing	15:1,4,15	15:5,10	first 5:4
23:8	24:19 25:4	38:13	15:19,21	22:22 25:24	14:22 19:11
either 31:24	25:7,15	estimated	16:4 44:13	34:22 42:9	46:5 52:10
elaborate	26:2,3,5,14	18:24	expenses	44:14	fits 45:10
14:17 15:19	26:20 27:15	Ethan 59:3	15:6 16:8	fairly 27:3,24	five 51:11
emergency	27:16,19,20	even 51:21	16:21 17:17	faith 46:22	follow 29:16
3:11 19:2	27:23 28:5	everybody	experience	familiar 34:7	following
34:8 43:8	28:6,8,9,11	29:16	47:2	43:7,11,15	51:13 58:4
emissions 1:3	28:15 29:9	exactly 7:8	expertise	43:17 55:4	follows 5:5
3:5,11 16:7	29:18,22	7:19 30:13	18:4	56:7	follow-up 9:1
49:23 53:20	30:1,5,15	40:9	explain 40:2	far 18:19	51:16,19
56:12,21	30:20 31:3	example 47:7	explaining	Feasibility	forced 40:16
end 4:14 6:12	31:5,9,19	47:17 57:8	43:12	16:17	foregoing
11:23 32:6				federal 14:14	

forget 7:19	Gina 2:12	hear 3:20	2:13 3:10	21:5 28:21	16:1,9
forgotten	4:21 7:19	heard 7:17	3:21 4:21	41:14 48:15	18:22 45:24
30:13	55:3	7:18 27:20	6:2,10,13	52:5	46:7,23
form 31:12	give 27:20	31:8,19,20	9:4,11,22	implementi...	50:19 53:23
forward	given 9:14	32:2 36:4	11:15 12:13	17:9 57:22	industry
21:15	15:8,10	44:2	12:17 13:10	important	50:23
four 6:5 14:9	23:23 30:9	hearing 1:7	15:11 23:4	4:7 48:1,5	inflexible
from 3:16,20	32:8 33:17	2:2 3:3,19	24:5,10,19	importantly	46:9
7:18,18 9:2	44:4	5:20 58:17	25:3 26:2,5	15:9	information
12:16 19:24	go 16:10	58:21	26:10 27:15	imposed	7:17 8:7
23:5 24:14	19:10 31:22	held 1:6	28:11 33:6	17:14	55:8 58:2
27:6 29:9	38:15 39:4	help 4:11	34:9,13	imposes	informed
30:2,16	51:15 57:22	22:7	35:2,6,12	34:15	24:10 37:9
31:5,13	58:13	helped 17:16	35:16,17	imposition	informing
32:2,13	goes 42:23	her 7:19	36:16 39:8	14:14,20	24:18
33:12 34:22	Going 53:13	highest 39:20	41:12 44:17	improveme...	initial 40:6
35:14,17	55:11	highly 30:12	45:19 47:4	55:17	initiate 57:24
36:4,16	good 3:1 4:20	him 3:15,17	47:14 48:7	improving	install 16:2
38:10 47:1	23:15 33:4	historically	48:18,23	20:9	54:5
48:11 50:11	46:22	39:1 53:3	49:9 50:9	inadverten...	installation
50:15,18	Grand 2:13	history 53:8	55:21 56:1	59:1	16:4,10,22
51:5 52:6	granted	Hodge 2:6	56:17 57:21	include 9:6	insufficient
54:21 56:12	19:23	9:2	59:24 60:13	32:18 37:12	55:7
57:5,16	Great 5:18	hold 50:20	60:21	44:18 48:11	intend 8:4
60:9	Group 2:9,12	holders 58:1	Illinois's	49:16 50:11	25:16
front 34:12	6:3 9:12	hopefully	56:19	50:14,18,24	intended
fulfill 25:5	26:11	31:2 52:8	immediately	55:13	4:11 21:16
full 22:8 39:2	groups 3:10	hour 1:12	4:4	included	intends 31:5
fully 23:23	26:12		impact 55:17	39:3 48:14	intent 24:22
30:15	guess 7:12,16	I	55:24 56:6	49:8,20	54:8
further 48:4	10:4 14:22	idea 38:5	implement	51:6 55:15	interested
future 9:19	29:17 43:3	39:10	18:1 41:10	includes	13:2
10:23 11:20	46:21 50:1	identificati...	56:17	38:19,20	interns 59:2
13:9 20:17	52:1	5:22	implement...	including	interpreted
21:1 42:8	guidance	identified	6:18 8:5,6	7:18 16:6	10:18
48:3 50:22	38:14,23	11:8,9 13:6	8:14 9:5	47:5,15	intervals
		13:14 44:9	16:21 22:8	56:9	28:22,22
G	H	identify	23:12 26:3	independent	introduce
gain 16:20	H 44:18,20	49:20 58:1	26:7 27:17	56:5	4:18
gained 18:10	44:21 45:9	IERG 15:12	28:10,20	Indiana 50:8	introductio...
