```
Page 1
BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
IN THE MATTER OF: )
COAL COMBUSTION ASH PONDS ) R2014-10
AND SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS AT )
POWER GENERATING FACILITIES: ) (Rulemaking-Water)
PROPOSED NEW 35 ILL. ADM. CODE )
841 )
```

TRANSCRIPT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS taken before the HEARING OFFICER TIMOTHY J. FOX by LISA K. HAHN, CSR, RMR, a notary public within and for the County of Macon and State of Illinois, at the offices of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Sangamo Room, 1021 North Grand Avenue East, Springfield, Illinois, on the 26th day of February, 2014, A.D., at 10:00 a.m.

February 26, 2014

Page 2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD 100 West Randolph Street Suite 11-500 3 Chicago, Illinois 60601 4 312-814-6983 BY: MR. TIMOTHY J. FOX, 5 Hearing Officer. 6 ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: 7 Mr. Jerome O'Leary, Lead Board Member Ms. Jennifer Burke, Board Member Dr. Deanna Glosser, Board Chairman 8 Ms. Carrie Zalewski, Board member 9 Mr. Anand Rao, Technical Unit Ms. Alisa Liu, Technical Unit 10 11 ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 12 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276 13 217-782-5544 BY: MS. JOANNE M. OLSON 14 MR. JAMES JENNINGS, 15 Appeared on behalf of the Petitioner; 16 NIJMAN FRANZETTI, LLP 10 South LaSalle Street Suite 3600 17 Chicago, Illinois 60603 312-251-5250 18 MS. SUSAN FRANZETTI, BY: 19 Appeared on behalf of Midwest Generation, 20 LLC. 21 22 23 24

February 26, 2014

Page 3 1 A P P E A R A N C E S: (Cont'd) 2 SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 6600 3 Chicago, Illinois 60606 312-258-5550 BY: MS. AMY ANTONIOLLI, 4 5 Appeared on behalf of Medina Valley Cogen. 6 ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & POLICY CENTER 35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600 7 Chicago, Illinois 60601-2110 312-795-3747 BY: JESSICA A. DEXTER and 8 ANDREW ARMSTRONG, 9 Appeared on behalf of Environmental Law & Policy Center. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

## Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

. 1			
			Page 4
1	I N D E X		
2		PAGES	
3	Hearing Officer Introductory Comments	6-13	
4	Public Comment by Joyce Harant	13-15	
5	Public Comment by Tracy Fox	15-21	
6	Public Comment by Eileen Borgia	22-24	
7	Public Comment by Rudolf Habben	24-26	
8	Public Comment by Joyce Blumenshine	26-30	
9	Public Comment by Christine Favilla	30-33	
10	Public Comment by Robin Garlish	33-36	
11	Public Comment by Katherine Edmiston	37-40	
12	Opening Comments by Joanne Olson	41-46	
13	Questions and Answers of Midwest Generation Conducted by Susan Franzetti	47-194	
14 15	Questions and Answers of Medina Valley Cogen Conducted by Amy Antoniolli	195-203	
16	Questions and Answers of Environmental	204-258	
17	Law and Policy Center by Jessica Dexter and Andrew Armstrong		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
_			

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

			Page 5
1	EXHIBITS		
2	NUMBER	MARKED	ADMITTED
3	Exhibit Nos. 1 - 5	44	46
4	Exhibit No. 6	49	49
5	Exhibit No. 7	196	196
6	Exhibit No. 8	208	208
7	Exhibit Nos. 9 - 11	255	255
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
<u>.</u>			

6

	Page
1	HEARING OFFICER FOX: The hour of 10
2	o'clock having come and passed, I want to wish you
3	all a good morning and welcome to this Illinois
4	Pollution Control Board Hearing.
5	My name is Tim Fox, and I'm the Hearing
6	Officer for this proceeding, which is entitled, Coal
7	Combustion Waste (or CCW) and Surface Impoundments at
8	Power Generating Facilities: Proposed New 35
9	Illinois Administrative Code 841. The Board Docket
10	Number for this Rulemaking is R14-10.
11	I first want to introduce others today
12	who are present from the Board. At my immediate
13	right is Board Member, Jerry O'Leary, who is the Lead
14	Board Member for this Rulemaking. At my left is the
15	Board's Chairman, Dr. Deanna Glosser.
16	At my far right are two Board Members,
17	Jennifer Burke, and at the end of the table, Board
18	Member, Carrie Zalewski.
19	At the left at the end of table are the
20	Board's Technical Staff Representatives, Anand Rao,
21	and at the end of the table, Alisa Liu.
22	The Illinois Environmental Protection
23	Agency filed this Rulemaking proposal with the Board
24	on October 28th of 2012, and in an Order dated

February 26, 2014

	Page 7
1	November 7th of 2013, the Board accepted that
2	proposal for hearing. Today, we are, of course,
3	holding the first hearing in this Rulemaking.
4	We will be hearing testimony from the
5	Agency and its witnesses and then entertaining
6	questions that are based on the Agency's proposal and
7	the testimony that they have filed.
8	There will also be an opportunity at the
9	end of the hearing to offer testimony on the Board's
10	request that the Department of Commerce and Economic
11	Opportunity perform an Economic Impact Study of the
12	proposal.
13	In an Order dated December 6th, the
14	Hearing Officer directed the Agency to pre-file
15	testimony for this first hearing on or before
16	Wednesday, January 15th of 2014, and on that date,
17	they did so.
18	They have pre-filed the testimony by
19	Mr. Richard Cobb, Mr. William Buscher, Mr. Lynn
20	Dunaway and Ms. Amy Zimmer. The Agency's witnesses
21	are present here today and are prepared to be sworn
22	in to answer questions.
23	The Hearing Officer Order also directed
24	participants in this proceeding to pre-file written

8

	Page
1	questions that were based on the Agency's pre-filed
2	testimony, and to do so no later than Wednesday,
3	February 5th.
4	On that date, the Board received three
5	sets of pre-filed questions: The first from Midwest
6	Generation, LLC; the second from Medina Valley Cogen,
7	LLC; and the third from the Environmental Law and
8	Policy Center on behalf of itself, the Environmental
9	Integrity Project, Sierra Club, and the Prairie
10	Rivers Network.
11	Also, on February 5th, a Board Hearing
12	Officer Order included in an Attachment the Board's
13	own questions, based on the Agency's proposal and
14	testimony.
15	The Board has posted all of these
16	filings, the testimony, and the questions, to its
17	Clerk's Office Online, and it's accessible there and
18	can be downloaded or printed. As you wish.
19	Although the Hearing Officer Order had
20	intended to begin today with the Agency's pre-filed
21	testimony, we do have appearing here today
22	approximately ten persons who wish to offer public
23	comment to the Board on the Agency's proposal.
24	Has everyone who is here wishing to offer

Page 9 1 a public comment signed in to indicate that they wish 2 to do so? 3 Neither seeing nor hearing anyone else 4 who wishes to comment, we have those folks. In 5 discussing the order of our hearing with the 6 participants, before we went on the record they 7 agreed, out of consideration of those -- the 8 schedules of those commentors, that we would begin 9 the hearing today with those comments, and I'll turn 10 to that again in a moment. 11 Once those comments are over, we will 12 turn to the Agency's pre-filed testimony. Under 13 Section 104.424(f) of the Board's procedural rules, that pre-filed testimony is entered into the record 14 15 as is if read, but it's my understanding that the 16 Agency wishes to begin with a brief introduction or a 17 summary. 18 Once that is concluded, we can turn to 19 the pre-filed questions that have been filed for the 20 Agency's witnesses. 21 Based on the order in which those 22 questions were filed with the Board, we will turn 23 first to Midwest Generation for the questions that it 24 has filed and any clarification or follow-up.

Page 10

1 We would next provide that same 2 opportunity to Medina Valley Cogen for any follow-up 3 it may have. We will also then provide the same 4 opportunity to the environmental groups for them to 5 address their questions. 6 I do want to note that the Agency has 7 produced for us here at hearing today written answers 8 to each of the questions that were pre-filed. The 9 Agency has generously provided copies both of those 10 written answers and exhibits, or attachments to them, and those are available at the rear of this room on 11 12 the round table. 13 Many thanks to the Agency for the efforts 14 that they no doubt undertook to prepare those and 15 then to supply the copies. I know those to be very 16 helpful in reviewing the testimony and the questions 17 that have been filed in this case. 18 Once we have turned -- once the 19 environmental groups have concluded their questions, 20 we will turn to the Board, which, as I have 21 mentioned, has filed its own questions on this 22 proposal for any follow-up that the Board may have. 23 After the testimony and questions have 24 wrapped up, we can determine whether any additional

February 26, 2014

Page 11 1 persons have appeared wishing to offer a public 2 comment before we adjourn. 3 Are there any questions about the order of our proceeding or any procedural issues before we 4 5 get under way? 6 Neither seeing nor hearing any, as I 7 mentioned, we would like to begin with the public 8 comments. I have in front of me the lists that 9 10 people have used to sign in indicating that they wish to offer one. I would like to read through these 11 12 names in the order in which we will call you up to 13 comment to verify that you are here. I would ask you 14 to note who you will be following so that you can 15 come up to the podium where we have a microphone set 16 up for you, and be waiting in the wings so that we 17 can address your comments as efficiently as possible. 18 I understand that you've been prepared to 19 limit your comments to approximately three minutes in 20 length, which we appreciate, and I would also ask 21 that you listen to the comments that precede yours so 22 that we can avoid any repetition of those. 23 But let me verify, first of all, that we 24 have these folks present, and forgive me if I

mispronounce your name or have difficulty reading your handwriting. The first is Joyce Harant, is that

1

2

3 4 correct, is present here this morning? Second is 5 Tracy Fox, who is not a relation that I'm aware of. 6 Third, Melinda Shaw. Do I see a hand for Melinda 7 Shaw here today? Oh, I do. I'm sorry that I 8 overlooked that. Fourth, Eileen Borgia? Very good. 9 Third is -- is it Audrey Hobber. The last name 10 H-O-B-B-E-R, it appears, with the Sierra Club is identified as the affiliation. And I'm having 11 12 trouble with first name. Hobber, though, I'm sure is 13 the last name? 14 MR. HABBEN: Rudy. The first name is 15 Rudolf. 16 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you for 17 clarifying for me. I wasn't close, I'm afraid. 18 The next one is Joyce Blumenshine, who I 19 do see is present. Christine Favilla -- am I 20 correct? 21 MS. FAVILLA: Favilla. 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Favilla. Very 23 And the last person is Robin Garlish. Very qood. 24 qood. All of those folks are present.

,	Page 13
1	Let me ask again, Harant? Did I
2	pronounce that correctly? We are absolutely ready
3	for you. The microphone at the podium is on. It's
4	my understanding that you need to be quite close to
5	the microphone in order for it to pick up your
6	comments clearly. If you would begin when you're
7	ready, please do so.
8	MS. HARANT: Thank you very much, and
9	thank you for this opportunity to speak here today on
10	the importance of strong regulations on coal ash
11	pits.
12	My name is Joyce Harant, and as a
13	resident of Peoria, I drove down here this morning in
14	this wonderful temperature, and I'm also an
15	environmental advocate.
16	I feel it is critical that the Illinois
17	Pollution Control Board listen to concerned citizens
18	in this room and that you strengthen the proposed
19	rules before the Board.
20	I fought hard to prevent a high hazard
21	landfill from being expanded in Peoria, imposing a
22	serious threat to my community's health and the
23	Illinois River, and I do not want to see these same
24	waters be damaged by the toxic chemicals present in

Page 14

1	coal ash.
2	The Edwards Power Plant is one among
3	several in the area that contain coal ash pits that
4	could contaminate my groundwater. Not only do I care
5	about my health and that of my family and friends,
6	but I've lived along the Illinois River for over 30
7	years.
8	I urge the Illinois Pollution Control
9	Board to strengthen these rules.
10	Our communities need to be protected by
11	closing pits that are causing contamination and to
12	require facilities to provide a guarantee that these
13	problems are not a cost on the community, and this,
14	for me, is extremely important. Communities should
15	not have to bear the burden of pollution that is from
16	a for-profit entity, such as a coal energy producing
17	plant.
18	Finally, as a member of the public, I'd
19	ask that I be given notice and included in the
20	process of protecting my community from coal ash
21	contamination.
22	Thank you very much.
23	HEARING OFFICER FOX: I should have asked
24	you to do this first. If you could spell your name

February 26, 2014

Page 15 1 in its entirety. 2 MS. HARANT: I certainly can. It's 3 Joyce, J-O-Y-C-E, Harant, H-A-R-A-N-T. Do you need addresses? 4 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: No, but if you 6 would identify anyone you're representing here today. 7 MS. HARANT: Peoria Families Against 8 Toxic Waste. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you very We appreciate your comments. 10 much. 11 MS. HARANT: Can I submit this? 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Yes, that's fine. 13 And Ms. Fox, we're ready for your 14 comments, whenever you're ready to begin. 15 I'm Tracy Fox from rural MS. FOX: Hi. 16 Peoria County. I also represent Peoria Families 17 Against Toxic Waste. Thanks to the Illinois Pollution Control 18 19 Board for having these hearings, and thanks to the 20 Illinois EPA for taking action, even though there 21 have been years of delay on the federal coal ash 22 rules. It is appreciated that we're moving forward. 23 When I read over the filing and the 24 regulations that were submitted, I was a little bit

February 26, 2014

	Page 16
1	disconcerted, however. I think it's a great idea to
2	avoid site-by-site plans and having to have, you
3	know, 50 different battles going on in the State to
4	protect waters. However, I feel like these are
5	unnecessarily vague, and, also, I feel like they're
6	very silent. They're only looking at groundwater
7	and, to me, that doesn't make sense because a lot of
8	the solutions that are contemplated in terms of
9	preventative, in terms of cleanup, have to do with
10	surface water as well.
11	Specifically, I'm our group is a
12	member of the Central Illinois Healthy Community
13	Alliance, and we're concerned about the Edwards Coal
14	Plant, and they are the coal ash ponds that are
15	directly on the river and, to me, to contemplate that
16	the regulations would allow a trench around the pond
17	to be part of the solution makes absolutely no sense.
18	Also, the lack of emergency protocols to
19	deal with flooding. With recent flooding of the
20	Illinois River, I called the Peoria County Health
21	Department, I called the local EPA office to ask, is
22	anybody looking at the coal ash ponds? And I
23	couldn't even find anybody who went down to the
24	plant. I would certainly hope that the regulations

Page 17 1 would be expanded to talk about that. 2 The other thing that was disconcerting to 3 me is that, to me, the presumptive thing has to be 4 when these plants close, they get cleaned up. There 5 should not be even a consideration, unless the 6 company builds an extensive case, for some 7 alternative arrangement. 8 To leave these plants with contaminated 9 groundwater, to leave these plants with humped-over, you know, closed landfills, unlined landfills of coal 10 ash, effectively leaves these plants in a state that 11 12 they will never be redeveloped. 13 In my part of Peoria County, there are already enough businesses that have been shuttered 14 15 and, it has been a struggle for years to clean up and 16 redevelop. 17 Instead, you know, I think that we're 18 contemplating when the Edwards plant closes, it needs 19 to be in a state that it can be redeployed to offset 20 the losses to the tax base to provide more jobs, etc. 21 As I went through and looked further, the 22 other thing that was really glaring to me was the 23 lack of requirement for financial assurances. 24 Peoria Families Against Toxic Waste has

February 26, 2014

	Page 18
1	worked on landfill issues for years. We know that at
2	the time that hazardous waste landfill expansion was
3	proposed, there was no one who was arguing against
4	some sort of post closure care fund.
5	Similarly, in Peoria where we expanded
6	the City/County Municipal Landfill, that was a key
7	part of the proposal from all players.
8	As long as coal plants continue to
9	operate in the State of Illinois, they should be held
10	to similar standards. It's ridiculous that a
11	for-profit entity would be allowed to push off the
12	cost of post closure care on to citizens and
13	communities. That is absolutely unacceptable.
14	Furthermore, the ten-year period seems
15	woefully limited. For landfills, we have much longer
16	and much more stringent requirements. I cannot
17	understand why known toxics and unlined situations
18	wouldn't be subject to longer periods of post closure
19	care, rather than shorter.
20	Finally, just and not to nitpick at
21	the report, but I was a little bit concerned when I
22	looked at the references of how ancient most of the
23	data that was cited is. In looking at the fly ash
24	characterization, Illinois EPA's presenting

February 26, 2014

	Page 19
1	information from 1983. Pollution control technology
2	has changed significantly since then, rendering
3	dirtier ash and hopefully different fly ash
4	characterization.
5	I would hope that we would look that
6	Illinois Pollution Control Board would direct its
7	scientists to look at some more current
8	characterization studies.
9	The same thing is true for radiation.
10	The radioactivity studies cited were from the '90s.
11	The characterizations of sulfates were from the '90s.
12	Both of those we know more about the health effects,
13	we know more about the migratory effects, and none of
14	that seems to be reflected in the proposal.
15	Finally, in terms of testing, and we went
16	round and round with the different types of testing
17	and leachate protocol as part of our fight against
18	the hazardous waste stabilization, still being
19	Peoria, and I was again very surprised to see nine
20	references, some as old as 1976, the most recent in
21	terms of 2009, when we know that the hole TCLP test
22	methodology was redone just a few years ago.
23	So I would hope that again Illinois
24	Pollution Control Board, please ask your staff to

February 26, 2014

	Page 20
1	direct IEPA to look at more current data.
2	I hope, also, that throughout this
3	process, communication will improve. I was
4	disappointed yesterday when I looked on the Illinois
5	Pollution Control Board site, and none of the printed
6	answers that were available today were available to
7	me as a citizen to review, and so I don't get the
8	opportunity to make comments after all of that is
9	done.
10	Finally, I know that you're working with
11	DCEO on a study. Well, please, I hope that the
12	Illinois Pollution Control Board will direct DCEO to
13	look at not only the cost to companies, but the
14	long-term financial situation and how that the
15	failure to clean up these plants will impact
16	communities.
17	In Peoria County, that is a very real
18	fear and concern. The townships don't know what's
19	going to happen when a plant closes. The County
20	Board is goosy about the loss of property tax
21	revenue, and as long as this regulation doesn't
22	ensure that it is restored back to a useable state
23	for redevelopment, communities end up losing again,
24	and I don't think anyone wants that.