Gary 2:5	hand 14:4	26:12 33:5	29:2,5,7,11	indicated	58:24
3:14	happen 6:21	34:9 35:13	30:12 32:4	11:2 25:15	inventory
gave 43:3	17:6 30:8	35:23 43:8	32:23 33:22	27:22 31:13	53:20
generally	happened	48:1	45:17,22	32:4 34:20	invest 44:6
18:5	6:21	IERG's 19:2	46:10 47:8	46:4	isolation
geographic	happens 23:2	34:8	47:18 51:23	indication	48:11
9:23 38:6	hardwired	Ill 1:3 3:5,12	53:5,11	31:5 36:16	issuance
53:14,16	7:4 28:14	Illinois 1:1,8	57:4,9	36:18	36:12
54:9	having 5:4	1:10,11 2:7	implemented	industries	issue 8:4 15:6
getting 33:12	26:13 30:3	2:9,10,12			

20:11 46:18 issued 45:22 47:9,19,20 53:11 issues 8:12 11:7,11 12:14 13:6 13:11,13 28:10 58:1 58:2 issuing 48:19 iterative 49:16	K Kaleel 2:15 4:23 5:3,12 5:15,19 6:4 6:5,16 7:16 8:19 9:8,19 10:3,17,19 11:1,6,9 12:15,20 13:4,8,12 14:8,22 15:22 17:5 17:12 18:3 18:15 19:5 19:18,23 20:7,14,20 21:4,21 22:1,6,12 22:19 23:7 24:8,12,21 25:8,12 26:9 27:12 27:19 28:7 28:13 29:4 29:8,17 31:8 32:7 32:12,21 34:3,11,18 35:5,8,20 36:7,10,13 36:18,24 37:5,19,23 38:5,8,12 39:10,13 40:1,5 41:6 41:16 42:5 42:13 43:9 43:14,20 44:2,12,21 45:7,23 46:17,21 47:11,21 48:9,21 49:1,12 50:1,6,13 50:17 51:7 51:19 52:1 52:22 53:7 53:19 54:7	54:14,24 55:19,23 56:2,7 57:7 57:10,13,23 Kaleel's 5:24 Kankakee 38:20 kind 24:15 50:18 knew 23:9 know 7:8,13 7:14 13:24 17:6 18:12 24:17 25:9 25:12 26:2 26:7 28:11 28:23 29:6 35:24 36:22 37:3,5,20 38:2,8 39:8 41:13,17 42:3,5,11 47:1 50:2,4 51:1 52:20 53:22 55:20 56:15 knowing 57:3 knowledge 14:18 known 7:14 28:23	44:15 45:2 latest 33:13 41:19 law 55:2 lawyer 52:23 least 11:13 19:19 21:6 34:1 54:17 left 3:13 59:1 lengthy 17:8 less 20:10 Let 22:14 letter 12:15 12:18 13:7 24:14,16 34:9 35:20 35:23 Let's 51:15 level 39:6 40:13,19,22 41:2 42:14 43:5 liability 17:23 18:3 License 2:18 like 4:18 12:6 30:16 33:8 50:20 58:10 58:12,24 59:4 likely 6:10,14 52:21 54:1 Line 50:5 55:21 listed 3:6 little 15:2,19 31:1,9 33:11 57:10 LLC 1:24 2:24 located 19:16 lock 48:5 long 30:4 37:13 longer 18:11 24:20 37:15 longest 30:2 look 48:10 looked 43:15	43:16 53:20 55:8 looking 55:5 55:9 lot 31:11 Louis 10:13 lower 42:21 L.A 1:24 2:24	M M 2:9 made 3:23 7:11,21 8:1 17:15 18:17 24:2,13 27:22 35:10 36:23 Madison 58:19 major 19:15 53:22 make 8:13,22 9:15 10:10 12:23 21:17 29:21 30:7 30:20,22 31:16 37:6 37:10 38:24 39:1,6 52:2 52:19 58:4 makes 11:19 30:11 manager 4:23 mandate 20:2 manner 14:16 many 16:1 56:16,20 marginal 39:23 40:3 40:10 41:4 42:22 49:5 marked 5:20 matter 1:2 3:4,9 58:11 matters 8:10 may 3:22	12:11 35:15 37:14 41:7 41:10 48:3 56:24 maybe 15:19 31:24,24 McCarthy 7:19 mean 10:12 20:8 27:1 30:15 33:16 45:2 52:14 54:14 means 52:3 measure 48:17 measured 40:8 measures 25:23 27:7 41:11 42:6 48:15 49:7 52:5 56:10 56:23 meet 49:11 meeting 7:2 15:11 20:10 21:7,12,14 29:22,23 34:23 37:24 Member 3:14 3:15 4:10 members 35:13 58:9 Member's 3:18 mention 33:7 mentioned 15:17 23:21 26:9 41:19 46:3 57:13 mercury 56:19 message 31:9 met 22:22 23:12 27:1 meteorolog... 18:5 Metro 21:24