Page 21 1 Again, thanks for your time, thanks for 2 your efforts, and thanks for indulging these overly 3 long comments. 4 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Fox, I do have one clarification. 5 6 MS. FOX: Yes. 7 HEARING OFFICER FOX: The Agency was not 8 required to prepare written answers and produce them 9 this morning for the first time. HEARING OFFICER FOX: I understand that. 10 11 I just am saying that in order to be more open to the 12 public, you know -- I mean, those answers are very 13 clarifying for me because I'm not of a technical 14 background, and so sometimes if I can read something 15 explained two or three ways, I can get a better 16 feeling of what's going on, you know, and I'm willing 17 to do that work, but I can't do it in ten minutes. 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. I know 19 that there are written copies of it. 20 MS. FOX: I got copies of them. Thank 21 you. 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Fox, thanks for 23 your comment. We're ready for Ms. Shaw. 24 MS. SHAW: I do not wish to comment at

Page 22 1 this time. 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. The 3 next is Ms. Borgia? Ms. Borgia, if you would please spell 4 5 your last name and identify anyone you're 6 representing here this morning. 7 MS. BORGIA: My last name is spelled 8 B-O-R-G-I-A, and I'm here representing the Prairie 9 Rivers Network, and the Sierra Club, and families and children who are going to be affected by these -- by 10 the effects of these coal plants not being cleaned 11 12 up. 13 I am a resident of Central Illinois and have lived there for the past 30 years, and by 14 15 training, I am an early childhood educator, and so 16 it's of great concern to me about the long-term 17 effects of the coal ponds not being cleaned up, and 18 the danger of those ponds, then, leaking or breaking 19 and our having situations like they have in North 20 Carolina and Tennessee. That would just be horrible, 21 and who would pay for that cleanup? Certainly, 22 it's the -- the companies are not. The coal 23 companies do not wish to have the expense of cleaning 24 up the coal ponds. Well, neither do I. I do not

Page 23

1 wish my taxpayer money to clean up after the fact and 2 after it's too late.

3 My area of concern is for the Middle Form River in Vermilion County, and it has a coal pond 4 5 sitting right on the edge of it that's now leaking. 6 Its products are leaking into the Middle Fork River. 7 I like to kayak on that river, and one beautiful 8 thing we have on that river, among other things, are 9 bald eagles, and I don't think they're going to be 10 very happy once the fish in that area are contaminated with the heavy metals that will probably 11 12 kill their young.

13 I'm also concerned that we have -- and I 14 don't need to tell anyone in this room -- that our 15 resources, our water resources in Central Illinois, 16 are very limited. We only have a few rivers and 17 streams. We don't have any large bodies of water for 18 fish or for recreation or for drinking. We're not 19 going to get anymore water. And so the cleaning up 20 of these menaces that are likely to spoil what we have is just imperative, and so I am very happy that 21 22 the proposed rules are published and people are given 23 the opportunity to comment, but I think -- I hope 24 that all of our citizen comments and all the

February 26, 2014

	Page 24
1	professional comments are taken seriously for the
2	value that they have in making our rivers and our
3	lands of Central Illinois last and be in a healthy
4	condition.
5	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Borgia, thank
6	you for your comments.
7	MS. BORGIA: Thank you.
8	HEARING OFFICER FOX: We're ready for
9	Mr. Hobber.
10	And sir, if you could also for our court
11	reporter, spell your name and let us know who you may
12	be representing.
13	MR. HABBEN: My name is Rudolf Habben,
14	R-U-D-O-L-F, Habben, H-A-B-B-E-N, and I am a resident
15	of Peoria Heights, Illinois. I'm speaking for the
16	Edwards Power Plant, and I prepared a letter that I
17	would just like to hand in and then just make three
18	short points for the presentation.
19	HEARING OFFICER FOX: If you would like
20	to use that in making points, please do, and I can
21	submit that to our Clerk as a written comment, sir.
22	MR. HABBEN: Okay. Do you want me to
23	write them up or to speak them?
24	HEARING OFFICER FOX: If you would like

February 26, 2014

Page 25 1 to use those comments to speak them, I can take a 2 written copy when you're finished to submit them. 3 MR. HABBEN: Okay. I'm primarily 4 interested in the Edwards Power Plant and the 5 possibility of putting liners in this area, which is 6 subject to flooding, and my concerns are in terms of 7 water supply, if there is a flood and the contaminants to the river. 8 9 The one community that I understand that has its water intakes down the river is Canton, 10 Illinois, and I know that there are studies that are 11 12 showing that there are birth defects and so forth 13 from these contaminants that are in the waste. The second one is in terms of the 14 15 environment, in terms if there is a leakage from 16 these power plants in terms of impact on wildlife, 17 both on the fish and on the wildlife that use the 18 river in terms of a flyaway. 19 And then the third point is on these 20 aging power plants. Edwards, I think, is almost 50 21 years old, and there is a trend to move to gas in 22 terms of power production, as well as nuclear and 23 solar and so forth, and my question is on who takes 24 the liability for these trashed plant areas when the

Page 26 1 plant closes down? 2 So those are my comments. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, sir, and 4 I can take that copy and submit it to our Clerk as a written comment. 5 6 MR. HABBEN: Thank you. 7 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And 8 Ms. Blumenshine, that brings us to your comments, if 9 you're ready. And if you could also provide us with 10 the spelling of your name and whomever you may 11 represent today. 12 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Yes. Good day. Good 13 morning. My name is Joyce, J-O-Y-C-E. Last name 14 Blumenshine, B-L-U-M-E-N-S-H-I-N-E. 15 I'm a volunteer with Sierra Club. T live 16 in Peoria. I'm part of the environmental groups here 17 which has many areas along the Illinois River. 18 I appreciate the efforts that IEPA and 19 your Pollution Board are making. 20 These proposed regulations are not strong 21 enough. They have to be improved, they have to be 22 strengthened, and here are some reasons why, as I see 23 it, having been an area resident. I'm concerned about the five coal-fired 24

February 26, 2014

Page 27 1 power plants that impact the area where I live and the coal ash landfills that are there. 2 3 I was very happy to see under your 4 background section that you list the heavy metals 5 from these plants. But, however, there is a part 6 that's missing, and that is: We, the people; you, the people, and everyone, and the long-term impacts 7 8 on us, our children, our families, for generations to 9 come from these heavy metals. Where is the social cost of these sites, that for decades, companies have 10 been making profits from and people have jobs, but we 11 12 know better now. We know these heavy metals have 13 serious health impacts and they are long term for our environment. 14 15 So I have brought a few pictures to enter 16 as exhibits just to point out. 17 There are some points in your rules that 18 are grievously lacking, from my point of view. One 19 of them is that you don't expect to redevelop 20 groundwater monitoring that were repeat site 21 investigations. 22 These areas have changed. As many of 23 these plants were built in the '50s and '60s, 24 communities have expanded. People have moved into

February 26, 2014

Page 28

1 these areas. There are new water wells. There are 2 new situations where people's health could be at 3 risk.

4 I'm pointing out areas such as at that 5 Powerton plant down by Pekin, which has a huge ash pond next to the river, or upriver is the Edwards 6 7 Plant, as I mentioned; upwards from Peoria is the 8 Hennepin plant. Peoria gets half of its water from intakes on the Illinois River. We are surrounded in 9 10 Peoria by these power plants. There's the Duck Creek plant that's on the river bluff above the Illinois 11 12 River. It has a pipe from its polluted boron ponds 13 going into the middle of the river.

Nowhere do I see where the cumulative impacts on an area like the Peoria River Valley are being considered from the totality of all these different ash ponds -- and there are a lot and they are really big. You can drive down Route 24 and see that going from the ponds across Illinois Route 24 when the wind's from the east.

I am concerned, too, about the Groundwater Management Zone. Let's get real and let's be honest. What happens when IEPA assesses and labels something in a Groundwater Management Zone?

February 26, 2014

Page 29 1 Is that cleaned up? Is the pollution then totally contained from affecting the public for generations 2 3 I don't think so. to come? 4 I think that your rules and review have to ensure that what is here for the future of our 5 state is truly protective of the public and our 6 7 health, and that the costs as referred to before 8 won't be saddled onto the communities for generations to come when these sites are abandoned or left in a 9 10 half-contained provision. Capping of the ash ponds and other 11 12 provision of latest and best technology should be 13 included. I think that is lacking. And why aren't we expecting the best procedures for containment to 14 15 be required? 16 In closing, I just want to mention, too, 17 that it seems like monitoring networks that are installed before the Coal Combustion Waste Surface 18 19 Impoundments begin operation, if those are utilized now, well, some of these are 50, 60 years old. 20 Isn't 21 it a fact that the monitoring networks and the 22 monitoring wells have to be reassessed at every site? 23 Many places, as you will see from these 24 Google satellite photos of the communities, are so

February 26, 2014

Page 30 1 close now to these plants, conditions have changed 2 dramatically since these sites have been approved. 3 Thank you for your time. I urge your every diligence to strengthen these rules. 4 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Blumenshine, 6 are these captioned or identified with your name so 7 that they can be associated? 8 MS. BLUMENSHINE: The top one is. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Thank 10 you very much, Ms. Blumenshine. 11 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Those will be submitted to our Clerk as written comments. 13 14 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. 15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: We next have 16 Ms. Favilla. And if you again would spell your name 17 and let us know who you represent, please. 18 MS. FAVILLA: My name is Christine 19 Favilla. It's F as in Frank, A-V-I-L-L-A, and I work 20 for the Sierra Club. I'm the Three Rivers Project Coordinator in Madison, Jersey, and Calhoun Counties, 21 22 where we serve over 700 members who live and recreate 23 in our area. 24 I want to also thank the EPA for drafting

	Page 31
1	and filing Proposed Rules for Surface Impoundments
2	Containing Coal Combustion Waste at Power Generating
3	Facilities. However, the Sierra Club believes that
4	these rules fall short of protecting Illinois
5	communities from the serious harm that the coal ash
6	pits pose to our waters, including surface, ground,
7	and drinking water supplies.
8	I work, live, and am raising a family in
9	Madison County, where the Wood River Dynegy plant has
10	four active coal ash ponds, and only one is lined,
11	and one has a high hazard dam.
12	We also have the Venice Dynegy plant,
13	which has two ash pits, both are active and both are
14	unlined.
15	In nine nearby water wells, there are
16	exceedances of arsenic, and there are exceedances of
17	magnesium in all of the wells in Venice.
18	After viewing the U.S. Forest Service
19	Fish Biologist's, Dr. Lindley's study, it is clear
20	that the surface impoundments pose a high biological
21	risk, regardless of their location and design.
22	The rules need to be strengthened for the
23	4.4 million tons of coal ash produced in Illinois
24	each year. We need to account for the serious

February 26, 2014

	Page 32
1	citizen health problems from this waste. We need
2	better monitoring and corrective action.
3	And personally, I've been concerned since
4	2009, when a Peoria entity found potential
5	groundwater contaminants in coal ash disposals at
6	every site investigated.
7	We are gravely concerned about the heavy
8	metals like lead, manganese, and arsenic in the coal
9	ash because they cause cancer and brain damage.
10	Specifically, the Sierra Club believes
11	there needs to be an assessment for surface water
12	impacts and threats to surface water requiring the
13	closure of impoundments that are causing groundwater
14	standards to be degraded.
15	Complete removal of waste should also be
16	considered as a closure strategy, moving the waste to
17	high and dry landfills they currently are in
18	floodplains behind a dam in my community requiring
19	the definition of surface impoundment to include both
20	holding and transferring of coal combustion wastes.
21	The rule needs the financial assurance
22	for power companies to make sure that Illinois
23	taxpayers are not left covering their bills. A
24	complete business plan should go through the real

Page 33 1 life cycles in all ventures, including the end of 2 life cycle. 3 And finally, we urge the IEPA to provide a 60 day comment period on each company's plant to 4 5 correct problems and close their plant. Once again, I thank for the opportunity 6 7 to bring these concerns to Southern Illinois 8 residents to your attention. Many more people would 9 liked to have come, but they were unable to get off 10 of work to make the trip. In working together with the EPA and 11 other entities, we're sure that we can ensure the 12 13 health of the Illinois residents with strong rules. 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you for your 15 comments. 16 We're ready for Ms. Garlish, and if we 17 could ask you again to spell your name and let us 18 know who you may be represent today. 19 MS. GARLISH: Robin Garlish, 20 G-A-R-L-I-S-H, and I'm a member of Central Illinois 21 Healthy Community Alliance. 22 I am a resident of Pekin Illinois, which 23 is right across the river from the Edwards Plant that 24 was just recently purchased with the five other

February 26, 2014

Page 34 1 plants, and our community is just beginning to understand and learn what this is all about. 2 The Pekin area, I don't know if you -- I 3 don't think you could ask one resident, if they have 4 5 a family member with cancer, I don't think you could get one resident, one family, to say they don't have 6 7 anybody with cancer in their family. It's become, 8 and I believe it's been this way for quite a while. 9 I also am a mother of a 16-year-old who has chronic asthma since we had moved here from the 10 San Francisco area, and she was born in 1998 at 11 St. Francis in Peoria, and I thank you for this 12 13 opportunity. I am concerned for my daughter because, 14 15 like many Midwesterners, we came here, and we boat, 16 we water ski, we fish, and in the cities I've been in 17 most of my life, there's warnings. There's radio, 18 there's air warnings. 19 When I came to this river, you know, and I just assumed that there would be some type of 20 State, federal warning, with the beaches, the 21 22 river -- if you look in the spring, in the summer, 23 and the fall, you see families fishing and swimming 24 and boating and water skiing, and you don't -- they

February 26, 2014

	Page 35
1	haven't got a clue of what's going on, and the
2	contaminants and the pollutants, the mercury, the
3	lead, and it's just since I had walked into my first
4	Central Illinois CIHCA meeting, it brought my fears
5	to life. I just can't even imagine that this is not
6	known to everybody in the area.
7	We live one thing that really, really
8	just was profound to me, last year when we had the
9	heavy flooding, we have a campground that is probably
10	ten miles south of Pekin, and all the children do
11	we have the beach area. They have their life jackets
12	on. We do the right things that we can for their
13	health, but the State doesn't, and I don't understand
14	that.
15	We helped the U.S. Corps of Engineers
16	evacuate farmers, and I believe I I may be wrong,
17	but I think this is the first time they evacuated
18	that area. We watched the saturation in the levy,
19	and when you go to the Edwards Plant ten miles back,
20	that water from the flood was directly at the top of
21	that levy.
22	I may be wrong, but I don't think there
23	was any study of this. I don't think anybody
24	checked, anybody recorded, or anybody tested

February 26, 2014

Page 36 1 anything. We -- as we helped the farmers and the 2 U.S. Corps of Engineers evacuate everybody, we could 3 see the wet dirt in the levy where we were at. 4 This year, we have had record snow, 5 record winter. I'm assuming that we're going to have 6 the same type of flooding. It could even be higher. 7 What are we going to do? Are we going to just stand 8 by again? I just -- I can't believe that's 9 happening. 10 I thank you guys, and I hope that I can help be a part of, you know, anything, any of this. 11 These changes have got to happen. For my daughter 12 13 and all other asthmatics, you know, we've got to make 14 changes. We've obviously got to have changes. 15 Thank you. 16 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you, ma'am. 17 Our Public Information Officer, Connie 18 Newman, let me know shortly after the comments began 19 that we did have someone arrive, Ms. Edmiston, who 20 wished to offer a comment? Is she still present 21 here? If she could raise her hand. 22 Ms. Edmiston, we're ready for you to 23 If you could step up to the offer a comment. 24 microphone, that will help everybody hear you very

Page 37 1 well. 2 If you would start by spelling your name 3 for us and letting us know who you represent. Feel 4 free to take three minutes or so to offer your 5 comments to us the Board. I'm Katherine Edmiston. 6 MS. EDMISTON: 7 My last name is spelled E-D-M-I-S-T-O-N. I'm head of 8 the group called Citizens Against Longwall Mining in 9 Montgomery County, and we have the Deer Run Coal Mine 10 operating in that county. 11 Now then, we're losing our streams in 12 Illinois. I've watched this happen, oh, for the last 13 five or six years. I've come down here to 14 Springfield and testified at the Annual Meeting and asked how many miles of streams we have in Illinois. 15 16 I didn't get a satisfactory answer for a long time. 17 I figured it out from some information I've got. 18 Coal mining destroys streams. We all 19 know that. You can't bring them back. They dig 20 deep, deep ditches that farmers have to drive their 21 tractors around to farm what's left of the field 22 after they dig the deep ditches. We've seen it 23 happen again and again. 24 Getting into the pollution and the water

February 26, 2014

Page 38 1 situation. I'm really concerned. I'm a mother of three and a grandmother of seven, and I'm wondering 2 3 what kind of a world my grandchildren are going to be 4 living in. 5 The Deer Run Mine hasn't given the citizens the right to an administrative review of 6 7 their Permit Number 399. For over four years, we've 8 waited for it, and citizens are perfectly innocent 9 for various minor reasons that have delayed this administrative review for a long time. People in 10 Canton have had the same problem. It's drug out for 11 12 many years by the IDNR. 13 But anyhow, we're concerned about waste 14 impoundments at those mines in Montgomery County that are going to leak. They're lined with plastic 15 16 liners. It's chocked full of coal ash, but plastic 17 liners don't last forever, folks. We all know that. 18 There's been a book that came out, 19 Everything In Its Path. A member of my group got it 20 and loaned it to me, and it will open your eyes as to 21 what happens when these waste impoundments give way. 22 We have one within the city limits of 23 Hillsboro. What it does to groundwater when all that 24 coal ash spills out of there, it destroys everything

February 26, 2014

	Page 39
1	in its path. It's a scary book, frankly. I wouldn't
2	read it at night before I went to sleep. It's a very
3	vivid description of what happened out in North
4	Carolina when this waste impoundment gave way and
5	killed people, and we have one now that this mine is
6	operating, Deer Run Mine, even without citizens being
7	allowed to testify in administrative review, and
8	they've got one waste impoundment and they have
9	applied for another one that was so big that they had
10	to get a separate permit for it. It can't be a
11	significant revision of a regional permit.
12	And so we have and they're building
13	high hazard dams and out of coal waste not clay,
14	but high hazard dams and there are other
15	classifications of dams. We've read about those,
16	too, in books; moderate and leads. But they high
17	hazard dams, folks, and they've told us, oh,
18	that's oh, that's the best kind. That's the best
19	kind we can manage. Well, we know better. It's
20	something to think about when it comes to water
21	pollution, isn't it?
22	There's been a recent break of a dam,
23	Duke Energy in North Carolina. That was just
24	recently. And then we've had West Virginia, river

February 26, 2014

Page 40 1 water contaminated for toxic chemical spills. 2 You know this happens guite frequently, 3 and we're not unaware of those happenings in other 4 This is something we need to think about. states. 5 Coal ash from power plants. I read also recently that there's about 100 of these waste 6 7 impoundments in Illinois. This coal ash is a 8 problem. It's highly contaminated. It's got arsenic and all sorts of chemicals in it. 9 10 In our group, we have a retired chemistry teacher, who keeps us very well informed of the water 11 12 pollution and the possibilities in our county. 13 Something's got to be done. And thank you for this opportunity to let 14 15 the Illinois Pollution Control Board know our 16 feelings on this. 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Edmiston, thank 18 you for your comment, which is in the transcript of 19 the hearing and the record today. We thank you for 20 your comment. My expectation, in checking with 21 22 Ms. Newman, is that no one else wishes to comment or 23 has signed in wishing that they would like to do so. 24 Ms. Shaw, did you want to revisit your

February 26, 2014

Page 41 1 conclusion? I'm seeing that you are saying that you 2 are not wishing to comment at this time. 3 Having wrapped those up, we're ready to turn to the Agency. 4 5 Ms. Olson, is the Agency ready to introduce itself for the record and have its 6 7 witnesses sworn in? 8 MS. OLSON: Yes, we are. Thank you. 9 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Please, 10 go ahead. 11 MS. OLSON: My name is Joanne Olson. Ι 12 am Assistant Counsel here at Illinois EPA, and, first 13 of all, I want to thank the Board for accepting our proposal and holding this hearing today. 14 15 The Agency developed this rule in 16 response to a site-specific rulemaking that was filed 17 by Ameren in April of 2013. Ameren's rulemaking 18 contained provisions that applied to 16 ash ponds at 19 eight different facilities. 20 In contrast, the proposal that Illinois 21 EPA proposes is of general culpability and covers all 22 coal combustion waste surface impoundments and power 23 generating facilities in the State of Illinois. 24 Under the Agency's proposed rules, we

February 26, 2014

	Page 42
1	include provisions for groundwater monitoring, weekly
2	inspection, annual reports, preventive response,
3	corrective action, and closure.
4	Under the Agency's proposal, the owner or
5	operator of a coal combustion waste surface
6	impoundment had three options when the groundwater
7	monitoring showed an exceedance of the groundwater
8	quality standards: They can demonstrate that the
9	coal combustion waste surface impoundment did not
10	cause that exceedance; they can provide a corrective
11	action to remediate that exceedance, or they can
12	close the surface impoundment.
13	The Agency does not intend these proposed
14	rules to cover impacts to surface water, as this is
15	covered in Subtitle C of the Board's regulations.
16	Air emissions: This is covered in
17	Subtitle B of the Board's regulations.
18	Dam safety: This is covered by the
19	Illinois Department of Natural Resources regulations.
20	The Agency has four witnesses here today,
21	and I'd like to give them a chance to introduce
22	themselves.
23	MR. COBB: Rick Cobb, and I'm the Deputy
24	Division Manager, Division of Public Water Supplies,

February 26, 2014

Page 43 1 and I'm also the Manager of the Groundwater Section 2 of the Bureau Water. 3 MS. ZIMMER: I'm Amy Zimmer. I'm a hydro geologist in the groundwater section of the Bureau of 4 5 Water. I work for Mr. Cobb. MR. BUSCHER: I'm Bill Buscher. I'm the 6 7 Manager of the Hydrogeology and Compliance Unit, and I also work for Mr. Cobb. 8 9 MR. DUNAWAY: My name is Lynn Dunaway. I'm also in the groundwater section, Bureau of Water, 10 and I am a geologist. 11 12 MS. OLSON: In addition, here today is 13 another member from the Division of Legal Counsel. MR. JENNINGS: I'm James Jennings. 14 I'm 15 like Ms. Olson, Assistant Counsel with the Illinois 16 EPA. 17 MS. OLSON: The Agency has prepared five 18 exhibits that they would like to move into the record 19 at this time. 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Terrific. Why 21 don't we ask you to identity those, and we can assign 22 them numbers and entertain motions, Ms. Olson. 23 MS. OLSON: I have marked the Pre-filed 24 Testimony of Lynn Dunaway as Exhibit 1; the Pre-Filed

February 26, 2014

	Page 44
1	Testimony of Amy Zimmer as Exhibit 2; the Pre-Filed
2	Testimony of Bill Buscher as Exhibit 3; the Pre-Filed
3	Testimony of Richard Cobb as Exhibit 4; and I have
4	marked as Exhibit 5 what is entitled Pre-Filed
5	Answers of the Illinois Environmental Protection
6	Agency.
7	(Exhibit Numbers 1 through 5
8	were marked for identification.)
9	HEARING OFFICER FOX: And to clarify for
10	the record, those Responses are to the questions that
11	have been pre-filed on February 5th by the various
12	participants in this hearing; is that correct,
13	Ms. Olson?
14	MS. OLSON: That is correct.
15	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Is
16	there a motion?
17	MS. OLSON: At this time I'd move to
18	enter Exhibits 1 through 5 into the record.
19	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Having heard
20	Ms. Olson's motion to admit those five documents into
21	the record, is there any objection to it?
22	MS. DEXTER: I have a question. Does
23	Exhibit 5 include the packet of exhibits called
24	Exhibit List

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 45
1	MS. OLSON: Yes.
2	MS. DEXTER: attached to it? It's all
3	part of it?
4	MS. OLSON: Yes.
5	HEARING OFFICER FOX: There is a list of
6	exhibits in the exhibits themselves; is that correct?
7	MS. OLSON: Yes. The attachment
8	Exhibit 5 contains four attachments, and those are
9	the Responses to the questions that were pre-filed.
10	In responding to the pre-filed questions, there were
11	instances where we were asked to provide additional
12	information, and those are attached as exhibits, and
13	those are Exhibits A through P, as opposed to these
14	are exhibits in number form.
15	HEARING OFFICER FOX: And Exhibit Number
16	5 encompasses all of the documents that you referred
17	to, both the attachments and the exhibits.
18	MS. OLSON: That is correct.
19	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
20	Again, you've heard the motion. I've
21	heard no objection to that, and the exhibits that
22	were the subject of Ms. Olson's motion will be
23	admitted into the record with the exhibit numbers as
24	she listed them in her motion. Ms. Olson thank you

February 26, 2014

Page 46 1 for producing those. 2 (Exhibit Numbers 1 through 5 3 were admitted into evidence.) 4 Ms. Olson, did you have any other 5 documents you wish to admit in the record as hearing exhibits? 6 7 MS. OLSON: Not at this time. 8 The Agency is happy to go over the 9 responses to Exhibit 5 and answer any other questions 10 that may be presented. 11 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. We can 12 turn to that? 13 We're going to begin with Ms. Franzetti, 14 as we have determined before the hearing began, and 15 we can take that up as we get under way with the 16 answers themselves. 17 At this point, is the Agency ready to 18 swear in its witnesses so that they're all poised to 19 respond to the questions? 20 MS. OLSON: Yes. 21 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. If the 22 court reporter would do so, please. 23 (Witnesses sworn.) 24 Very good. Anything further, Ms. Olson?

47

	Page
1	MS. OLSON: No, not at this time.
2	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
3	And as I mentioned, in discussing
4	procedural issues before the hearing began, we will
5	begin with the questions filed by Midwest Gen, as
6	they were the first to be filed on the deadline.
7	Ms. Franzetti appears to be making her
8	way to the front so that she can begin working
9	through those, and we'll give her a moment to get
10	settled.
11	If I may make a quick housekeeping
12	comment. The Agency's answers which were provided to
13	the participants earlier today have been available to
14	the other participants, at least for a short time, to
15	review.
16	I understand that Ms. Franzetti has had a
17	chance to look at them and is prepared to go through
18	them, asking questions and perhaps summarizing them
19	for the clearest possible record and indicating
20	whether the written answer is sufficient, or whether
21	she has some additional clarification or some
22	follow-up questions.
23	Have I summarized that clearly,
24	Ms. Franzetti?

Page 48 1 MS. FRANZETTI: You have, except I only 2 got to page 9, but I also wanted to listen to the 3 comments. So I got that far. HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 4 5 MS. FRANZETTI: I'll do my best to move 6 it along as quickly as I can. 7 HEARING OFFICER FOX: We certainly have 8 sworn in the witnesses. I'm sure they're ready to take care of your questions. 9 10 Did you have -- the written questions 11 that you filed are, of course, in the Board's 12 records. Did you have a copy of them to introduce as 13 a hearing exhibit today? As I mentioned, they're in 14 the record, Ms. Franzetti. That was merely an option 15 I wanted to make available. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. You know, I don't 17 know if I have a clean copy. Give me just a second. 18 I don't think I do, but we can always get you one. HEARING OFFICER FOX: That's fine. 19 We 20 can certainly turn to the substance of those 21 questions, Ms. Franzetti. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: We have a clean one. 23 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. I can 24 certainly entertain a motion.

Page 49 1 MS. FRANZETTI: I would move to introduce 2 that as Exhibit 6. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Ms. Franzetti has moved to introduce into 4 5 the record of this hearing as Exhibit Number 6 a document entitled Midwest Generation, LLC's, 6 7 Questions for the Illinois EPA Witnesses. 8 Is there any objection to the motion to admit that document into our record here this 9 10 morning? Neither seeing or hearing any, 11 12 Ms. Franzetti, please consider it as admitted as 13 Exhibit Number 6, and when you are ready to begin 14 with your first question, please go ahead and do so. (Exhibit Number 6 was marked for 15 identification and admitted into 16 17 evidence.) MS. FRANZETTI: For the court reporter's 18 19 benefit, my name is Susan Franzetti, 20 F-R-A-N-Z-E-T-T-I. I am appearing today as counsel 21 for Midwest Generation, and I'm being assisted -- to 22 my right is Maria Race, R-A-C-E, of Midwest 23 Generation, and to my left is Richard Gnat, G-N-A-T, 24 of the consulting firm, KPRG.

	Page 50
1	Okay. With that, I'll turn to the first
2	question. This one I think I can just summarize.
3	I had asked whether proposed Part 841
4	rules establish a new permit program, and the Agency
5	has responded no.
6	Moving to question 2. This one I do have
7	some follow-up. The question's regarding the answer,
8	so I think maybe this one I'll ask a question and you
9	can read your response.
10	At page 15 of Mr. Cobb's pre-filed
11	testimony, he states that, quote: If a numerical
12	standard set forth in Section 620.410 or 620.430 is
13	exceeded at an existing or new CCW unit, the
14	appropriate remedy is corrective action under 35 Ill.
15	Adm. Code Section 620.250, end quote. What is the
16	appropriate remedy if the exceedance is caused by a
17	CCW unit that was closed before the effective date of
18	these rules?
19	MR. DUNAWAY: This is Lynn Dunaway. If
20	the exceedance occurred or continued after the
21	effective date of these rules and the CCW surface
22	impoundment is not otherwise excluded by Section
23	841.105, either Subpart C for corrective action or
24	Subpart D for closure would apply.

	Page 51
1	If a CCW surface impoundment is not
2	subject to the proposed part, but is causing
3	exceedance of a groundwater quality standard,
4	corrective action is still the appropriate remedy,
5	but the corrective action will not be under proposed
6	Part 841.
7	MS. FRANZETTI: Mr. Dunaway, can you just
8	expand on that to explain what would it be under if
9	it's not if the corrective action is not under the
10	proposed 841 rule?
11	MR. DUNAWAY: It could be under another
12	program. It could be under Part 620.
13	MS. FRANZETTI: It could be under the
14	site remediation program, for example?
15	MR. DUNAWAY: Potentially.
16	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So based on this
17	answer, am I correct that the rules will have a
18	retroactive effect regarding closed CCW units, and
19	there does not seem to be any temporal limitation on
20	that. If it was closed 30 years before these rules
21	became effective, but the Agency believes the impact
22	to the groundwater is due, in whole or in part, to
23	that closed CCW, then they could still be subject to
24	these rules for corrective action.

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

ſ

	Page 52
1	MR. DUNAWAY: If a closed CCW impoundment
2	is impacting groundwater, it would still be subject
3	to these regulations.
4	MS. FRANZETTI: Right. No matter how
5	long ago that CCW unit was closed, correct?
6	MR. DUNAWAY: Correct.
7	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Is the is it
8	different, however, if when that CCW unit stopped
9	being used, the CCW material was removed from the
10	unit?
11	MR. DUNAWAY: Can you repeat that
12	question, please?
13	MS. FRANZETTI: Is your answer different
14	if when the old CCW unit ceased being used or was
15	closed. I'm trying not to limit it to closed. That
16	may have a different connotation, particularly under
17	these rules.
18	So it ceased being used but all of the
19	CCW material was removed, including any leachate, is
20	that different, then, potentially under as to
21	whether these rules apply?
22	Take your time. If you need to consult
23	with your colleagues, please feel free.
24	MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Does this is

February 26, 2014

Page 53 there still groundwater contamination associated with 1 2 that unused impoundment? 3 MS. FRANZETTI: For purposes of this 4 question, assume that the Agency, at least, takes 5 that position. 6 MR. DUNAWAY: Then it would still be 7 subject to these rules. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. MS. OLSON: Can I ask a follow-up 9 question? 10 11 MS. FRANZETTI: Sure. 12 MS. OLSON: Can you flip to Section 13 841.105? I asked the witness to turn to Section 14 841.105 of the proposed rules. 15 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. MS. OLSON: Can you read Subsection A, 16 17 please? 18 MR. DUNAWAY: Except as specified in 19 Subsection B of this section, this part applies to 20 all surface impoundments at power generating 21 facilities containing coal combustion waste or 22 leachate from coal combustion waste that are operated 23 on or after the effective date of these rules, or not 24 operated after the effective date of these rules, but

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

,	Page 54
1	whose coal combustion waste or leachate from coal
2	combustion waste causes or contributes to an
3	exceedance of the groundwater quality standards on or
4	after the effective date of these rules.
5	MS. OLSON: So looking at Subsection A,
6	isn't it true that if the power generating
7	facility surface impoundment does not contain coal
8	combustion waste, or leachate from coal combustion
9	waste, these rules would not apply?
10	MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
11	MS. FRANZETTI: Thank you, Counsel. That
12	was one of the points I was trying to clarify. I
13	appreciate it.
14	Okay. Moving on to
15	MS. DEXTER: May I ask a follow-up on
16	this?
17	MS. FRANZETTI: Sure.
18	MS. DEXTER: So in Part II in Section
19	841.105, it's what you just read, it says "causes
20	or contributed to an exceedance of the groundwater
21	quality standards on or after the effective date of
22	those rules," and as I'm reading in the pre-filed
23	testimony in Cobb, page 10, it describes Section 2 as
24	having groundwater contamination attributable to the

February 26, 2014

	Page 55
1	unit prior to the effective date of these rules.
2	So my question is, are we standing by the
3	draft? I just want to clarify that if IEPA discovers
4	groundwater contamination at a unit that is not
5	operating in five years from now, it would still
6	be
7	MR. COBB: I answered that in another
8	question, and it was actually my mistake. It was a
9	misquote from what was in the filed in the TSD. I
10	was trying to think of the name, sorry, the Technical
11	Support Document. That was my mistake. And that is
12	answered in these questions because you answered the
13	same question so or asked the same question
14	elsewhere.
15	MS. DEXTER: Great. Thank you.
16	MS. FRANZETTI: Question 3.
17	Is it correct that the purpose of the,
18	quote, alternate cause demonstration, end quote, is
19	to remove from the scope and applicability of these
20	proposed Part 841 regulations such alternate causes
21	of impacts to groundwater?
22	Would you read your answer? I have a
23	follow-up question.
24	MS. ZIMMER: No. Showing an alternative

February 26, 2014

	Page 56
1	cause of impacts to groundwater other than the unit
2	does not remove a facility from the applicability of
3	the rules. It means that the facility would not be
4	required to take corrective action under proposed
5	Part 841 on that particular exceedance.
6	MS. FRANZETTI: What I'd like you to
7	clarify, Ms. Zimmer, is when you say that it doesn't
8	remove a facility from the applicability of these
9	rules, are you referring there to the fact that there
10	is still a CCW unit there that is going to be subject
11	to these rules?
12	MS. ZIMMER: Yes.
13	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. But the alternate
14	cause of the impact to groundwater falls outside of
15	the scope and applicability of these rules, correct?
16	MS. ZIMMER: I'm not sure I totally
17	understand the question. The alternative
18	MS. FRANZETTI: Don't answer a question
19	you don't understand. Let me help.
20	What we're trying to understand is both
21	the purpose and effect of the proposed provision in
22	the rules that is termed the "alternate cause
23	demonstration," okay?
24	MS. ZIMMER: Okay.