J J 2:15,17 January 6:23 9:6 11:15 15:14 18:18 25:15,15 26:6 30:5 31:7 33:17 33:19 34:1 34:10,19,24 35:15,21 44:14 45:3 45:8 47:24 51:22 52:6 52:9 Johnson 2:4 3:15 10:12 10:16 28:3 joined 59:2 July 7:23,23 8:4,14 29:13,20 31:3 34:6 June 1:11 58:18,23 just 7:10,16 7:21 13:1 24:14,16,23 29:19 31:14 32:9 37:8 39:19 41:23 46:11 48:16 51:8,10,18 53:8 58:24 59:4	L Lake 49:18 language 15:2 33:10 52:3 55:8 large 24:24 larger 53:16 largest 56:16 last 23:8,16 25:15 33:19 35:10 37:22 37:23 late 24:3 30:19 later 8:17 12:18,20 33:9 36:5					

25:22 27:13	9:2	nature 17:19	non-attain...	42:7 43:22	32:8 45:11
41:9	monitoring	necessarily	6:8 7:1 8:8	44:17 45:18	46:3 51:2,8
metrologist	16:5,22	18:4 49:12	8:11 9:22	48:8,10	54:23 56:10
52:23	55:10,18	necessary	9:23 10:5	49:10,13,13	ones 12:10
metropolitan	monitors	15:5,16	15:10 19:17	49:23 51:20	only 4:7
38:16,17,24	16:7 55:17	24:20 25:24	20:6 21:2	51:23,24	opening 5:7
39:3	Monroe	30:21 34:17	21:10,11	52:15 53:18	5:11
Michigan	60:20	34:21 35:1	22:2 25:23	53:22 54:2	operations
49:18	month 31:21	44:13	26:21,24	54:11 56:12	17:9,19
middle 31:24	32:14	need 9:15	27:11,13	56:21 57:3	opportunity
might 10:21	months 28:1	10:9 11:2	28:16,24	57:8,20	4:16 23:24
11:12 15:13	32:1 35:10	16:1 17:18	30:4,22	number	48:3
17:19 30:24	37:1,1	26:17 27:3	31:11 37:17	16:12 44:3	order 26:16
33:10 53:24	54:21,24	27:5 30:17	38:11,14,22	47:8,18	57:20 58:22
million 44:1	55:2	34:5 39:3	39:24 41:5		organic
mind 11:14	Moore 2:3	41:8,10	42:11,16,18	O	56:12
12:10 47:13	3:18	54:2 57:5	43:5 49:3	objection 4:2	original
minute 51:9	more 15:9,20	57:19	49:14 53:17	5:17	19:12 22:18
51:11	18:21 19:8	needed 15:13	53:21 54:11	obligation	44:10,16,18
misreading	21:17 25:21	15:15 41:8	North 2:13	22:20	originally
15:3	37:8 51:19	44:10 49:11	note 4:9	obligations	45:13
missed 8:2	53:17 55:2	needs 6:21,22	58:24	35:15	other 3:16,24
47:11	most 18:19	8:13 14:16	noted 58:22	obviously	8:10 10:13
mitigate	21:13 33:14	negotiating	notes 60:10	58:4	11:24 24:22
17:17	37:7 39:16	46:22	noticed 12:1	occur 23:15	28:17 36:19
mixed 31:9	motion 7:4	new 6:8 9:5	notification	56:21	48:11 49:18
Mobil 9:3	14:9 19:2,3	10:10 25:10	29:16	occurred	56:4 58:11
43:18,23	34:8 43:11	26:4 27:17	notified	32:11	others 12:11
45:9	52:13	27:18 28:10	23:16	off 56:13	57:1
mobile 51:6	motivation	32:5 36:5	notion 4:13	58:13,16	out 9:10
56:9,12,13	20:8,8	36:12,16,23	NOx 6:10,14	59:1	11:13 26:14
model 48:9	motivations	38:3 41:14	6:17,19	Officer 1:7	27:2 30:22
51:4,6	19:19	42:4,12	8:16 10:2,7	2:2 3:3	31:1 34:5
modeling	move 21:15	45:17 47:7	10:22 11:7	58:21	38:11 46:3
48:8,12,19	much 18:24	47:17 48:19	11:14,20	official 29:1	46:10 55:4
48:21,24	25:20 31:15	49:11 50:10	14:1 15:9	60:12	59:5
49:6,10,15	multipollut...	52:20 53:15	16:19 19:12	offset 50:23	over 27:24
49:20 50:10	56:17	57:21	19:13,15,24	51:3	49:22
50:24 55:12	must 17:1	next 3:14	20:2,3,16	Oil 9:3	overlap
moderate	18:12	31:22 49:22	20:24 21:19	Okay 10:11	16:15
8:11 10:6,7	mutually	58:13,17	22:3,10,16	10:16 14:7	Oxides 1:2
26:24 27:13	9:17 26:10	Nitrogen 1:2	22:20 23:6	58:10	3:5,11
40:4,11	33:5	3:5,11	23:22 24:6	once 7:3	ozone 6:11
42:16 49:3	N	noncontro...	24:19 25:5	28:18 45:22	6:15,22 7:8
modificatio...	N 2:1	13:19,21	25:9 32:5	57:16	7:22 8:17
30:21	name 3:2 4:6	none 6:20	32:16 33:23	one 4:7 7:20	9:5,15,20
money 16:6	6:1	58:9,12	34:15 35:3	11:14 12:2	10:23 13:23
16:13	National	nonstarter	35:14 41:5	13:17 15:18	15:11 20:1
Monica 2:6	9:20 10:24	11:19	41:6,13	19:19 24:22	21:3,15,24
				30:8,10	

22:4,16	performed	50:22 52:2	12:22 34:4	30:2,8,10	proximity
23:1 25:6	48:12	52:18 58:12	present 2:15	30:11,17,21	55:21
25:16 26:4	performing	pointed 55:4	13:16 45:7	31:18,22	prudent
26:15 27:18	50:10	points 40:6,8	presentatio...	38:13 49:15	32:18
28:11 29:12	perhaps	40:17,23	27:21	55:3	public 7:11
32:6 33:22	12:20 15:2	policy 50:19	presiding	projected	24:6,13,16
34:2 36:2,5	20:10 50:23	pollution 1:1	3:14	23:8 30:13	27:20 31:18
36:9 37:13	period 37:4	1:8 7:20	Pressly 59:3	projecting	publicly 3:23
39:16 40:18	37:12	23:19 58:3	presume	27:2	31:20
42:8 47:7	permit 51:2	poor 27:24	22:24	promulgated	publish 7:22
47:17 48:20	permits	portion	presumptive	9:21 19:13	purpose 3:19
50:10 52:21	50:20	38:10,21	38:15	20:4,17	24:18 44:10
53:4,15	person 4:15	portions 21:9	pretty 17:20	21:1 44:11	pursue 13:15
	personal	21:10	18:6,19	promulgati...	push 11:22
	60:10	position	prevent	22:18 27:17	33:2
P	perspective	34:14 35:24	38:10 46:19	36:9	pushback
P 2:1,1	50:19	possibilities	previous	proponent	31:12,13
page 6:5 14:9	petition	32:8	45:20 46:13	3:20 4:18	put 7:9 51:4
16:15 25:3	43:18,21	possibility	58:21	proposal 6:7	p.m 1:12
paper 50:7	petroleum	54:22	previously	8:6,22 9:16	58:18
paragraph	44:24	possible 9:16	22:15	14:10,15	
14:8	Phone 60:21	12:19 13:18	pre-file 4:16	30:6,6,10	Q
part 1:3 3:12	place 10:13	36:11,14	pre-filed	44:13 47:22	quality 4:23
6:20 10:21	56:22,24	39:11,22	3:22 5:14	58:3,5	6:22 9:20
11:3 12:23	plan 12:3	40:1 41:19	pre-filing	propose 8:18	10:24 15:12
14:23 15:1	17:1,9,18	41:20 53:1	58:22	13:10 29:10	20:9 21:7
16:9 17:3	17:24 23:12	55:9 57:2	Primarily	29:10,14	21:13 26:20
17:11 18:14	28:20	possibly	6:21	31:6 35:18	34:23 37:7
20:7 24:22	planned	51:21	primary 20:8	45:12	40:13 42:17
32:1 35:4	49:22	potential	prior 14:13	proposed	56:1,6
42:7 47:12	planning	18:24	14:20 24:6	6:23 12:3	question 9:2
48:15 49:6	4:24 16:10	potentially	34:16 35:15	15:6 18:10	10:4,9,18
56:18	17:20 18:20	17:23 18:7	48:12,19,24	22:6 25:17	18:23 22:13
participants	52:8,8	Power 50:5	51:23 53:9	31:10 44:15	47:12 57:11
12:19	Plant 50:5	55:21	58:2	Protection	57:14
parts 25:18	55:21	practicable	probably	3:21 4:22	questions 4:4
25:20 36:21	play 29:19	33:9 41:21	18:15 54:17	28:4	4:5,7,9,10
38:1 39:14	41:21	51:21,22	55:14	provide 8:7	5:24 6:3
39:18	please 4:5	52:3,12,14	proceed 5:11	12:19,21	19:9,12
passing 7:17	14:17	52:16	48:2,6	26:5 56:8	23:22 33:13
past 7:21	PM 10:23	practice 46:2	proceeding	provided	51:17,19
27:24 35:18	15:11 20:6	preconceived	3:4 5:7,19	12:12	53:14 55:12
36:9	20:18	4:13	58:11,14	providing	56:10 58:8
pending 35:3	PM2.5 9:20	prefer 12:8	proceedings	45:2	58:9
36:1	point 4:17	premature	1:6 51:14	provision	quickly 9:16
people 7:20	5:18 14:2	14:2	60:6,8	55:6	48:2,6
59:1	15:15 23:10	premise 10:4	process 6:24	provisions	quite 8:3