February 26, 2014

	Page 57
1	MS. FRANZETTI: And so assume for
2	purposes of my question that the owner or operator
3	successfully shows that the impact to groundwater is
4	due to an alternate cause. Then is that situation,
5	the impact to groundwater, caused by that alternate
6	cause dealt with outside of these proposed rules? Is
7	that the Agency's intent?
8	MS. ZIMMER: Yes.
9	MS. OLSON: May I ask a follow-up
10	question?
11	MS. FRANZETTI: Uh-huh.
12	MS. OLSON: When you say so they're
13	only outside these rules if they don't follow the
14	applicability section of 841.105; is that correct?
15	MS. ZIMMER: Yes.
16	MS. OLSON: So if a facility falls within
17	the applicability section of 841.105 and then later
18	has an exceedance of the groundwater quality
19	standards, would they then use the alternative cause
20	demonstration possibly to show that it wasn't from
21	their source?
22	MS. ZIMMER: Yes.
23	MS. OLSON: And after they successfully
24	show that it wasn't from their source, are they still

February 26, 2014

Page 58 1 subject to these rules? 2 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. 3 MS. OLSON: Thank you. I don't want to beat it 4 MS. FRANZETTI: 5 to death, but I'm not sure the point that you were --6 you're making, Ms. Olson -- and we're just trying to 7 understand it. 8 When you say it's still subject to these 9 rules, do you mean the impoundment is still subject to the rules? Because that's what we think, but we 10 also read the rules to say that when it's -- when the 11 12 groundwater exceedance you're picking up, at whatever 13 the monitoring level is, is shown to be due to 14 something other than that impoundment, then the owner 15 or operator doesn't address it under these rules; they address it outside of these rules, whether it's 16 17 the site remediation program, you know, whatever. 18 That's what we're trying to understand. 19 I'm not trying to trick you. We're just really 20 trying to understand. 21 The impoundment would still MS. ZIMMER: 22 be -- the impoundment would still be subject to these 23 The exceedance would not need to be active. rules. 24 This particular exceedance you're describing where

February 26, 2014

Page 59 1 you successfully prove it's an alternative source for 2 that particular exceedance would not have to take 3 corrective action. 4 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. Okay. Thank you. 5 Moving on to guestion 4. This is one I don't have a follow-up or clarifying question on. 6 7 It's a little lengthy. What would you like me to do? 8 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Could you, 9 Ms. Franzetti, just to frame the issue, briefly 10 summarize your question? I can see that the Agency 11 began with a one-word answer that might clarify that 12 very nicely. 13 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. I'm just going to 14 jump to the end of my question. My question was, is it correct that under 15 16 the proposed rules, as long as an owner or operator 17 has demonstrated compliance with the Part 620 18 groundwater standards, the corrective action can be 19 terminated? 20 And the Agency's answer was: No, because 21 generally the owner or operator will be expected to 22 complete all the requirements of an approved 23 corrective action, but the owner or operator could 24 seek to modify their corrective action plan subject

February 26, 2014

Page 60 1 to review and approval by the Agency. 2 Moving on to question 5, I also don't 3 have any follow-up questions here. I'll try and 4 summarize. 5 I asked for an explanation under the proposed rules as to whether it is the applicable 6 7 groundwater compliance standards -- I'm sorry --8 whether the applicable compliance standards are the 9 Part 620 groundwater standards, the background concentrations, or both. 10 The Agency's response is that the Part 11 12 620 groundwater quality standards include 13 nondegradation and numeric limits, and so in 14 evaluating compliance, the Agency's going to look at 15 both the nondegradation standard, as well as the numeric limits. 16 17 Moving on to question 6. Similarly, I 18 don't have any follow-up questions here. I had asked 19 the Agency to provide some examples of how the result 20 of preventive response, corrective action, or closure 21 under these proposed rules would require the operator 22 to submit an application to revise an NPDES permit, 23 and in its answer, the Agency gave several examples, some of which include where the corrective action is 24

February 26, 2014

	Page 61
1	going to result in some sort of discharge to a
2	surface water where it might involve rerouting a
3	discharge stream or a location of a discharge
4	outfall, if the corrective action would involve
5	changing or modifying the NPDES permit to allow storm
6	water to be directed to another impoundment; or if
7	the closure plan or the corrective action plan
8	involves construction that disturbs more than one
9	acre, a construction storm water permit may also be
10	needed.
11	Moving on to question 4 sorry; I'm
12	sorry question 6, small (a). The question
13	involved whether the Agency, based on its review of
14	the preventive response, corrective action, or
15	closure activities should indicate or require the
16	owner or operator to apply to revise its NPDES permit
17	as necessary as a result of any of these actions when
18	the Agency believes that any part of those approved
19	activities, in fact, triggers the need to modify an
20	existing NPDES permit.
21	And the Agency responded: No, that
22	owners or operators are responsible for having the
23	appropriate NPDES permit.
24	Question (b) is: If the owner or

February 26, 2014

	Page 62
1	operator fails to recognize that something in its
2	preventive response, corrective action or closure
3	under these proposed rules may, in fact, trigger the
4	need to modify an existing NPDES permit, then is the
5	owner or operator out of compliance with proposed
6	Section 841.150 and, in fact, subject to potential
7	enforcement because they failed to recognize that
8	they needed to seek a modification of their NPDES
9	permit? And the Agency answers: Yes, and they could
10	pursue enforcement action for that.
11	Moving to (c): Does Section 841.150
12	potentially and unnecessarily duplicate requirements
13	under existing regulations for state operating
14	permits or NPDES permits and/or the provisions of
15	those permits which specify when an application to
16	revise or modify the permit is required?
17	The Agency responded: Yes, and that they
18	included this provision merely to provide a check or
19	cross reference with respect to existing NPDES permit
20	requirements and that this was recommended to the
21	Agency during stakeholder outreach, but they had no
22	objection to removing this section if the Board
23	chooses.
24	Here's my concern. Here's one of the

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 63
1	reasons why I'm asking these questions. It's not
2	unusual in Agency enforcement actions for a single
3	act to cite every place in the regs, in the Act
4	that deal with that same action or failure to act,
5	and hence, I am concerned that when you put the same
6	requirement into more than one place under Board
7	regulations, and I have no issue with making a cross
8	reference to help the reader know where to go to find
9	out more about whether you need to modify your NPDES
10	permit, but I don't think the same requirement
11	regarding when you need to modify or seek a
12	modification of an NPDES permit should be in two
13	places, but particularly outside of the NPDES portion
14	of the regulations or part of the regulations.
15	So would the Agency agree to consider a
16	change that effectuates the cross reference but
17	doesn't make it a separate obligation under these
18	rules?
19	MR. COBB: Well, as we said, we were
20	intending it to be a matter of a cross reference
21	because it does take different levels of expertise to
22	review those plans.
23	MR. ARMSTRONG: Can I ask just a
24	follow-up question? Andrew Armstrong with the

February 26, 2014

Page 64 1 Environmental Law and Policy Center. 2 I believe I was probably one of the 3 stakeholders who recommended that provision to the 4 Agency, so I have an interest in it. 5 MS. FRANZETTI: So it was you. 6 (Laughter.) 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Can I get an 8 understanding here of how the NDPES permit relates to 9 the approval of a corrective action plan? Under the rules, is it the Agency's 10 intent that a corrective action, preventive response, 11 or a closure plan can be approved under these rules 12 before there's an application for a NPDES permit? 13 14 MR. COBB: They're separate. And, in 15 fact, if you go back to page 3 of 39 of the Responses 16 to Midwest Gen's questions -- oh, I apologize. Ιf 17 you look at the -- I'm not sure how to reference it. 18 Is it Response to Question 6(a) from Midwest Generation? 19 20 In the example for Hutsonville, the 21 corrective action there required hydraulic 22 containment for the Hutsonville example, and 23 therefore required a NPDES permit to deal with that 24 discharge, but they were separate. The NPDES matter

February 26, 2014

Page 65 1 is still being dealt with according to how NPDES 2 operates. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: So to --4 MR. COBB: And some of your colleagues 5 participated in that rulemaking. 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: So to try to get a better 7 sense of the timing, then, so if the -- if there's a 8 discharge from the hydraulic containment system and 9 there's a NPDES permit required for that, at what point is there an anti degradation analysis for the 10 new discharge from the water side of things relative 11 12 to the Agency's approval of the hydraulic containment 13 system? MR. COBB: As we said in the Hutsonville 14 15 hearing, that's handled through the NPDES permitting 16 process. 17 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. But I'm just 18 trying to understand. 19 That is what is done at the MR. COBB: 20 time prior to getting your permit, which makes sense 21 for an anti deq. 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: The situation that we're 23 just trying to understand here is, what if there's a 24 situation where you go through a NPDES permitting

February 26, 2014

	Page 66
1	process and you do an anti degradation analysis, and
2	that analysis tells you that you cannot contribute
3	any more pollutants to that waterway. How does that
4	affect the hydraulic containment system in the
5	Hutsonville example?
6	MR. COBB: Very simple. You have to come
7	back and come back with a different corrective
8	action plan to have the Agency review, if that isn't
9	an option, and I think that's where we can modify
10	those corrective action plans.
11	MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.
12	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further,
13	Mr. Armstrong?
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: Not right now. Thank
15	you.
16	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. I
17	think, Ms. Franzetti, we're ready to turn back to
18	you.
19	MS. FRANZETTI: All right.
20	I'm going to move to question 7, and I'm
21	still in the general questions to the Agency, not to
22	a particular witness.
23	I do have some follow-up questions on
24	this one, so I'll read my question and you go ahead

Page 67

1 and read your answer.

2	Did the Agency consider reducing the list
3	of chemical constituents that are required to be
4	monitored to match the shorter list of chemical
5	constituents that the proposed federal rules for CCW
6	surface impoundments require and, if so, why did the
7	Agency decide not to reduce the list of chemical
8	constituents for which monitoring is required?
9	MR. COBB: Rick Cobb. Yes. The Agency
10	considered it and rejected it for several reasons.
11	One, Illinois has groundwater quality
12	standards for chemical constituents at Part 620 that
13	must be met onsite and offsite at these facilities
14	that apply right now. Two, USEPA's list of
15	constituents do not apply right now. Three, the
16	Agency has a significant amount of groundwater
17	quality data for sites that USEPA may not have. And
18	fourth, we put in a provision to reduce sampling to
19	semiannual from quarterly if things are not being
20	detected.
21	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Mr. Cobb, I want
22	to ask you about this. Your point number 3 there
23	that the Agency has a significant amount of
24	groundwater quality data for these sites that USEPA

Page 68

1 may not have.

2	With respect to that data and for the
3	constituents that are included in these proposed
4	rules through the Part 620 standards but are not on
5	the proposed federal list of constituents to be
6	monitored, does the Agency's data show that those
7	constituents are typically exceeded, or sometimes
8	exceeded and, if so, can you identify which ones, and
9	again due to CCW impoundments.
10	MR. COBB: Yeah. In the technical
11	support document in my section of that document, I
12	provided statistics for the types of contaminants
13	that we found thus far at all of the facilities
14	across the state, and also in pre-filed testimony,
15	Attachments 1 through 14 in my pre-filed testimony, I
16	included all of the facilities for which we found
17	groundwater quality standard exceedances for which we
18	also sent violation notices, or subsequently in some
19	cases, having referred for notice of intent to pursue
20	legal action.
21	So that data has been provided in not
22	only the Technical Support Document, but also my
23	pre-filed testimony.
24	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So if I look

February 26, 2014

	Page 69
1	through all that, I'll be able to figure out which of
2	the constituents that are not on the federal proposed
3	monitoring list the Agency's data indicates have, in
4	fact, been detected at levels above the Part 620
5	standards in which you believe to be due to CCW.
6	MR. COBB: Right.
7	MS. FRANZETTI: All right. Now, am I
8	correctly understanding that the best one can do as
9	an owner or operator to reduce the number of
10	constituents that are monitored for at each of the
11	monitoring wells, even if over repeated monitoring,
12	it's non-detect, non-detect, non-detect, I am still
13	going to have to continue, as long as that unit's
14	operating, to sample for those parameters at least on
15	a semiannual basis.
16	MR. COBB: Yes.
17	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Did you give
18	consideration to the approach that is taken under the
19	NPDES permitting program where, just as with the Part
20	620 groundwater standards, we have a lot of surface
21	water quality standards, and we don't make NPDES
22	discharges, continue to sample their discharges,
23	whether it's multiple outfalls or single outfalls, on
24	a semiannual basis, year after year after year, when

1 sampling data has shown that it's non-detect for 2 those parameters. 3 I don't understand the difference the 4 Agency's taking as between discharges to surface 5 water and groundwater. MR. COBB: Although most of the 6 7 processes, I think, remain in a pretty steady state 8 in things that are being discharged to surface water, 9 and the dynamics of what goes into surface water is going to be completely different than groundwater 10 because it's such long term. Because we're possibly 11 12 concerned that the source material for the coal 13 combustion waste could possibly change over the time 14 into the future, we want to continue to try to 15 monitor for the contaminants that could show up. Internal monitoring wells, you know, have shown other 16 17 types of contaminants, but downgradient points of 18 compliance have not. 19 You could also possibly get certain 20 changes in operations or, once again, that may lead 21 to different contaminants that possibly may be going 22 in, and that's why we decided to keep it broad. 23 Although we did remove the organics, we removed the 24 radionuclides, and I think in this proceeding we're

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

#### Page 70

February 26, 2014

Page 71 1 recommending you can remove the perchlorate, or we're referencing that to the Board for consideration. 2 3 MS. FRANZETTI: But if there are changes 4 in the operations that would impact influent to these 5 CCWs, you could instead provide in these rules that the owner or operator has to notify you of such a 6 7 change in its operations and advise you accordingly 8 so that you can potentially require the owner or 9 operator to, at that point, change what they're 10 monitoring for and perhaps go back to a broader panoply until a new baseline is established for 11 12 whatever that change in operations was. Isn't that a 13 possible alternative approach? 14 MR. COBB: I would like to see a history 15 to be able to compare. You know, with a lot of 16 these -- and we're asking for the history now -- we 17 don't necessarily have that. Would you be willing to 18 include that as well? 19 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm willing to work on 20 anything that is more reasonable than year after year 21 after year after year of non-detected parameters. 22 So yeah, I'm willing to talk to you. I 23 recognize what you're saying. You want a baseline of 24 data.

	Page 72
1	MR. COBB: Let me make it clear, it's no
2	longer our proposal so I would leave this matter to
3	the Pollution Control Board.
4	MS. DEXTER: Do you know the costs
5	associated with the non-detect semiannual testing?
6	MR. COBB: Inorganic contaminants such as
7	these are relatively cheap tests. We are not
8	talking like, for organics, you can get into 300
9	some dollars a sample. These are not expensive
10	tests. I'm sure we're talking less than a hundred
11	dollars per sample analysis for the inorganic suite.
12	MR. ARMSTRONG: I have a follow-up
13	question.
14	MS. FRANZETTI: Hold on a second. I've
15	got one and then I'll defer to you.
16	With respect to the cost of the testing,
17	you would agree it's not just the cost of the
18	testing, however. One has to get in the test
19	results, review them, validate them, report them to
20	the Agency and periodically conduct statistical
21	evaluations on those parameters for every single well
22	that you've got at the facility, right?
23	MR. COBB: Yes.
24	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay.

	Page 73
1	MR. RAO: Has the Agency taken a look at
2	the Board's nonhazardous waste landfill regulations
3	for groundwater monitoring where there are provisions
4	allowing to reduce the list of contaminants based on,
5	you know, the monitoring results?
6	MR. COBB: Can I say one thing back to
7	MR. RAO: Yeah, yeah.
8	MR. COBB: Just one quick comment on the
9	point you made, Ms. Franzetti, in terms of the
10	statistics and the costs there.
11	You really can't do the statistics
12	without the data, so that's another point. There's a
13	benefit showing that things aren't there.
14	Back to your
15	MR. RAO: Yeah. I was just asking if you
16	had looked at the landfill rules where there are
17	provisions that allow the landfill owner or operator
18	to reduce the number of contaminants based on ongoing
19	results.
20	MR. COBB: I've got to say that we did
21	not look at those simply because of the adjusted
22	standard that was issued that where we there
23	was a site-specific adjusted standard sought for the
24	Hutsonville site, and that led to instead of

February 26, 2014

	Page 74
1	suggesting that you get an adjusted standard from
2	landfills that a site-specific regulation be
3	developed, and so that kind of led us to develop kind
4	of a separate approach, and the fact that landfills
5	aren't defined as surface impoundments, and the fact
6	that surface that landfills have liners, I think
7	our data shows that the majority of these sites
8	haven't had liners. So you're dealing with a little
9	bit a little bit different situation than the
10	landfills.
11	MR. RAO: Because you did mention it's up
12	to the Board to decide on this issue, so if you have
13	anything more to add, looking at other rules, that
14	could be helpful.
15	MR. COBB: Okay. Thank you, Anand.
16	MR. ARMSTRONG: I have one follow-up.
17	Andrew Armstrong with the ELPC.
18	In terms of the extent and the nature of
19	the monitoring requirements, isn't it accurate that
20	the peak level of contamination from these
21	impoundments can be several decades, many decades
22	after the contamination is I'm sorry many
23	decades after the CCW is placed in the impoundment?
24	MR. COBB: It's my technical opinion that

February 26, 2014

	Page 75
1	that's incorrect. These have been here, many of
2	them, for decades. The contaminants have been
3	moving. The groundwater has been moving. We've had
4	different climatic conditions.
5	So the process of hydrodynamic
6	dispersion, which I tried to describe in detail in my
7	pre-filed testimony, we're at the bottom of that
8	curve in these sites. These have been there.
9	Variability. What we're seeing, the peak
10	concentrations would have been gone long ago. So
11	it's my opinion, no. But when we're reviewing these,
12	typically we're going to model that using groundwater
13	flow and contaminant transport models we're not,
14	the entity is we're going to review that, and if
15	such modeling shows something like that, we're not
16	going to approve it.
17	But it's my opinion, and I tried to state
18	that, that what we're seeing there in those
19	monitoring wells is a result of decades of
20	groundwater recharging through these unlined
21	impoundments and resulting in what we're seeing.
22	This isn't a one-time shot. What we're seeing there
23	has been happening as a process over decades.
24	MR. ARMSTRONG: Do you have an

February 26, 2014

	Page 76
1	understanding as to the USEPA's view of the peak
2	level on contamination from unlined impoundments,
3	based on their notice in the Federal Register of the
4	proposed rule in 2010?
5	MS. FRANZETTI: Counsel, what are in
6	fairness, what are you referring to as the EPA's
7	opinion on peak
8	MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, the EPA's opinion
9	on peak levels as expressed in the Federal Register
10	notice of the proposed coal ash rule under RCRA.
11	MS. FRANZETTI: What is it? Maybe
12	Mr. Cobb memorized that notice and knows it off the
13	top of his head, but I know I don't.
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, according to the
15	Federal Register, they say that the unlined surface
16	impoundment risks typically peak within the first 100
17	years, and that's 75 Federal Register 35.145, and
18	that's an attachment to the Agency's filing.
19	MR. COBB: What page is that,
20	Mr. Armstrong?
21	MR. ARMSTRONG: 75 Federal Register
22	35.145.
23	MR. COBB: Can you repeat where that is?
24	This on page 35.145?

February 26, 2014

Page 77 1 MR. ARMSTRONG: Sure. This is actually 2 just to clarify. This is Attachment E. 3 MR. COBB: Yeah, I know. We've got it 4 right here. 5 MR. ARMSTRONG: This is the center 6 column, and I can read the entire paragraph. 7 The model there predicts that groundwater risks will occur centuries later for landfills and 8 9 for surface impoundments. For the groundwater and 10 drinking water pathway for unlined landfills, arrival times will have peak concentrations and a receptor 11 12 well peaking in the hundreds or thousands of years, while unlined surface impoundments particularly peak 13 14 within the first one hundred years. Clay liners 15 resulted in later arrival in peak risks, nearly 16 always to the thousands of years for landfills, but 17 still in the first few hundred years for surface 18 impoundments. MR. COBB: I'd have to see the 19 20 site-specific data the USEPA used to generate this 21 statement and exactly what the geochemistry is. Ι 22 know the geochemistry of the impoundment at our 23 sites, and I know how hydrodynamic dispersion works. 24 Before I could answer this question, I

February 26, 2014

Page 78 1 would need to see the exact inputs into this model. 2 We will be modeling and we -- when you 3 run contaminant transport models, we usually run 4 those out to steady state conditions. 5 So, like I said, when we run the contaminant transport model, we'll be running the 6 7 contaminant transport model based on our source 8 materials and impoundments in Illinois, and if 9 there's a peak concentration, you don't just stop at 10 a timeframe; you run the model out into the future just like they did. But I don't know what their 11 12 inputs are to say how this compared. 13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Just one more follow-up 14 question. 15 How old is the oldest impoundment that 16 Illinois EPA's been dealing with in Illinois? 17 MR. COBB: We don't have all of them, but I know that, for example, one was 1951. It's older 18 19 than me. 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: And how long has the 21 Agency been collecting data for the impoundments? 22 MR. COBB: That's a bit of a complex 23 question in that some of these facilities -- and I'll 24 let one of my staff answer that.

	Page 79
1	MR. BUSCHER: This is Bill Buscher. That
2	varies from site to site. In some instances,
3	groundwater monitoring was taking place prior to
4	1990. It really just depends on the specifics of the
5	site, but
6	MR. ARMSTRONG: So the Agency's
7	understanding of the trends in groundwater
8	contamination around the impoundments is based upon
9	about 14 years of monitoring data, 1990?
10	MR. BUSCHER: Twenty-four.
11	MR. COBB: As in the pre-filed testimony,
12	the Agency's understanding is beyond just the
13	monitoring. It's beyond the concepts of hydro
14	geology, groundwater flow, hydrodynamic dispersion
15	and matching that with the data. So it's more than
16	just the monitoring we are using to make our
17	opinions.
18	MR. BUSCHER: That would be 24 years of
19	data.
20	MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct.
21	MR. BUSCHER: Thank you.
22	MR. COBB: Thank you, Bill.
23	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further,
24	Mr. Armstrong?

Page 80 1 MR. ARMSTRONG: No. 2 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Franzetti, we 3 may be ready, if I'm not mistaken, for question 7(a) 4 on your part? 5 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm sorry. We're not quite ready yet. It also kind of relates to (a). 6 7 Mr. Cobb, with respect to your answer 8 in -- to question 7, part 1 of that, Illinois has 9 groundwater quality standards for chemical 10 constituents in 620 that go beyond what are in the 11 proposed federal does. 12 Would you agree that the Part 620 13 standards, though, the constituents that are in Part 14 620 standards was not developed specifically to 15 address coal combustion waste? 16 MR. COBB: Well, the Part 620 standards 17 are not site-specific rules. They're rules of 18 general applicability that certainly apply to the 19 groundwater resources under your -- the facilities 20 you represent. 21 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. But my point is, 22 for example --23 MR. COBB: The answer is yes. 24 MS. FRANZETTI: And so, for example, one

February 26, 2014

Page 81 1 of those constituents for which there's a Part 620 2 numeric standard is perchlorate. Would you ever 3 reasonably associate perchlorate with coal combustion 4 waste? 5 MR. COBB: We recommended to the Board 6 that they consider removing perchlorate in response 7 to one of these questions. I'll see if I can find 8 that response. Hold on. 9 Does any of the panel --10 MS. FRANZETTI: If you can't find it now, it's going to come up. That's okay. But if you did, 11 12 I didn't get to it. I didn't see it. 13 But let me give you another example, 14 then, that you would -- maybe you would also consider 15 making that recommendation on. What about the --16 MR. COBB: If you would like to provide 17 us with a list, we'd be happy to evaluate it, because 18 I wouldn't want to review this independent of our technical staff. 19 20 MS. FRANZETTI: And I understand, and the 21 question was more intended, maybe you already have 22 and there was some reason we weren't thinking of for 23 why it should remain on the list, so that's fine. 24 MR. RAO: May I ask a follow-up question?

Page 82 1 No. (Laughter.) MS. FRANZETTI: Of 2 course. 3 MR. RAO: Would the groundwater 4 monitoring results that you got based on, you know, 5 ash pond strategy, what -- did you come up with a 6 list of constituents which you wanted these 7 facilities to monitor, or did they provide you with 8 what they thought was appropriate for the CCW 9 impoundments? Well, since you all set the 10 MR. COBB: standards, we felt we shouldn't be doing that. Part 11 12 620 defines the standards, so we started with that. 13 Here are the Board's groundwater quality standards, assess for these. That's how we did it. 14 15 MR. RAO: Okay. So any monitoring that 16 you have included in the record represents all the 17 constituents under Part 620? 18 MR. COBB: Not all of the constituents 19 because these types of contaminants are primarily 20 inorganic, so let me slightly modify my response that 21 we went to the inorganics because coal combustion 22 waste does include inorganics, and we were focusing 23 on coal combustion waste residues in all the research 24 that we've seen, which we also tried to include in

February 26, 2014

Page 83 1 the Statement of Reasons and in the pre-filed 2 testimony what's been seen nationally, so --3 MR. RAO: And in these results that you evaluated, if you had a number of non-detects for 4 5 various contaminants, you still continue to believe that they should be part of the list. 6 7 MR. COBB: We did because we -- at this 8 time, we're not positive of the history and we're not 9 positive of if there are going to be changes, but we heard some testimony regarding that. 10 11 MR. RAO: Okay. Thanks. 12 MS. FRANZETTI: Along those lines, I'll move then to 7(a), and I think we probably ought to 13 14 read the question and the answer on this one. 15 If leachate from the unit to be monitored 16 is collected and analyzed by the owner or operator, 17 would the Agency be willing to use that analytical 18 data as a basis to shorten the parameters monitoring 19 list to only those parameters which are shown to be 20 detected within the leachate from the unit? 21 And the Agency answered that it believes 22 the full list is needed, as future influent and the 23 chemical makeup of the influent may be different than 24 what is currently being sent to the impoundment. In

February 26, 2014

	Page 84
1	addition, many of the existing impoundments have been
2	in existence for many years. The current influent
3	may not be reflective of the total chemical makeup of
4	what has been placed in the impoundments over the
5	length of their existence.
6	And I wanted to ask a follow-up question,
7	and it may be unique to the Midwest Generation
8	impoundments.
9	What about our situation, where ash is
10	removed periodically, so that it is the current
11	influent that is reflective of the total chemical
12	makeup of what's being placed in these impoundments?
13	Would the Agency want to have the flexibility for a
14	situation like ours where it's lined, ash is
15	periodically removed, to be able to allow some
16	reduction in the list of parameters that have to be
17	monitored?
18	MR. COBB: You know, at those
19	impoundments, we have corrective actions in place,
20	and you were able to put low permeability liners in
21	place, and we're looking then at hydrodynamic
22	dispersion to deal with the existing groundwater
23	quality contamination that exists at those
24	impoundments because now you've got an impermeable

February 26, 2014

Page 85 1 liner to prevent more contaminants. We have not 2 looked at that consideration. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Will you consider 4 that question further and give us some idea of 5 whether you might be willing to consider, allowing for under appropriate circumstances, a reduction in 6 7 the list of constituents to be monitored? 8 MR. COBB: Yes, that's fair. 9 MS. FRANZETTI: I think with that, I'm 10 going to skip 7(b) and move to the questions, then, 11 for Mr. Cobb. 12 MS. OLSON: I would just like to state that while these questions are directed to Mr. Cobb, 13 they were divided up among the panel, so these 14 15 questions may not be answered by Mr. Cobb, just so 16 you know. 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. And I want to do 18 that for the record because I start again at number 19 1, and don't want to confuse people --20 MS. OLSON: Sure. MS. FRANZETTI: -- and make them think 21 22 I'm going back to the beginning again. 23 Okay. We're okay to keep going. No 24 break.

Page 86

1	Question number 1, Midwest Gen Power
2	Stations Impoundments - Periodic Ash Removal and
3	the following questions refer to Attachment 1 and
4	specifically to our stations; Waukegan, Powerton,
5	Joliet 29, and Crawford Stations.
6	Question (a), just summarizing the
7	Agency's Response, it's fine in terms of I don't have
8	any follow-up questions, and we were just asking for
9	confirmation that none of the impoundments identified
10	on Attachment 1 for the Midwest Generation Stations
11	are used as permanent disposal sites for ash, but
12	rather, the ash that collects in these impoundments
13	is removed on a periodic basis, and the Agency
14	confirmed that is its understanding as well.
15	So moving on to (b) where excuse me.
16	I do have one follow-up question. The question was
17	whether there are other impoundments owned or
18	operated by the entities listed in Attachment 1
19	besides Midwest Generation which are also not used as
20	permanent disposal sites for ash and from which ash
21	is removed on a periodic basis, and the Agency's
22	answer points out that is there are impoundments that
23	are still operating. They haven't closed. These
24	owners or operators have the option at any time to

	Page 87
1	remove the ash for beneficial use and can close these
2	impoundments by complete removal of ash. Therefore,
3	the Agency cannot say whether impoundments that are
4	not closed are permanent disposal sites for ash.
5	Venice and Hutsonville Ash Pond D would be termed
6	permanent disposal sites.
7	I understand your answer. What you're
8	saying is that at any given time, an owner or
9	operator could change and start removing ash from an
10	unclosed CCW impoundment, but just to clarify for the
11	record, because I'm trying to understand whether
12	right now Midwest Gen is the only one that is
13	periodically removing the ash.
14	So, at present, is it the Agency's
15	understanding that that periodic removal of ash is
16	not occurring at any other impoundments besides
17	Midwest Gen's?
18	MR. BUSCHER: As you're aware, ash is
19	marketed, so there are other sites that periodically
20	remove ash.
21	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Maybe I need to
22	further clarify. They don't remove all the ash in
23	the impoundments. They may remove some to sell it.
24	MR. BUSCHER: That's a site-specific

Page 88 1 call. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 3 MR. BUSCHER: And the regulation does 4 cover leachate created by the ash, so it's not -there's a little more to it than that. 5 6 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 7 Moving on, then, to question 2, 8 summarizing. I don't have a follow-up. 9 Attachment 1 to your pre-filed testimony notes that the Will County Midwest Gen Station has 10 four impoundments, and we were seeking a correction 11 12 on that because two of those impoundments, Ponds 1 North and 1 South, have been removed from service, 13 and the Agency agreed that those two impoundments 14 have been removed from service. 15 16 Moving to 2(b): If the two Will County 17 impoundments are removed from service prior to the 18 enactment of these proposed rules, will they be 19 subject to the proposed closure requirements of these 20 proposed rules? 21 And the Agency responded: If all CCW or 22 leachate from CCW is removed before the effective 23 date of these rules, this Part would not apply. 24 My question is, could you also give us

February 26, 2014

	Page 89
1	some idea what type of information does the Agency
2	expect the owner or operator to have to demonstrate
3	that all CCW or leachate from CCW is removed, so that
4	we have some idea of what information we should
5	document to show that those two ponds, assuming
6	they're removed from service and we get rid of all
7	the CCW or leachate from CCW, so that we are not
8	subject to these rules, what type of information will
9	you expect to see for us to make that showing?
10	MR. BUSCHER: I can't answer that.
11	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. All right. That's
12	not something that the Agency has specifically
13	considered?
14	MR. BUSCHER: We have not conclusively
15	considered.
16	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving on to
17	question 3, this these questions regard Midwest
18	Gen's Will County, Joliet 29, and Powerton Stations,
19	and they were seeking clarification of liner status
20	in questions 3(a) through (d). I don't have any
21	follow-up questions on those except one on 3(a), so
22	I'll read 3(a).
23	As part of the work that was done by
24	Midwest Gen under the Will County Station CCA, which

February 26, 2014

	Page 90
1	stands for Compliance Commitment Agreement, is it
2	correct that one of the two remaining impoundments
3	was to have its liner replaced with a new synthetic
4	liner subject to Agency approval of the proposed
5	liner specifications?
6	Agency Response: Yes, for Will County
7	Power. Pond 3S lined with an HDPE liner, Pond 2S is
8	to be lined with an HDPE liner, and Ponds 1N and 1S
9	are to be removed from service and a de-watering
10	system installed.
11	One thing we want you to further check on
12	is your comment that Pond 2S is to be lined with an
13	HDPE liner, because we do believe it has been lined.
14	I don't know if you can answer that or make that
15	clarification right now, but if you would look into
16	that.
17	MR. BUSCHER: We're going to have to look
18	into that.
19	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Is it okay if I
20	jump to question 4?
21	HEARING OFFICER FOX: If there are no
22	follow-ups based on questions 3(b), (c), or (d) on
23	the basis of those questions, Ms. Franzetti, I think
24	it makes perfect sense to go to question number 4.

	Page 91
1	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. And with respect
2	to question 4, again, these are questions specific to
3	the Midwest Gen Will County, Waukegan and Powerton
4	Stations with respect to some of the provisions of
5	the Compliance Commitment Agreements that Midwest Gen
6	and the Agency entered into, and the only one that I
7	have a follow-up question on was Subpart C, so I'm
8	going to move to that one.
9	The question was: Under the proposed
10	rules, will ELUCs, capital E-L-U-C, small s, continue
11	to be available as an institutional control to
12	address groundwater impacts?
13	The Agency's Response is: ELUCs can be
14	used as authorized under Section 58.17 of the
15	Illinois Environmental Protection Act, 415 ILCS
16	5/58.17 (2012.)
17	My question is, is it the Agency's intent
18	under the proposed rules that any institutional
19	control that is authorized under the Illinois
20	Environmental Protection Act is applicable under
21	these proposed rules?
22	MR. COBB: Can you repeat the question?
23	Did you ask if only authorized under the Illinois
24	Environmental Protection Act?

	Page 92
1	MS. FRANZETTI: Not only. It was if; if,
2	in addition to ELUCs, there are other institutional
3	controls that the Illinois Environmental Protection
4	Act authorizes be used, then is it the Agency's
5	intent that they would be eligible for use under
6	these proposed rules?
7	MR. COBB: If authorized under the Act
8	and regulations, then they could be used as specified
9	under the Act and those regulations.
10	MS. OLSON: May I ask a follow-up
11	question?
12	MS. FRANZETTI: Sure. Maybe I'm sorry
13	to interrupt you, but here's what we're trying to
14	understand. It didn't seem to us, unless we missed
15	it, that ELUCs were mentioned anywhere in these
16	proposed Part 841 rules, okay? Your answer, though,
17	seems to say, sure, if they're allowed per Section
18	58.17 of the Act, you can rely on ELUCs as part of
19	your corrective action under these rules.
20	I'm now just trying to broaden it, since
21	ELUCs weren't mentioned in the rules, if there are
22	other types of institutional controls that the Act
23	generally allows, although it may have certain
24	criteria for when they can be applied. Is it your

Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

-	
	Page 93
1	intent, then, they can apply to Part 841 rules?
2	MR. COBB: Yes.
3	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay.
4	MR. COBB: And I think there was a
5	further clarification. It may have been this
6	section. We were just using the term generically in
7	the pre-filed testimony.
8	MS. OLSON: What are you talking about?
9	MR. COBB: The institutional controls,
10	slash, restricted use ordinances, because there could
11	be other institutional controls other than
12	ordinances. That may have actually been a Board
13	question. I can't recall.
14	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay.
15	Moving on to question 5. These again
16	were all your specific questions relating to the
17	monitoring results from Midwest Gen's groundwater
18	monitoring system at certain of its plants, Will
19	County, Waukegan, and Powerton, which we felt had
20	been misreported in Attachment 1 to the Agency's
21	testimony, so we asked a series of questions to try
22	and correct the misreporting of those values in
23	Attachment 1, and the Agency has generally agreed
24	with our pointing out some of the corrections that

February 26, 2014

	Page 94
1	needed to be made, with one exception being in
2	question 5(c) where the Agency could not state
3	stated for Powerton with respect to mercury results
4	for Monitoring Well 12 that the Agency cannot find
5	laboratory data sheets to confirm that mercury at
6	MW-12 on December 15th, 2010, was initially
7	misreported to the Agency.
8	So we'll work on helping supply those
9	data sheets, but otherwise, I don't have any
10	follow-up on question 5.
11	HEARING OFFICER FOX: And, Ms. Franzetti,
12	I'm not seeing a signal that anyone else has a
13	follow-up on that request for data, so question
14	number 6 seems to be in order.
15	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Similarly, on
16	question 6, this was give me a second. I'm sorry.
17	Now I'm forgetting what my questions are.
18	Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Question 6 we
19	wanted specific confirmation that the Midwest
20	Generation Stations were included within the
21	statement on page 4 of Mr. Cobb's testimony that the
22	assessments conducted determined that none of these
23	sites with groundwater contamination threatened
24	offsite potable water supply wells.

Page 95 1 And the answer is: Yes, that that 2 statement does include the Midwest Gen Stations that 3 are listed in Attachment 1. 4 As to question 6(a), we questioned why 5 the Agency believes these regulations need to be adopted now, given that none of the sites threaten 6 7 offsite potable water supply wells, and the Agency's 8 response is: Illinois has groundwater quality 9 standards that apply onsite as well as offsite. In addition, the Agency is proposing these rules in 10 response to the site-specific rulemaking filed by 11 12 Ameren Energy Resources. 13 I have no follow-up questions. Moving on to question 7, I'll paraphrase. 14 15 I don't have a follow-up question. 16 My question was for the Agency to explain 17 what it meant by its statement at page 4 of 18 Mr. Cobb's testimony that these rules were developed 19 specifically to fill a regulatory gap that exists 20 pertaining to CCW surface impoundments at facilities, 21 and the Agency responded that the surface 22 impoundments are built and operated under the 23 Subtitle C regulations, but that Subtitle C does not 24 contain provisions for closure or corrective action.