per 25:18,20	26:7 38:16	prepare 49:2	21:18 23:18	10:20 12:2	22:12 33:1
36:21 38:1	42:9 46:2	prepared	24:15,16	16:5	46:8
39:14,18					quote 6:8,12
perform 48:7					

14:11	really 33:16 41:22 47:21	4:19 12:18 12:24 13:2	17:2	49:1,5 51:20 54:5	20:11 21:18 28:7 34:4
R	reason 10:20 39:15	27:24 51:16 52:24 58:13	regulatory 2:9,12 3:10 6:3,24 9:12 24:15 26:11 30:17	54:12 57:3 57:20	37:9 38:18 39:19 54:3
R 2:1	reasonable 9:12,17 15:5 17:14 33:6 42:1	58:16 recordkeep... 16:22	relief 13:22 35:14,17	requirement 10:8,23 15:9 16:7 19:24 35:17	Rios 2:6 9:1 9:2 11:7 12:12,17 13:5,9 19:8 19:11,21 20:3,12,16 20:24 21:19 21:23 22:3 22:10,14 23:4 24:5,9 24:17 25:2 25:9 26:1 27:9,15 28:9 29:1,6 31:4 32:3 32:10,16 33:21 34:7 34:13 35:2 35:6,12 36:3,8,11 36:15,22 37:3,17,20 38:2,6,9 39:8,11,22 40:2 41:3 41:12 42:3 42:10 43:7 43:10,17,22 44:4,16 45:4,15 46:13,18 47:4,14 48:7,18,23 49:9,21 50:4,9,14 51:5,8,18 52:20 53:3 53:13 54:4 54:9,19 55:11,20,24 56:4 57:2,8 57:12,18 58:6
RACT 6:10 6:14,17,19 7:5 8:16 10:2,8,23 11:8,14,20 14:1 15:9 19:12,13,15 19:24 20:2 20:3,16,17 20:24 21:1 21:19 22:3 22:11,16,20 23:6,17,22 24:6,11,19 25:5,9 28:20 30:12 30:14,24 32:5,16,24 33:7,12,23 34:15 35:4 35:14 41:5 41:6,13 42:3,5,7 44:17 45:18 46:5,23 47:8,18 48:8,10,12 51:20,23,24 52:15,18 53:18 54:2 54:11 57:3 57:8,20	Reasonabl... 16:17 reasons 6:6 7:10 13:16 16:16 23:15 25:3 34:21 46:4 48:1 55:15 recall 11:10 24:8,9,12 32:14 42:24 44:19,21 53:8 receive 13:22 33:2 received 34:22 receiving 57:4 recent 21:13 37:7 39:16 53:8 recently 32:10 43:8 43:16 50:7 recognized 26:12,17 recollection 48:14 recommend 21:9 recommen... 29:21 37:6 37:11 recommen... 31:17 37:14 recommen... 39:2 recommen... 7:1 8:8 record 4:9,11	redesignated 23:2,9 24:24 redesignati... 23:14,24 24:4 reduce 49:23 reduced 18:11 19:1 41:2 reductions 49:10,13,13 49:14 50:11 50:15,22 51:3,5 56:5 56:8,11,20 refer 28:5 referring 28:6 34:19 refineries 44:24,24 45:5,20 46:20 50:11 regard 47:17 regarding 5:24 14:18 27:16 45:16 54:20 55:12 regardless 14:24 regards 47:7 Register 24:7 31:13 regulated 14:13,20 15:1,8 24:10,18 25:1 34:16 regulation 18:7 regulations 11:3 14:23	remain 34:14 remember 38:18 40:9 removed 23:3 removes 22:19 reopen 50:21 REPORT 1:6 reported 2:16 60:5 reporter 4:8 60:5 REPORTE... 1:24 2:24 reporting 16:8,23 represent 4:6 6:2 request 23:5 23:7 24:1,6 24:11,13 33:2 35:3 35:10 requesting 11:11 35:14 require 11:4 14:24 16:6 24:15 52:15 required 6:11,14,17 7:6 8:16 9:6 10:1 11:17 11:22 17:7 21:20,22 22:4 25:10 25:13,14 31:16 32:17 33:24 37:6 41:5,7,13 44:8 48:22	requireme... 14:1,12,14 14:21 16:1 16:19 17:10 17:14,20 19:14 20:4 20:17 21:1 22:9 23:6 23:13 24:20 25:5 28:17 32:5 34:15 48:11 57:17 requires 23:13 26:23 29:21 33:18 requiring 44:5 47:8 47:18 resolve 13:6 58:2 resources 44:6 respect 20:21 35:21 responded 57:14 result 6:9 9:21 resulted 53:4 review 14:10 19:3 revise 11:2 21:16 45:4 revised 44:18 revisions 57:19 right 6:18 15:13,16	20:11 21:18 28:7 34:4 37:9 38:18 39:19 54:3 Rios 2:6 9:1 9:2 11:7 12:12,17 13:5,9 19:8 19:11,21 20:3,12,16 20:24 21:19 21:23 22:3 22:10,14 23:4 24:5,9 24:17 25:2 25:9 26:1 27:9,15 28:9 29:1,6 31:4 32:3 32:10,16 33:21 34:7 34:13 35:2 35:6,12 36:3,8,11 36:15,22 37:3,17,20 38:2,6,9 39:8,11,22 40:2 41:3 41:12 42:3 42:10 43:7 43:10,17,22 44:4,16 45:4,15 46:13,18 47:4,14 48:7,18,23 49:9,21 50:4,9,14 51:5,8,18 52:20 53:3 53:13 54:4 54:9,19 55:11,20,24 56:4 57:2,8 57:12,18 58:6 road 56:13 56:13