Page 96 1 Therefore, the Agency believes there is a regulatory 2 gap. 3 It also noted the Board's recommendation 4 in AS 09-1 that a site-specific regulation be 5 developed under Subtitle G to address CCW surface impoundments, and the April 2013 Ameren Energy 6 7 Resources site-specific rulemaking proposal to close 8 multiple sites is also cited. No follow-up 9 questions. 10 Question 8: Is the intended scope of the proposed rules to address threats or impacts to 11 12 groundwater from CCW surface impoundments? 13 The answer is: Yes, as well as threats 14 or impacts to groundwater from leachate from CCW 15 surface impoundments. 16 Moving to question 9. Is it not -- and 17 excuse me -- this is where I stopped reviewing. Ι 18 ran out of time, so I won't be as quick to be able to 19 say whether I have a follow-up question or not. 20 Question 9: Is it not the intended scope 21 and purpose of these rules to address threats or 22 impacts to groundwater from sources other than CCW 23 surface impoundments at these facilities? Why did 24 the Agency decide to limit the scope of the rules to

February 26, 2014

	Page 97
1	impacts from CCW surface impoundments? Is it because
2	this is where the regulatory gap exists and there are
3	other existing state programs that can address
4	impacts on groundwater from other sources?
5	Agency Response is: Yes, the Agency does
6	not intend the scope of these rules to cover
7	activities other than surface impoundments containing
8	CCW or leachate from CCW. The Agency limited the
9	scope of these rules because, as stated above, this
10	is where the regulatory gap exists.
11	I don't have any follow-up questions.
12	Question 10. On page 7 of your pre-filed
13	testimony, you state that, quote, metals in
14	groundwater are most soluble in water with a low pH,
15	end quote. What pH range are you referring to as,
16	quote, low pH, end quote? Is it the, quote, below
17	4.5, end quote, pH range referenced at page 9 of your
18	testimony?
19	Agency Response: The statement was
20	intended to emphasize acidic conditions at 4.5 or
21	less.
22	I have no further questions on that.
23	Question 11 relating to TDS. On page 9
24	of your pre-filed testimony, you state that TDS can

February 26, 2014

	Page 98
1	cause, quote, objectionable taste and odor
2	conditions, end quote. At what TDS concentration
3	level do such conditions occur? Is it these types of
4	conditions that the Class I standards of 1,200
5	milligrams per liter is based on?
6	Agency Response: TDS can include
7	sulfate, which causes objectionable taste and odor
8	conditions, at a concentration of 250 milligrams per
9	liter. See the Agency's response to question 12
10	below: Yes, these are the types of conditions that
11	the Class I standard is based on.
12	No follow-up questions.
13	Moving to question 12, Sulfate. In the
14	1999 EPA Study of high levels of sulfate in drinking
15	water referenced on page 9 of your pre-filed
16	testimony, what concentrations of sulfate were
17	reported to cause the bad taste and smell reported by
18	the participants in the study?
19	Agency Response: 250 milligrams per
20	liter.
21	Moving to question 13 on the Boron. On
22	page 9 of your pre-filed testimony, you state that,
23	quote, boron contamination may prevent watering of
24	sensitive plants, end quote. Please explain what

February 26, 2014

Page 99 1 this statement means, including explaining what types 2 of plants you are referring to as quote-unquote 3 sensitive plants. 4 Agency Response: Boron is phytotoxic. 5 Table Roman Numeral V-14 from Water Quality Criteria 1972 describes what plants are sensitive to boron. 6 7 See Exhibit L. 8 Exhibit L to your Statement of Reasons? 9 MS. OLSON: No, Exhibit L that's 10 attached. MS. FRANZETTI: Oh, it's here? 11 12 MS. OLSON: Yeah. Did you get a package of exhibits? 13 14 MS. FRANZETTI: No. 15 MS. OLSON: Would you like me to get you 16 one? 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Yeah. 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Franzetti, 19 while we have a moment to break, we have been at it 20 for over two hours now, and at the risk of sounding 21 like I'm assigning homework during the lunch break, 22 that might be an opportunity to review the exhibits 23 that Ms. Olson is preparing -- submitting to you and 24 the written answers that we obtained earlier today,

February 26, 2014

Page 100 1 so that a break, in addition to good timing, might 2 give us a chance to move a little more guickly 3 through some of these questions when we resume this 4 afternoon. 5 Why don't you take up question number 14 6 if you don't object. We can get to the issue of 7 applicability, at least, and then we can see what a 8 one-hour break would -- and what time a one-hour 9 break would end. MS. FRANZETTI: Sure. Ouestion 14. 10 Is 11 the boron groundwater set at a level to protect against such harm to plants? 12 13 Agency Response: Yes, and other 14 beneficial uses. 15 Just a quick question. What do you mean 16 by other beneficial uses? 17 MR. COBB: Well, if you have a private 18 well in your front yard and it's your drinking water 19 source and it's also used to water your grass and 20 plants, which might include some of these trees that 21 could be in your yard, that's what I mean by other 22 beneficial uses. 23 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 24 MR. COBB: And taking a shower, swimming.

	Page 101
1	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further on
2	boron, Ms. Franzetti?
3	MS. FRANZETTI: No.
4	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Why don't we stop
5	there. We've reached the issue of applicability.
6	Our Board Members have suggested with lunch options
7	very close that we a 45-minute break, which should be
8	ample time, and we would plan to resume at 5 to 1:00
9	and we can pick up precisely where you have left off,
10	Ms. Franzetti, and attack your questions on
11	applicability.
12	We'll see you in 45 minutes, then. Thank
13	you.
14	(The noon recess was taken from 12:10
15	p.m. to 12:55 p.m.)
16	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you again for
17	your promptness in returning from the break. I did,
18	in coming to the head table, check the sign-in sheet
19	for people who wish to comment, and no other person
20	has signed in indicating that they wish to do so. So
21	we can proceed right back into the questions and the
22	answers to the Agency submitted earlier.
23	When we broke, Ms. Franzetti, we had
24	finished your question number 14 posed specifically

February 26, 2014

	Page 102
1	to Mr. Cobb, who suggested may be answered in full or
2	in part by other folks. I think that leaves us ready
3	to jump back into the question number 15 addressing
4	applicability, and we'll turn it over to you to begin
5	right there.
6	MS. FRANZETTI: Thank you. Surely.
7	With respect to question 15, I don't have
8	any follow-up questions.
9	The question relates to page 10 of your
10	pre-filed testimony, but since your answer does
11	indicate that there was an error in your testimony, I
12	think it's appropriate, for the record, for me to
13	read the question and answer.
14	On page 10 of your pre-filed testimony,
15	you state that, quote, the proposed rules apply to
16	units: (1) in operation after the effective date of
17	the proposed rules, or (2) that have groundwater
18	contamination attributable to the unit prior to the
19	effective date of these rules, end quote.
20	Isn't your reference in Part 2 of this
21	statement to units that have attributable groundwater
22	contamination, quote, prior to the effective date of
23	these rules, end quote, inconsistent with the
24	language of proposed Section 841.105, which states

February 26, 2014

	Page 103
1	that for units that are, quote, not operated after
2	the effective date of these rules, end quote, Part
3	841 applies when CCW or leachate from CCW, quote,
4	causes or contributes to an exceedance of the
5	groundwater quality standards on or after the
6	effective date of these rules, end quote.
7	Agency Response: The Agency agrees.
8	This was accidentally miscopied from page 18 of the
9	Technical Support Document.
10	Moving on to question 16. I don't have
11	follow-up until I get to 16(b), so I'm going to
12	paraphrase a little bit here. These questions deal
13	with the exemption from the proposed rules set forth
14	in Section $841.105(b)(4)(A)$ through (C), and the
15	Agency's response has confirmed that all three
16	requirements set forth in subparagraphs (A) through
17	(C) of this subparagraph (i.e., the liner
18	requirement, the removal of the CCW, or the CCW
19	leachate from the unit in a one year or less time
20	period and the maximum volume of no more than 25
21	cubic yards) must be satisfied in order for the
22	surface impoundment unit to be excluded from these
23	proposed rules.
24	The Agency noted that in comments by a

February 26, 2014

Page 104 1 few parties, including Midwest Gen, there was a suggestion that a de minimus exemption be developed, 2 3 and the Agency developed the de minimus exemption in 4 this Subsection(b)(4)(A)-(C). 5 In your response to question 16(a) in which we asked why it wasn't sufficient for purposes 6 7 of minimizing the risk of exposure to seasonal 8 recharge from precipitation to remove all the CCW and 9 any associated leachate on an annual basis, even if 10 the quantity is somewhat more than the 25 cubic yards, as long as the unit has the low permeability 11 12 liner required by this proposed rule, the Agency 13 responded that all three are required because it 14 provides a multiple barrier approach to protection. 15 For example, if one barrier fails, then there are two 16 more to ensure protection. 17 My question is whether the Agency has any 18 data or other information to support the need for 19 three multiple barriers -- its three multiple barrier 20 approach to protection. For example, any instances 21 of where a CCW unit, which has the specified liner in 22 (b)(4)(A) and from which CCW waste is removed on at 23 least a yearly basis, have there been adverse impacts 24 to groundwater when both of those conditions are

1 satisfied?

2 MR. COBB: We don't have the data in 3 place where the liner has been put in place and 4 there's currently problems and have had the timeframe 5 to watch to see what happens over time.

6 However, a multi barrier approach is 7 something that's used in a lot of the immediate 8 programs, including drinking water, and we feel it's 9 appropriate here, too. In fact, Midwest Generation recommended, I think, 50 cubic yards as one of the 10 criteria. We chose 25 because it's about one 11 truckload, one of the large trucks that can haul 12 13 waste away.

14 MS. FRANZETTI: Just to clarify, I think 15 what Midwest Gen's comment was, was that if you've 16 got a unit that only has up to 50 cubic yards in it, 17 regardless of the liner, regardless of anything else, 18 it should be exempted. It's just too small of a 19 source to warrant this kind of program, but I don't 20 think that we suggested that where you've got the 21 required liner, you're removing the CCW on a yearly 22 basis, that you could only have up to 50 cubic yards 23 in that unit for it to be exempted, and if that's the 24 way you interpreted it, I just want to correct that

> L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. 312-419-9292

Page 105

February 26, 2014

Page 106 1 for the record. 2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Can I have a follow-up 3 question? 4 MS. FRANZETTI: Yes. 5 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. Is the Agency 6 aware of any impoundments where a synthetic liner has 7 failed? 8 MR. COBB: No. 9 So the Agency's not aware MR. ARMSTRONG: 10 of any impoundments where a liner is needed to be replaced or relined? 11 12 MR. COBB: Can I ask for clarification? Your first question is different than your second 13 14 question, because in your second question you just 15 use the generic term liner. The first question you 16 used, are we aware of any synthetic liner. 17 MR. ARMSTRONG: Is the Agency aware of 18 any cases where an impoundment needed to be relined? 19 MR. COBB: Yes. 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: And what were those 21 cases? 22 MR. COBB: Midwest Generation. 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: And why did the 24 impoundments need to be relined?

	Page 107
1	MR. COBB: Because they didn't have
2	appropriate liners, and that was prior to the
3	installation of the appropriate liner, which is a
4	high density polyethylene liner with a hydraulic
5	conductivity of 1 x 10 to the minus 7 or less
6	centimeters per second.
7	MR. ARMSTRONG: And what was the
8	inappropriate liner in that case?
9	MR. COBB: It's a material called
10	pausopak (phonetic.)
11	MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. No further
12	questions.
13	MS. FRANZETTI: Question 16(b) was: Why
14	is 25 cubic yards a threshold for additional risk?
15	And the response is: See the Agency's
16	response to 16(a) above, referring back to the
17	multiple barrier approach.
18	But what we're trying to understand is
19	why specifically the Agency arrived at 25 cubic yards
20	as the amount.
21	MR. COBB: Sure. Well, Midwest Gen
22	actually recommended two truckloads as 50 cubic
23	yards, and we wanted to be a little bit more
24	protective, so we chose one truckload. So we

February 26, 2014

Page 108 1 actually built off of your recommendation of 50 cubic 2 yards, which I believe was referenced as being two 3 truckloads. 4 Okay. But Mr. Cobb, I MS. FRANZETTI: 5 quess we should have recommended four truckloads and 6 gotten you to pick 50. 7 MR. COBB: We were just trying to be more 8 protective. 9 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Question (c) was asking for the source or 10 basis of the permeability standard of 1 x 10 to the 11 12 minus 7 centimeters, and you did provide the source, 13 and that is in Exhibit M of the exhibits that were 14 filed today. 15 One other question on the HDPE liner that 16 is used at Midwest Gen impoundments today. What is 17 the hydraulic conductivity of the HDPE liner? 18 MR. COBB: At a minimum, it's 1 x 10 to 19 the minus 7 centimeters per second. It could be 20 actually a little bit less than that, but at a 21 minimum, it meets that performance standard. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: Do you recall whether the 23 information indicates it is actually a lot less than 24 ten to the minus seven?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

February 26, 2014

Page 109

MR. COBB: I do not recall. MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving to question 17, I'm going to paraphrase. I don't have any follow-up questions. This question deals with the exclusion relating to a stormwater unit that does not collect stormwater from a CCW surface impoundment. And the Agency's response is noting that runoff from a CCW storage pile would also be considered leachate, and so, therefore, the exclusion applies if the unit does not collect stormwater from a CCW surface impoundment, runoff from a CCW storage pile, or other CCW source, or leachate from a CCW landfill or other CCW source. Moving to question 18. The question asks for an explanation of how your statement at page 11 of your pre-filed testimony that quotes: Stormwater is a disperse nonpoint source of pollution that does not have a significant hydraulic head, end quote, is relevant to the proposed exclusion for stormwater runoff units. Agency Response is: The testimony was 23 referring to stormwater running over the land surface, not stormwater collected in an impoundment

Page 110 1 which has a hydraulic head. 2 Moving on to Definitions questions, 3 question number 19. I do have a question regarding 4 your answer. 5 The guestion dealt with the compliance point definition in Section 841.110 of the proposed 6 7 rules, which includes language that the compliance 8 point is, quote, a lateral distance of 25 feet from 9 the outer edge of the unit, or property boundary, whichever is less, and when you were asked to explain 10 the basis for the restrictions to the lateral 11 12 distance of 25 feet, even if the location of the 13 facility's property boundary is greater than 25 feet, and the Agency Response is that the, quote, 14 15 compliance point, end quote, as described is 16 consistent with the point of compliance in Part 620, 17 and see specifically Section 620.240. Within the 25 18 foot distance, the groundwater is Class IV. 19 Now, I'm going to stop there. I know the 20 answer goes on, I'll get to that, but I have a 21 question on that statement. 22 Why is it significant that within the 25 23 foot difference the groundwater is Class IV. 24 MR. DUNAWAY: The standard that must be

February 26, 2014

Page 111 1 met for Class IV groundwater is a monitored 2 concentration. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: And by the monitored concentration, what is being referred to? 4 5 MR. DUNAWAY: The result from a sample 6 collected from a monitoring well. 7 MS. FRANZETTI: So even within that 25 8 feet of the unit, the monitored concentration is 9 three times the standard, well over the standard, 10 it's in compliance with the Class IV requirements that apply to that 25 foot distance? 11 12 MS. OLSON: Can I just clarify? When you say three times over the standard, are you talking 13 about the Class I standard? 14 15 MS. FRANZETTI: Oh. Well, that's a good 16 That's a good guestion. Let's go back and question. 17 clarify that. So if Class IV is the monitored 18 19 concentration, it's whatever that value is that is 20 monitored in the groundwater in that 25 foot area, 21 lateral area, no matter how high the number is. 22 MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct. But I 23 would add to that, that the regulation specifies a 24 maximum of 25 feet, so if the well is closer than

February 26, 2014

Page 112 1 that, it would be less than 25 feet. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm sorry. I lost you on 3 that last statement. 4 MS. OLSON: Let me ask a couple guestions 5 and hopefully we can clarify. 6 When a facility develops a groundwater 7 monitoring system, they put wells in close to the 8 unit; is that correct? 9 MR. DUNAWAY: That's correct. 10 MS. OLSON: And is it possible that they could put the monitoring well in at 23 feet? 11 12 MR. DUNAWAY: It's possible. 13 MS. OLSON: And if the monitoring well 14 was placed at 23 feet, where would the compliance 15 point be? MR. DUNAWAY: At 23 feet. 16 17 MS. OLSON: Can a compliance point be at 26 feet? 18 19 MR. DUNAWAY: It can be, yes. 20 MS. OLSON: And when would that be? 21 MR. DUNAWAY: When a well's installed 22 there, compliance has to be met at any monitoring 23 point. 24 MS. OLSON: So when we say that the

February 26, 2014

Page 113 1 compliance point is 25 feet out, not farther than 25 2 feet out, what do we mean by that? 3 MR. DUNAWAY: We mean out to that 4 distance, it is Class IV groundwater. Beyond that 5 point, it's the appropriate class of groundwater, whichever the natural class would be. 6 7 Thank you. MS. OLSON: 8 MS. DEXTER: Can I ask a clarifying 9 follow-up, too? In the draft regulation, it says, a lateral distance of 25 feet from the outer edge of 10 the unit or property boundary, comma, whichever is 11 12 Is that whichever is closer? And closer to less. 13 what exactly? 14 MR. DUNAWAY: I don't believe there's 15 really a difference between whichever is closer and 16 whichever is less, but it's referring to the edge of 17 the unit. 18 MS. DEXTER: Thank you. 19 MS. FRANZETTI: Mr. Dunaway, I need to 20 ask you one more question to understand this concept. 21 I understand that you said that if the 22 monitoring well is located 23 feet from the edge of 23 the unit, then whatever the monitored concentration 24 is, is acceptable at that location. So is it correct

February 26, 2014

Page 114 1 that one can never be out of compliance with 2 groundwater standards at those -- at such a 3 monitoring location that is 23 feet from the edge of the unit? 4 5 MR. DUNAWAY: If the property boundary 6 were closer, you certainly could be out of compliance 7 at a closer distance. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. But assume the 9 property boundary is greater than the 23 foot 10 location of that monitoring well. MR. DUNAWAY: Within the area, it is 11 12 Class IV. However, if you are on that line, that 13 line is an imaginary line, of course. Immediately on 14 the other side of it, you must meet the standards 15 that are applicable to the natural class. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 17 MR. DUNAWAY: So if you can -- well, 18 okay. 19 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Could I ask a question? 20 My name is Amy Antoniolli. I'm here on behalf of 21 Medina Valley Cogen. 22 Just to follow up on that line of 23 questioning, within Class IV groundwater standards, 24 do the nondegradation standards apply?