Randolph 1:10 range 25:17 32:9 36:20 39:14 41:22 Rao 2:3 3:17 13:1 29:14 rather 32:20 rationale 9:9 26:18,19 33:4 read 4:3 5:17 real 23:1 54:14					

Robert 2:15 4:23 5:3,19	48:3 58:5	see 8:20	significantly 25:18	sources 16:19 17:1,7,18	26:4,15,21 27:1,4,5,18
Robertson 1:8 2:2 3:1 3:2 5:6,10 5:23 14:4,7 19:10 51:15 58:7,17	rules 10:2 23:17,19 27:23 35:14 35:17 R-819 44:16 R11-24 1:2 3:6 R11-26 3:9	22:14 25:8 34:5 Seeing 58:8 58:12 seeking 23:14,24 24:4 27:7 50:23 51:2	Similarly 10:19 since 7:7 18:4 20:9 41:1 52:10 54:17 SIP 10:23 28:19 30:24 35:4	17:19,23 18:12,16 19:16 33:24 41:14 45:18 49:15 51:6 53:17,22 54:2,4,12 56:13,14 57:9	27:18 28:1 28:11 29:12 29:18,20,23 30:3 31:7 32:6 33:22 36:2,5,9,12 36:17,20 37:2,18,22 38:1,4,7 39:6,13,17 39:21 40:14 40:15,17,18 40:19,20 41:2,15 42:4,8,12 42:17,24 47:7,17 48:20 49:11 50:10 52:21 53:9,15 57:21
Roccaforte 2:12 4:20 4:21 5:9	S	seemed 8:3 seems 32:21	situation 11:23	57:9	37:2,18,22 38:1,4,7 39:6,13,17 39:21 40:14 40:15,17,18 40:19,20 41:2,15 42:4,8,12 42:17,24 47:7,17 48:20 49:11 50:10 52:21 53:9,15 57:21
Roland 2:7	S 2:1	sell 50:22	six 27:1 42:16,18	speak 4:7 51:9	38:1,4,7 39:6,13,17 39:21 40:14 40:15,17,18 40:19,20 41:2,15 42:4,8,12 42:17,24 47:7,17 48:20 49:11 50:10 52:21 53:9,15 57:21
rule 8:5,6,14 10:10 11:8 11:15,23 12:4,6 13:19,21 16:6 18:18 19:2,13,13 19:20 20:3 20:16,24 21:19 22:3 22:11,18 23:22 28:10 29:5,7,15 30:14,15 33:18 34:8 34:15 35:4 43:24 44:7 44:17 45:17 46:1,5,10 46:23 47:5 47:15 48:8 51:24 52:11 53:11 54:6 54:11 56:5 56:19 57:20	safe 7:13 18:6 saith 5:5 same 11:23 21:10 29:11 34:14 38:7 41:1 46:18 satisfy 10:22 19:14 20:4 20:17 21:1 42:7 saw 14:4 scenarios 32:9 schedule 7:10 8:8,9 26:3,8 27:9 27:16 29:2 29:11,15 30:7 31:6 31:10 33:22 45:9,11,22 46:9 53:5 54:20 57:5 schedules 44:23 46:1 46:16 47:2 scheme 40:16 scope 9:23 season 6:12 6:15 8:17 23:1 34:2 37:13 seasonal 12:7 12:9 Section 4:24 19:14,24 20:4	sense 33:12 serious 8:12 40:11 42:23 47:22 serve 3:3 set 39:21 40:19 42:14 58:13,18 sets 7:4 40:17 settle 26:17 several 6:19 11:9,16 17:15,16 36:10 41:17 53:13 55:15 56:8 severe 8:12 40:11 43:2 share 58:1 short 31:14 shorthand 60:4,6 show 27:4 55:17 shows 49:10 shutdowns 46:19 49:22 49:24 50:15 51:4 55:13 55:16 shutting 50:20 side 3:16 sides 9:17 26:16 signature 60:12	soft 9:14 33:3 some 10:12 10:23 11:11 11:12 12:4 13:13 14:17 15:15 16:14 17:7,19 18:8 23:14 24:3 28:13 33:18 41:17 50:3,22 56:24 57:16 57:24 something 30:16 33:4 sometime 27:4 30:18 30:24 somewhere 31:24 36:20 37:1 soon 13:18 51:22 52:4 sooner 52:17 sorry 31:4 42:18 sort 18:8 57:24 sound 26:19 27:3 source 32:17 51:1 56:9	speaking 18:5 specific 32:15 35:9 specifically 11:10 43:10 48:10 50:2 specifics 15:20 54:3 speculation 27:2 32:1 37:9 54:15 speculations 41:18 speculative 31:2 spent 15:7 Springfield 2:7,10,13 SS 60:1 St 10:13 staff 4:11 standard 6:23 7:2,8 7:23 9:5,15 10:24 13:24 19:17 20:1 20:6,14,19 20:21,23 21:3,5,7,8 21:12,13,14 21:16,17,24 22:5,17,21 22:23 23:11 25:6,10,16 25:19,19	26:4,15,21 27:1,4,5,18 27:18 28:1 28:11 29:12 29:18,20,23 30:3 31:7 32:6 33:22 36:2,5,9,12 36:17,20 37:2,18,22 38:1,4,7 39:6,13,17 39:21 40:14 40:15,17,18 40:19,20 41:2,15 42:4,8,12 42:17,24 47:7,17 48:20 49:11 50:10 52:21 53:9,15 57:21 standards 9:21 15:12 20:10 34:23 36:23 53:4 standpoint 52:6 starting 28:23 38:16 starts 6:24 state 1:10 4:5 6:24 18:7 20:21 21:6 21:9,10 23:12 28:18 28:19 29:21 29:22,24 42:1 50:4 52:4,7 55:21 56:17 57:24 59:24 stated 17:12 statement 6:6 7:9,21 16:16 25:2 34:14 statements

5:7,11 7:11 8:2 states 6:7 8:7 14:10 16:18 18:13 25:4 29:3 31:13 31:15,19 35:13 41:10 47:5,15 49:18,19 status 9:15 Steel 43:13 stenographic 60:9 step 24:23 steps 29:18 58:4 Steven 1:9 2:17 60:4 60:19 still 6:13 19:21 20:13 22:1 23:23 26:18 41:7 41:10 45:12 52:13 56:23 strategies 49:16,19 Street 1:10 2:10 60:20 strengthen 25:16 stretched 32:24 stretches 30:22 31:1 stringent 21:17 25:21 strong 25:14 stronger 25:18 subheading 16:16 subject 10:21 15:23 17:3 53:18 submit 13:1 28:19 submitted	24:11 Subsequent 21:8 substantial 44:6 suggest 21:14 Suite 60:20 summer 23:16 24:3 support 34:4 35:13,16 37:4 supposed 52:4 sure 12:22 13:4 15:22 16:8 22:12 37:5 51:10 surrendered 51:2 surrounding 53:21 sworn 5:1,5 <hr/> T T 2:6 take 15:20 30:1 51:11 taken 1:9 4:3 51:12 60:10 takes 28:9 47:6,16 taking 17:24 59:5 talk 7:18 45:24 talked 23:21 27:19 36:24 41:16,18 52:15 talking 30:18 33:11 technical 3:16 16:17 terminology 38:18 terms 33:7,8 testified 22:15 26:1 36:3 42:9	44:8 45:16 51:20 54:19 55:14 testify 4:17 58:11 testimony 3:20,22,24 4:3,16 5:8 5:12,13,17 5:18,24 28:5 55:12 testing 16:5 thank 7:12 8:24 16:14 19:6 28:8 58:7 59:4 Thanks 8:15 their 4:19 11:11 17:8 17:9 18:20 18:20 30:5 30:6,9 50:20 51:2 53:11 themselves 4:18 thing 14:22 41:1 things 11:12 11:13,24 15:18 16:12 17:16 31:1 think 8:14,19 8:20 9:16 12:10 15:14 18:15 19:18 24:23 26:11 26:18 27:3 34:3,4,18 34:20 38:17 39:15 40:6 45:23 46:3 47:1,11 48:4 57:14 58:6 THOMAS 2:4 though 18:5 26:2	thought 22:7 24:24 three 27:5 37:7,12,22 37:23 39:16 42:22,23 44:24 thresholds 53:24 through 23:18 29:4 time 4:8,14 5:1 12:7,7,9 20:1 21:12 22:6 23:10 23:11 24:3 26:13 28:19 28:21,22 29:9,11 35:23 36:1 44:8 46:5 46:24 50:2 52:10 59:5 timeframe 31:14 33:17 45:10 timeline 28:12,13,14 29:2 times 36:10 40:22 41:17 title 7:19 titled 3:9 today 3:13 4:22 12:23 21:11 58:8 58:12 59:2 59:5 today's 3:19 21:7 told 31:20 Tom 3:15 top 7:20 track 27:24 52:24 transcribed 60:10 transcript 60:8	trial 60:6,9 tricky 50:18 trigger 10:7 true 18:16 60:7 try 14:3 50:17 52:2 58:1,1,2 trying 24:23 38:18 52:19 53:8 turnaround 44:23 46:15 two 23:9 30:4 30:8,11,23 31:23 32:24 44:23 59:1 59:2 types 15:21 40:12 typically 29:5,23 30:23 50:17 50:20 <hr/> U ultimately 6:17 32:24 uncertain 6:18 9:4 30:12 uncertainties 45:16 uncertainty 9:14 41:23 under 16:16 20:6,18 21:2 25:5 25:10 37:21 38:3 41:14 42:4 60:10 understand 22:13 understan... 