	Page 115
1	MR. DUNAWAY: Not nondegradation as it's
2	typically referred to in Subpart C of 620. However,
3	since it's the monitored concentration repeat that
4	question.
5	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Within Class IV
6	groundwater, would the nondegradation standards
7	apply?
8	MR. DUNAWAY: Are you referring to the
9	Class IV groundwater within 25 feet of the unit, or
10	are you referring to Class IV groundwater beyond the
11	25 feet?
12	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Does that make a
13	difference? Sorry to answer with a question.
14	MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, because there are
15	Class there are areas of Class IV groundwater that
16	exist outside of 25 feet.
17	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Can you give an answer
18	to both, whether it's within the 25 feet boundary and
19	also whether there's a Class IV groundwater outside
20	of the 25 foot boundary and whether nondegradation
21	standards would apply in both cases?
22	MR. DUNAWAY: Class IV groundwater
23	requires that within that 25 feet, it's the monitored
24	concentration. Beyond that distance, Class IV as

	Page 116
1	an example, in a previously mined area, the numerical
2	standards apply unless they have already been
3	exceeded, in which case the monitored concentration
4	would be the appropriate standard, which essentially
5	would mean you could not increase the concentration
6	in that area outside that 25 feet in a Class IV
7	groundwater area.
8	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Okay. Thank you.
9	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further,
10	Ms. Antoniolli?
11	MS. ANTONIOLLI: No.
12	MS. FRANZETTI: I will just go back to
13	note that as part of the Agency's Response to
14	question 19 regarding this issue of the definition of
15	compliance point, the Agency also references its
16	answers to Board questions 21 and 22 for
17	clarification and suggested alternate language.
18	Subsection 620.240(e)(1)(A) indicates: A lateral
19	distance of 25 feet from the edge of such potential
20	source or the property boundary, comma, whichever is
21	less.
22	By referencing Section 620.240(e)(1)(A),
23	are you telling me that that's what you relied on for
24	the definition of compliance point and its use of

Page 117 1 this 25 foot distance? 2 MR. DUNAWAY: Let me look at my rules. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: Sure. MR. DUNAWAY: That's the definition of 4 5 compliance point for a potential primary or secondary source taken from 620, and since we said it was --6 7 that this definition is consistent with that, that's 8 a reference to where compliance point is defined in 620. 9 10 MS. FRANZETTI: And as you just noted, that's the definition -- that's the definition for 11 the compliance point when you're dealing with primary 12 13 and secondary sources under Part 620? 14 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 15 MS. FRANZETTI: Can you just briefly, for 16 all of our benefits, if you recall or if you've got 17 the regs in fronts of you, what is generally the 18 primary and secondary source for which Part 620 19 provides this kind of compliance point? 20 MR. DUNAWAY: Hang on just a second. 21 Sure. Thanks. MS. FRANZETTI: 22 While you're looking, I'm asking because 23 it's going to come up right in the very next 24 question, so let's have everybody have a general

February 26, 2014

Page 118 1 sense of what that means as we go on. 2 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. It's a fairly long 3 definition, but potential primary source --4 MS. FRANZETTI: Feel to paraphrase, if 5 you would like. 6 MR. DUNAWAY: Potential primary source 7 means any unit or facility at a site not currently 8 subject to removal or remedial action, which is 9 utilized for the treatment, storage, or disposal of 10 any hazardous or special waste not generated at the site, utilized for the disposal of municipal waste 11 12 generated at the site, or other landscape waste -- or 13 excuse me -- other than landscape or construction demolition debris, utilized for landfilling, land 14 15 treating, or surface impounding or piling of any 16 hazardous or special waste that is generated on site 17 or other sites owned, controlled, or operated by the 18 same person. 19 And then there's also a requirement for 20 storage of hazardous substances, which is more than 21 75,000 pounds above ground or 7,500 pounds below 22 ground. 23 Potential secondary source means a unit 24 or facility at a site not currently subject to rule

February 26, 2014

	Page 119
1	or remedial action, other than a potential primary
2	source, which is utilized for landfilling, land
3	treating, or surface impounding of waste that is
4	generated on the site or at other sites owned,
5	controlled, or operated by the same person, other
6	than livestock or landscape or demolition debris,
7	stores or accumulates any size more than 25,000, but
8	not more than 75,000 pounds aboveground, more than
9	2,500 or more, or 7,500 pounds below ground of
10	hazardous substance.
11	Then there's an exemption for storage of
12	fuel aboveground or below ground, pesticides,
13	fertilizers, deicing agents and livestock waste
14	handling, which probably we're not concerned about
15	here.
16	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So now let me go
17	on to question 19(a), and the question was asking:
18	Why didn't the Agency follow the Zone of Attenuation
19	approach and the distance that is allowed under the
20	Zone of Attenuation approach as defined in Section
21	810.103, which basically goes out a hundred feet from
22	the edge of one or more adjacent units versus your
23	use of the 25 foot distance?
24	And your answer was that the Agency

	Page 120
1	relied on Part 620 in determining where the
2	compliance points were located. The smaller distance
3	was adopted by the Board for potential primary and
4	secondary sources, excluding landfills, in Section
5	620.240(e) because these units are generally smaller
6	than landfills and do not require a larger area for
7	determining compliance.
8	First of all, a very specific question to
9	make sure I understand your statement. When you say
10	because these units are generally smaller than
11	landfills, are we talking about CCW units, or is that
12	referring back to the primary and secondary sources,
13	excluding landfills?
14	MR. COBB: Well, when we were doing that
15	as part of the groundwater standards docket under
16	RD9-14(b), we had a specific subsection under Section
17	620.250(a) that is related to a Zone of Attenuation
18	for landfills. (E) was for potential and primary and
19	secondary sources, which includes things like coal
20	combustion waste surface impoundments, and now
21	retrospectively, and it still makes sense, they're
22	still generally smaller than most of the landfills
23	that I've seen out there than it did back in 1991
24	when we worked on this with the Pollution Control

February 26, 2014

Page 121 1 Board, but that is what the Board adopted. The unit was also defined in the Act 2 under the definitions of the Act. The potential 3 4 source definitions were, also. 5 MS. FRANZETTI: Yeah. I'm sorry, I'm now -- I'm still unclear. 6 Mr. Cobb. 7 When this answer says because these units 8 are generally smaller than landfill, are we referring to CCW units there? 9 10 MR. COBB: Yes. MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So given the use 11 12 of generally smaller, would you agree, though, that 13 there are CCW units that are certainly as big as a 14 lot of landfills? 15 MR. COBB: I don't have that kind of 16 comparative data to know that, no. 17 MS. FRANZETTI: All right. Well, how big 18 do you think a landfill is, when we're talking here 19 that CCW units are generally smaller than landfills? 20 What is in the Agency's head is the size of a 21 landfill that a CCW unit is smaller than? 22 MR. COBB: Well, taking a tour of Lake 23 County in that area, some of them are much greater 24 than -- maybe the largest impoundment I've seen is

February 26, 2014

	Page 122
1	400 acres. I've certainly seen landfills double or
2	triple that size, and most of the surface
3	impoundments I've seen are nowhere near the largest
4	that I've seen, which is about 400 acres.
5	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Did the Agency go
6	back and look at the underlying record and the
7	rulemaking that you were referring to earlier in your
8	answer to see on what basis there was a distinction
9	drawn between landfills and primary and secondary
10	sources?
11	MR. COBB: Yeah. I remember what the
12	basis was. The landfill regulations were already in
13	existence and had kind of a zone they had a Zone
14	of Attenuation, which is really you know, you
15	can't monitor underneath the unit. That's the basis
16	of this whole thing. You've got to move some way
17	out. You need a little bit of room to work
18	horizontally and vertically. That's the whole
19	purpose of this.
20	And yes, those rules were already adopted
21	by the Board at the time when we were doing the Part
22	620 or Part 620 regulations.
23	So yes, I remember the rationale because
24	I was involved in it. We were saying there are also

February 26, 2014

Page 123 1 these other units, other than the landfills, that we 2 probably should give a similar but conservative 3 compliance area to work with that, and that was the basis. 4 5 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So from your recollection, the basis wasn't that -- a feeling that 6 7 the regs had been wrong when they adopted the hundred 8 foot plane for landfills. 9 MR. COBB: No. 10 MS. OLSON: May I ask a follow-up question? 11 12 Rick, to your knowledge, are service impoundments included in the definition of landfills 13 14 found in Part 810 of the Board's regulations? 15 No, they are not. MR. COBB: MS. OLSON: So do landfills have Zones of 16 17 Attenuation -- or excuse me. Let me start over. 18 Do service impoundments have Zones of 19 Attenuation as provided in 35 Ill. Adm. Code 811 to 20 814. 21 MR. COBB: No, they do not. 22 MS. OLSON: That's all I have. 23 MS. FRANZETTI: Well, is your compliance 24 point approach similar to a Zone of Attenuation

Page 124 1 approach, or no? 2 MR. COBB: As I just described, we built 3 off of that Zone of Attenuation approach. Yes, it 4 is. 5 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. You just chose to 6 use a shorter distance. 7 MR. COBB: We chose to be preventive. That was the intent of the Illinois Groundwater 8 9 Protection Act is to be preventive, and these are areas in which to work with. 10 There were some conditions on the -- on those areas under the 11 12 groundwater standards, too, that I don't think have 13 been mentioned that the source of any release of 14 contaminants has been controlled within that area, 15 and migrations within the site resulting from the 16 release of groundwater has been minimized. So I'm 17 not sure your three times the standard example may be 18 correct. 19 I mean, you have to meet these standards, so it's an area in which to work with it. It's not a 20 21 pollution zone, though. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 23 MR. RAO: Mr. Cobb, are you also aware of 24 under the landfill rules when they have a hundred

February 26, 2014

	Page 125
1	foot zone that zone is coupled with a very detailed
2	groundwater impact assessment that needs to show that
3	they comply with the standards for a hundred years.
4	MR. COBB: Yeah.
5	MR. RAO: That's kind of different from
6	what's being proposed here.
7	MR. COBB: Exactly. Remember, these
8	units have didn't have design standards from the
9	get-go with modeling done from the get-go that showed
10	the technology controls a hundred years after closure
11	were going to be in compliance at that Zone of
12	Attenuation point of compliance a hundred years after
13	closure.
14	So when we were, you know, trying to be
15	cognizant that there are other things than landfills,
16	potential primary and secondary source, we proposed
17	to the Board this area and the Board adopted that for
18	these other types of units.
19	MR. RAO: Okay.
20	MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to 19(b). In the
21	proposed federal coal combustion residual rules, it
22	is proposed that the compliance boundary be
23	established at 150 meters downgradient of the unit
24	boundary or the facility property line, whichever is

February 26, 2014

	Page 126
1	closer. Did the Agency consider using the 150 meters
2	distance instead of the lateral distance of 25 feet
3	and, if so, why did the Agency reject the use of the
4	150 meters distance?
5	The Agency Responds: The Agency elected
6	to follow the compliance distance already applicable
7	to these units pursuant to Section 620.240(e)(1)(A),
8	and by that and by saying the Section
9	620.240(e)(1)(A) provision is already applicable to
10	these units, it is because you feel they're within
11	the definition of a primary or secondary source; is
12	that correct?
13	MR. COBB: Yes.
14	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Putting aside the
15	fact that you believe Section 620.240(e)(1)(A)
16	already applies to these CCW units, given that you're
17	now enacting or proposing to enact specific
18	regulations for CCW units, did the Agency conduct an
19	evaluation of the EPA's reasoning for using the 150
20	meter distance and, in fact, find it inappropriate
21	for whatever reason?
22	MR. COBB: We considered and evaluated
23	the 150 meter distance; however, the monitoring that
24	we've seen conducted at these facilities, which I

February 26, 2014

	Page 127
1	don't believe USEPA has, but we do have site-specific
2	monitoring, it certainly appears that the monitoring
3	wells that were established relative to the Board's
4	existing compliance points still seems to make sense.
5	We don't have tremendous offsite
6	groundwater contamination, and we didn't have Zones
7	of Attenuation around these units like we did
8	landfills. We have groundwater contamination, but it
9	still seems that the tighter distances are
10	applicable, in our opinion, and appropriate.
11	MS. FRANZETTI: Is there anything
12	specific to CCW units that makes you say that 25 feet
13	is more appropriate than the USEPA's proposed 150
14	meter distance, or where, if the property line is
15	closer?
16	MR. COBB: Well, landfills have liners,
17	and they're designed with the modeling up front.
18	Landfills, in my opinion, as I described earlier,
19	still appear to be a lot larger than what I've seen
20	as the typical or general surface impoundment.
21	Like I say, the largest impoundment that
22	I'm aware of is 400 acres, and most of them are
23	significantly less than that.
24	MS. FRANZETTI: Moving on to 19(c).

February 26, 2014

Page 128

1 In the Part 814 landfill regulations, in 2 Section 418.402(b)(3), it is provided that upon a 3 petition by the owner or operator, the Board may 4 provide for a Zone of Attenuation and adjust the 5 compliance boundary. Is it correct that such a 6 provision for petitioning the Board to provide a Zone 7 of Attenuation and to adjust the compliance boundary 8 is not included in these rules, and if not, why not? 9 And the Agency responded that the 10 proposed rules do not contain this provision because anyone can seek an adjusted standard from the Board's 11 12 rules of general applicability pursuant to Section 13 28.1 of the Act. 14 So am I correct that the Agency's view is 15 it's really unnecessary to say in these rules that an 16 owner or operator can petition the Board for some 17 change because if you can make your showing under an 18 adjusted standard, you've got that right? 19 That's my understanding. MR. COBB: 20 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. And my concern is 21 just -- and that's why I want that on the record --22 because 814 has an express provision that one may 23 argue, well, if you were allowed to do that under the 24 Part 841 rules, once they become effective, it would

Page 129 1 have said you could, and it doesn't, so that's the 2 difference. 3 So that's why I want to make it clear, 4 the Agency is not attempting by leaving out that kind 5 of language to foreclose adjusted standard relief; you just don't feel it's necessary because 6 7 everybody's got that right under the Act. 8 Okay. All right. 9 Question 20. I do have a follow-up 10 question on your answer, so let me read this one, 11 also. 12 Section 811.317 of the Solid Waste Landfill rules addresses groundwater impact 13 14 assessments and provides for a systematic assessment 15 of the impacts of the seepage of leachate from a 16 solid waste unit, including the use of a groundwater 17 contaminant transport model. Please explain whether, 18 and if so, how, the Agency considered this approach 19 to assessment of impacts from CCW surface 20 impoundments in these proposed rules? 21 Agency responds: The Agency did consider 22 this approach to assessment of impacts from CCW 23 surface impoundments in these proposed rules for both a corrective action at a unit and closure of a unit. 24

February 26, 2014

	Page 130
1	The proposed rule includes the Corrective Action
2	Sections 310(e) and (f), as well as the Section
3	410(a) and (b) which addressed this issue.
4	Specifically, Section 310(e) requires that the
5	corrective action plan include groundwater monitoring
6	modeling results and supporting documentation be
7	provided as applicable to establish a GMZ. Again,
8	the Closure Plan Section 410(a)(7) requires the
9	groundwater modeling results and supporting
10	documentation be provided where appropriate to
11	establish a GMZ.
12	My question is, is what you are saying is
13	that while you didn't mirror the language that's in
14	Section 811.317, in general, the technical aspects of
15	the groundwater impact assessment to be done under
16	these proposed rules is going to be the same.
17	MR. BUSCHER: I'm not sure that it's
18	going to be the same, but it's similar in principle.
19	MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to question 21.
20	I'm going to paraphrase here because I don't have a
21	follow-up question until 21(c).
22	These questions deal with, in part,
23	statistical analysis with respect to the results of
24	groundwater monitoring, and with respect to question

February 26, 2014

	Page 131
1	(c), which is, if a statistical analysis is applied
2	to make this determination and that's relating to
3	confirming existing concentrations of contaminants
4	is it an intra well statistical analysis that is
5	required for each of the GMZ wells?
6	And the Agency responded: An intra well
7	statistical analysis may be used.
8	Our question is, what else could be used?
9	You're saying may be used. We don't know what else
10	you could use, other than this type other than a
11	statistical analysis.
12	MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. When you say intra
13	well statistical analysis, are you talking about a
14	technique specifically that uses the background from
15	a wait a minute. Let me start over again.
16	Are you talking about a statistical
17	technique where the existing concentrations for a
18	well are established and then the results are $$
19	later results are compared to that, or are you
20	talking about intra well in as much as each
21	monitoring well is a compliance point?
22	MS. FRANZETTI: Mr. Dunaway, I never took
23	statistics in college, something that I really regret
24	now, so I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Gnat to

Page 132

1 answer your question.

2	MR. GNAT: The intent of the question is,
3	and we'll have some questions further on that, the
4	statistical analysis can be pretty complex the way
5	these are laid out, and at some point we're going to
6	be looking at intra well statistics for wells and
7	maybe specific parameters within an individual well,
8	which need to be evaluated separately.
9	So once we're going into this GMZ, and
10	then we've got to provide our determinations, the way
11	the question was answered is that an intra well
12	statistical analysis may be used.
13	What we're saying is, right now it
14	appears that's the only tool that can really address
15	some of these questions. So is there something else
16	out there that the Agency is aware of that would be
17	acceptable to you as we're doing these evaluations,
18	or is this really the only avenue that we have, in
19	which case it's not that it may be used, it's the
20	only tool that's available at that level of detail.
21	MR. DUNAWAY: I'm not sure I understand
22	from your questions where you're referring to the
23	intra well would be the only method that would be
24	acceptable.

Page 133

1 MR. GNAT: For example, and this deviates 2 a little bit off here, but it intertwines with some 3 questions further down.

4 We've established a groundwater 5 management zone. We're evaluating the performance of 6 the source control measure that was employed, you 7 know, as monitored within the groundwater management 8 zone. We have a compliance point within that 9 groundwater management zone of whichever monitoring well we're looking at. We really have to look at it 10 on an individual basis at that point, if our upgraded 11 12 versus downgradient statistics don't fit the standard 13 use.

So you're looking at a single well. Making a determination, am I going to be -- am I in compliance or not within my groundwater management zone, and you have to run statistics on the parameter on an intra well basis to make that determination.