13:20 35:22 undertake 17:8 unit 3:16 Unless 4:2 unnecessary	14:12,19 15:4 unplanned 46:19 unreasona... 14:12,19 15:4 until 8:16 13:23 26:3 28:9 30:24 32:17 33:1 53:10 upgrades 49:24 50:16 55:13,16 upwind 49:15 use 52:5 used 37:4,15 39:17 uses 38:19 using 33:8 37:10 52:1 usual 57:23 utilities 56:16 <hr/> V value 39:16 39:17 40:8 values 40:10 variance 43:18 versus 40:4 40:11,11 very 11:19 31:2 33:19 47:12 52:17 53:1 VOC 23:17 49:14 56:11 volatile 56:11 <hr/> W wait 8:20 13:23 18:12 waiver 15:8 19:23 22:11 22:16,17,19 22:20 23:2
---	---	---	---	---	--

23:5 24:1,3 24:6,11,13 34:21 want 12:4 13:19 19:11 32:13 wanted 13:17 13:23 23:15 wants 12:22 wasn't 33:1 53:10 way 10:17 12:2 13:2 24:22 42:24 website 3:24 week 7:21 weeks 32:14 well 9:8 16:11 17:12 18:3 27:14 were 9:11 10:15 11:11 11:24 21:12 23:14,17 24:4,20 26:13 27:6 32:22 40:6 40:10 45:1 46:14,22,24 51:14 West 1:10 60:20 we'll 8:22 32:21 we're 8:21 12:22 20:9 21:14 23:17 23:23 29:8 33:11 34:3 37:6 55:5 we've 7:17 17:15 27:21 31:8 32:2 34:20 36:24 39:1 41:16 41:18 59:1 while 24:3 willing 8:18 8:19,22,23	45:24 57:15 wish 4:17 withdrawn 35:3 witness 4:19 5:4 60:12 work 28:3 49:17 worked 9:10 11:13 working 23:18 wouldn't 41:6 46:18 49:12 51:3 55:15,16 writing 12:13 written 35:20 35:23 wrong 33:11 55:3 <hr/> X X 47:8,18 <hr/> Y Yeah 7:16 year 7:23,24 8:4,14 23:8 29:13,24 30:1,8,8,10 30:11,16 33:2 36:6 37:12 39:16 54:23 55:7 56:23 years 11:16 15:24 27:1 27:6 30:4 30:23 31:23 32:24 37:7 37:22,24 42:17,18,22 42:23 43:3 47:9,18 49:22 Yee 59:3 <hr/> Z Zalewski 2:4	3:18 <hr/> \$ \$28 43:24 <hr/> 0 084-004675 2:18 60:22 <hr/> 1 1 5:19,21 1st 9:6 11:16 15:14 18:18 26:6 33:17 33:19 34:1 34:19,24 35:15,21 44:14 45:3 45:9 47:24 51:22 52:6 52:9 1-hour 40:20 42:24 1:00 1:12 58:18 100 1:10 1021 2:13 12 25:3 27:24 31:21 37:1 54:21 12th 34:10 13 16:15 15 14:8 17 43:2,3 172(b)1 20:5 18 27:6 32:1 182 19:14,24 19th 3:22 1990 40:19 43:1 54:17 1997 19:17 20:1,6,14 21:11,24 22:4,16 25:19,19 38:7 40:15 40:17 53:9 <hr/> 2 2nd 1:11	2.5 10:24 15:12 20:6 20:18 20th 58:23 2004 53:10 2005 53:10 2006 20:18 20:21,22 2007 60:20 2008 21:2,5,7 21:15 37:18 37:21 2009 22:22 37:11,15 2010 6:23 23:8,15 25:15 30:5 31:7 37:11 37:16 60:14 2011 1:11 3:22 26:21 29:20 34:10 37:11,16 2012 6:9 11:16 15:14 18:18 26:22 30:19 33:17 33:19 34:19 34:24 37:16 44:14 45:3 51:22 52:6 52:9,15 56:22 2013 30:19 57:6,7,9,11 2014 30:14 45:10 2015 6:11,15 8:17 9:6,9 26:6 27:7 30:24 32:20 33:3 35:16 35:19,21 36:1 45:9 47:24 57:12 57:12 2016 45:13 2017 32:6,18 32:23 33:23	2018 27:4,5,8 33:1 34:1,2 203 58:19 215 2:10 217 1:3 2:8 2:11,14 3:6 3:12 10:21 11:3 14:23 16:1 17:3 17:11,14 18:14 42:7 24 37:1 54:21 54:24 55:2 28th 58:18 29th 7:23 <hr/> 3 30 12:9 31st 45:10 312 1:24 2:24 60:21 3150 2:7 35 1:3 3:5,12 <hr/> 4 419-9292 1:24 2:24 60:21 <hr/> 5 522-5512 2:11 523-4900 2:8 <hr/> 6 60 25:17 36:20 39:14 60603 60:21 62701 2:10 62705 2:7 62794 2:13 <hr/> 7 70 25:17 36:21 39:14 39:18,20 73 39:18 74 39:18 75 37:24 39:19	782-5544 2:14 <hr/> 8 8 60:20 8-hour 19:17 25:6 40:18 53:9 85 25:20
---	---	---	---	---	---