19 Is there any other way that we can show 20 compliance at that location, short of doing the 21 statistics?

22 MR. DUNAWAY: I believe in the case 23 you're describing, an intra well analysis would be 24 the only way to do that.

Page 134 1 MR. GNAT: Thank you. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to move to 3 question 22. This question related to whether it was 4 correct with respect to the proposed leachate 5 definition, that it also excludes and does not apply 6 to the ash slurry or combination of ash and 7 wastewater within the conveyance system used to 8 transport it to the surface impoundment unit, or 9 basically the CCW unit. And the Agency Response is 10 Why not? no. MR. COBB: It's the definition of 11 12 leachate that would propose not the applicability 13 section to the rule that makes me answer this no. It's based on how the question was asked. 14 15 MS. OLSON: When you answered this 16 question, were you evaluating whether or not the 17 structures that contained the ash slurry, or combination of ash and wastewater within the 18 19 conveyance system was applicable to this rule? 20 MR. COBB: No. 21 MS. OLSON: Were you just evaluating 22 whether or not the definition of leachate would be 23 applicable to the ash slurry or combination of ash and wastewater? 24

February 26, 2014

Page 135 1 MR. COBB: Yes, because it could be 2 moving through those units. 3 MS. OLSON: So the context of the 4 conveyance system would be considered under the 5 definition of leachate under this proposed rule. 6 MS. FRANZETTI: I thought you were going 7 to go to the next step, which -- would you answer 8 this question, based on not the definition of 9 leachate, but what we're trying to understand is, is 10 the conveyance system subject to these rules? 11 MR. COBB: If it has leachate in it. 12 MS. OLSON: Let me ask another question. 13 What part -- a part of the conveyance system would include a pipe; is that correct? 14 15 MR. COBB: Yes. MS. OLSON: Is a pipe a surface 16 17 impoundment? 18 MR. COBB: No. 19 MS. OLSON: Are pipes covered under this 20 rule? 21 So that part of the MR. COBB: No. 22 conveyance system would not be considered under these 23 rules; is that right? 24 MR. COBB: Correct.

	_
	Page 136
1	MS. OLSON: Is there any particular part
2	of the conveyance system that you believe is a
3	surface impoundment?
4	MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Could you repeat
5	the question, please? It's hard to hear you back
6	here.
7	MS. OLSON: Is there a part of the
8	conveyance system that is considered to be a surface
9	impoundment?
10	MR. COBB: No, it's all based on the
11	leachate definition.
12	MS. OLSON: Is it possible that a
13	site-specific situation may arise where there would
14	be an impounding structure intertwined with the
15	conveyance?
16	MR. COBB: Yes.
17	MS. FRANZETTI: Moving on to question 23,
18	Previous Investigations, Plans and Programs.
19	My question related to testimony on page
20	18 of your pre-filed testimony, and it was: Has the
21	Agency reviewed the previous assessments and the
22	components of the Compliance Commitment Agreements
23	entered into between it and Midwest Gen for the
24	Midwest Gen stations as shown on Attachment 1 to your

February 26, 2014

Page 137 1 testimony and determined that all of the components 2 required in this section are included. 3 The Agency Response: The Agency has not reviewed the previous assessments and components of 4 5 the CCAs and compared them to the requirements of the 6 proposed rule. 7 My question is, will the Agency be doing that review at some future time? 8 9 MR. COBB: First of all, I would probably 10 want to wait to see what the rule requirements are before we do that assessment, so after that's done, I 11 12 can anticipate we would probably be doing that. Okay. So if I understand 13 MS. FRANZETTI: 14 your answer correctly, you won't do this review until 15 the final -- any final rulings are adopted in this 16 proceeding? 17 MR. COBB: Yes. 18 MS. FRANZETTI: And at some point 19 thereafter, though, is it the Agency's intention to 20 take a look at existing work that's already been done 21 by companies and apprise them whether or not it feels 22 that that work does satisfy the requirements of any 23 final rules adopted in this proceeding? 24 MR. COBB: Absolutely. The rules require

February 26, 2014

Page 138 1 that that work be resubmitted and repackaged in case 2 we're missing something; and, yes, there is a 3 requirement on us to review that. 4 MS. FRANZETTI: If Midwest Gen believes, based on its understanding of the final rules, that 5 6 the previous assessments that it's done meets the 7 requirements of these rules, then it could simply 8 just resubmit those to you for review? 9 MR. COBB: Yes. 10 MS. FRANZETTI: Okav. We're now at the questions for Bill 11 12 Buscher, Subpart C, Corrective Action, question 1. 13 Excuse me just a second. 14 I don't have any follow-up questions 15 until I get to 1(b), so I'm going to go to that 16 question. 17 If the groundwater concentrations above 18 the groundwater standards for the particular 19 constituents detected in both upgradient and 20 downgradient monitoring wells for a unit are 21 substantially the same, or if the concentration 22 levels of groundwater exceedances concentrations for 23 the constituents in the downgradient well are lower 24 than in the upgradient well, is this sufficient

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 139
1	evidence for the Agency to determine that the release
2	is not associated with the unit? And, if not, what
3	else is necessary?
4	Agency Response: No. In this case, the
5	groundwater flow conditions would need to be
6	carefully evaluated. Many of the impoundments are
7	located near rivers or lakes where groundwater flow
8	direction may change on a regular basis due to the
9	change in elevation of the water body.
10	So tell me what if the groundwater
11	flow direction changes in a given location of a CCW,
12	then what does the owner or operator have to do to
13	make its alternative cause demonstration?
14	MR. BUSCHER: You know, I think it's a
15	site-specific call, and I'd need really more
16	site-specific information.
17	I will say one thing: Due to the nature
18	of these impoundments, you can have groundwater flow
19	that flows out regularly, so in the process of your
20	question, you are simplifying geometry, and it could
21	very well be as stated in your question that you have
22	contaminants quote-unquote, upgradient, that are due
23	to the impoundment, and that would not surprise me.
24	MS. FRANZETTI: Uh-huh.

	Page 140
1	MR. BUSCHER: And I understand, you know,
2	where you're going but, you know, that's a physical
3	fact. I've seen it happen. And my point with the
4	river is that the river is another complicating
5	factor.
6	MS. FRANZETTI: I understand. But it's
7	also the case that the reason that your upgradient
8	well has got higher levels of a constituent in it
9	than does your downgradient well, even though the
10	downgradient well may also be somewhat the standard,
11	is because the actual source is somewhere upgradient
12	of the upgradient well, and so what we're trying to
13	understand here is, how do you show the Agency in
14	that situation that it's not a CCW unit that's the
15	cause of the impact?
16	MR. BUSCHER: As I stated in the
17	response excuse me for a moment.
18	You would need to look more closely at
19	evaluating groundwater flow, the specific flow at the
20	site.
21	MS. FRANZETTI: Why? To what end? I
22	don't understand what you mean by saying more closely
23	evaluate.
24	MS. OLSON: Can I jump in?

Page 141 1 MS. FRANZETTI: Sure. 2 MS. OLSON: Would it depend on the facts 3 of the site? So if you've got groundwater flow 4 information in front of you that's very 5 straightforward, it's simple geometry, the conclusion 6 would be easy to reach. It would be that the 7 upgradient well has higher contamination than the 8 downgradient well from a source other than the unit. 9 Is that a possible solution you could reach based on 10 your evaluation? MR. BUSCHER: That's a conclusion one 11 12 could reach, yes. 13 MS. OLSON: Then, is it also true that 14 you could look at the direction of the groundwater 15 flow and conclude that there's radial groundwater 16 flow, and therefore you cannot make that conclusion 17 that the upgradient well is not necessarily from a source other than from a unit? 18 19 MR. BUSCHER: That is correct. 20 MS. OLSON: So what -- did you have to 21 evaluate the difference -- the groundwater flow at 22 each site to be able to answer this question? 23 MR. BUSCHER: Yes. 24 MS. FRANZETTI: Am I correct in

	Page 142
1	understanding that it's the Agency's position that if
2	there's any doubt as to whether or not the cause of
3	the impact is the unit or something else, you are
4	going to feel authorized under these rules to say the
5	owner or operator has not satisfactorily demonstrated
6	it's an alternate source?
7	MR. BUSCHER: There's a section in this
8	regulation that allows the regulated entity to make
9	just the argument that you're referring to, I
10	believe, and that was our intent, and if you were not
11	to agree with the conclusion we would draw, you've
12	got the opportunity to go to the Board.
13	MS. OLSON: Can I ask one more question,
14	or a couple questions? Bill, can you explain to me
15	what a potentiometric surface map is?
16	MR. BUSCHER: Certainly. A
17	potentiometric surface map is a map very similar to a
18	topographic map that shows lines of equal elevation,
19	and in the case of a potentiometric surface map, it
20	shows lines of equal elevation in the surface of the
21	water and the groundwater saturated zone surface, top
22	of it.
23	MS. OLSON: If you were provided with a
24	potentiometric surface map, could you evaluate the

February 26, 2014

Page 143 1 groundwater flow for a particular site? 2 MR. BUSCHER: Yes. 3 MS. OLSON: Would it help you determine 4 whether or not the source of the pollution is the 5 unit or some other source offsite? 6 MR. BUSCHER: Yes. That would be an aid, 7 yes. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: I don't have any 9 follow-up on 1(c) or (d). Is it okay if I just move 10 on to question 2? 11 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mrs. Franzetti, I'm not seeing any indication that 1(c) or (d) has 12 13 generated any follow-up, so please go ahead. 14 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. And I'd also like 15 to skip 2 because I think the Agency response is 16 understandable, and I don't have any follow-up 17 questions. 18 Okay. Moving to 3. Do the proposed 19 rules allow for the use of a Tiered Approach to 20 Corrective Action, acronym is TACO, as provided under 21 Part 742 of 35 Ill. Adm. Code, and, if not, why not? 22 And the Agency Response is: No. The use 23 of a Tiered Approach to Corrective Action, or TACO, 24 as provided under Part 742 of 35 Ill. Adm. Code is

February 26, 2014

Page 144 1 not intended for these sites. The impoundments at 2 these sites are operated under permits issued by the 3 Agency must be in compliance with permit conditions. 4 Go back to my very first question on the 5 first page, because I'm not following this "under permits" reference. 6 7 I asked if the proposed 841 rules 8 establish a new permit program, and the answer is no, 9 but now to justify the exclusion of TACO to these units, the answer is, they're operated under permits 10 11 issued by the Agency. I am confused. Can you help 12 clarify? 13 MR. BUSCHER: That would be under a 14 Subtitle C permit to operate these units. 15 MS. FRANZETTI: What is a Subtitle C 16 permit? 17 MR. BUSCHER: It includes NPDES or 309 18 Subtitle -- Subpart A in the state operating permit 19 under 309 Subpart B. 20 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. It includes NPDES 21 permits. That is one category of what the -- what a 22 Subtitle C permit can be. 23 MR. BUSCHER: That's my understanding. MS. FRANZETTI: And it also includes for 24

Page 145 1 309 state operating permits. 2 That's my understanding. MR. BUSCHER: MS. FRANZETTI: All right. So is it the 3 4 Agency's understanding that all of the Midwest Gen 5 impoundments that you've got listed in Attachment 1 are either covered by an existing NPDES permit or by 6 7 the 309 state operating permit? 8 MR. BUSCHER: Okay. No person should 9 violate -- it's construct, install, or operate any equipment, facility, vessel, or aircraft capable of 10 causing or contributing to water pollution. So it's 11 12 a requirement under the regulation. 13 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So --MR. BUSCHER: Under the Act. Under the 14 15 Environmental Protection Act, excuse me. MS. FRANZETTI: And because there is some 16 17 permit, whether it's 309 or NPDES permit that is 18 applicable to the CCW units, even though those 19 permits don't address all the issues you're trying to 20 address under these proposed rules, the Agency's 21 taking the position that TACO should not be 22 applicable because these units are already subject to 23 a permitting program. 24 MR. BUSCHER: Yes.

Page 146

1 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 2 Moving then to guestion 4. Question 4 3 relates to the use of an institutional control 4 prohibiting potable water use as part of an owner or 5 operator's corrective action plan, whether or not it is the Agency's intention under these proposed rules 6 7 that corrective action plans may incorporate and rely 8 on the provisions for institutional controls that are 9 provided in Subpart J of the Part 742 TACO 10 regulations. I mean, that is my question, and, if so, 11 12 where is that provided in the proposed rules, and, if 13 not, how will the Agency make the determination of 14 what is or is not an acceptable institutional 15 control? 16 The Agency Response is: The use of a 17 TACO as provided under Part 742 of 35 Ill. Adm. Code 18 is not intended for these sites. The Agency will make the determination of what is or what is not an 19 20 acceptable institutional control prohibiting potable 21 water use at a site on a case-by-case basis. 22 Why, when there are provisions under TACO 23 about what are and what are not appropriate 24 institutional controls when addressing similar

February 26, 2014

Page 147 1 releases, are you not willing to utilize the 2 provisions that have been established and have been 3 used now for a number of years by the Agency under Part 742? 4 5 MR. BUSCHER: As long as their use has a 6 correct authority, I think that's where this -- the 7 use or not the use of them really depends upon the authorization of the use in the Act. 8 9 MR. COBB: In the Part 841 rules, we 10 specify that you can use an institutional control after every effort has been made to clean up the 11 12 groundwater down to an asymptotic level. That was in 13 my pre-filed testimony. 14 Further, under TACO, there's a requirement that there's total closure. It isn't the 15 16 case with many of these units at these facilities 17 that are part of a wastewater treatment system. So there's a business distinction here 18 19 between totally closing out and cleaning up and 20 eliminating versus some of these are still being 21 used. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: What are you referring to 23 under TACO as totally closing up? 24 MR. COBB: Let's get back to you on that.

Page 148

1 That's my understanding.

2	MS. FRANZETTI: All right. Would you
3	agree that there are TACO projects that go on at
4	operating facilities where they might have addressed
5	a specific release, but they're still going to be
6	operating and using those same types of contaminants,
7	but they've addressed an initial release. Similarly
8	here, you could address a release from a CCW, but it
9	may continuing operating.
10	MR. COBB: Let me in your statement
11	you used the word facility, not unit. We're talking
12	about units.
13	MS. FRANZETTI: I understand you are.
14	MR. COBB: Yeah. So you may use TACO for
15	some other unit at one of your facilities that is not
16	covered by this regulation, not a CCW unit. Maybe
17	it's a coal pile or some other legacy activities
18	that's not a CCW impoundment. That's the
19	distinction.
20	MS. FRANZETTI: I understand. I was
21	trying to show you that under TACO you don't
22	necessarily have closed up everything or removed
23	everything in order to be able to utilize the TACO
24	approach to getting a no further remediation letter.

	Page 149
1	MR. COBB: My understanding is we were
2	changing the language to talk about the individual
3	unit at that facility, that you would have to close
4	out that unit; not the entire facility, but you would
5	have to quit using that unit.
6	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay.
7	MR. COBB: It would have to be closed and
8	removed.
9	MS. FRANZETTI: I understand that's your
10	position.
11	MR. COBB: There's a big distinction
12	between facility and unit.
13	MS. FRANZETTI: Now, with respect to this
14	statement that the Agency will make the determination
15	of what is or what is not an acceptable institutional
16	control prohibiting potable water use on a site on a
17	case-by-case basis, what criteria are you going to
18	use?
19	MR. COBB: What we're looking at is if
20	you have a corrective action or you have a
21	groundwater management zone, essentially what we'll
22	be looking at in trying to determine if an
23	institutional control is appropriate is looking at
24	Section 620.424, the alternative groundwater

February 26, 2014

	Page 150
1	restoration standards, and if you've done every
2	effort you can do to mitigate that impairment and
3	you're reaching some asymptotic level, as I provided
4	in my testimony, there may not be anymore cleanup
5	that can be done.
6	So it's at that time, then, that
7	alternative water supplies, if it's an offsite
8	concern or an onsite institutional control, may be
9	appropriate.
10	So essentially, you know, the standard
11	that we're looking at is in Section 620.454(b), the
12	concentration that's determined by groundwater
13	monitoring. If the standard exceeds the applicable
14	numerical standard for such constituent that to the
15	extent practicable, the exceedance has been minimized
16	and beneficial use is appropriate for the class of
17	groundwater's been returned, and any threat to public
18	health of the environment has been minimized.
19	So that's the standard in saying, are we
20	at a point where we have to adopt an institutional
21	control offsite and/or onsite. Has every effort been
22	done to do what I just read.
23	MS. FRANZETTI: I actually want to go
24	back for a moment to the TACO point and your

February 26, 2014

Page 151 1 understanding that TACO requires that the unit be 2 closed out, you know, and where a CCW could continue 3 operating. 4 So let's change the scenario to an owner 5 or operator is closing the CCW, but there is an 6 impact to the groundwater that's already occurred. 7 Then are the TACO -- is the TACO approach 8 appropriate? Because you're dealing with the same 9 situation where, as you say, the unit has been closed 10 down. 11 MR. COBB: I think the lead-in to the 12 TACO or site remediation program is that it's usually 13 determined by each agent, each bureau media within the Agency, and we still have the groundwater 14 15 management zone option, which is what we do in the Bureau of Water. 16 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Yes, but TACO applies to 18 groundwater as well. I don't understand the 19 distinction here. 20 MR. COBB: Groundwater management zones 21 also apply to groundwater. 22 MS. FRANZETTI: I understand, but why 23 should be it be different as to how TACO handles 24 groundwater impact when the unit has been closed down

February 26, 2014

,	Page 152
1	versus how these rules address groundwater impacts.
2	That's what I'm not understanding, why you feel you
3	need to exclude TACO principles in what seems to be a
4	very similar situation. Groundwater's impacted,
5	source is addressed, it's closed. That's what I'm
6	trying to understand.
7	MR. COBB: I believe this approach is
8	more protective and keeps in concert with the
9	nondegradation provisions in Section 12.
10	TACO is set up for voluntary cleanups.
11	These are under the permits. They violated the
12	permit conditions, they violated the groundwater
13	standards, and the GMZ is appropriate and applies.
14	MS. FRANZETTI: In TACO, they've violated
15	the groundwater standards, haven't they?
16	MR. COBB: Is there enforcement, or is it
17	a voluntary program? To me, it's a voluntary program
18	and not an enforcement program.
19	MS. FRANZETTI: And that's the
20	difference.
21	MR. COBB: All of these have the units.
22	MS. FRANZETTI: Right. So if you've
23	enforced, then the party you've enforced against
24	should be held to a stricter standard than the party

February 26, 2014

Page 153 1 who voluntarily addressed the situation. 2 MR. COBB: No. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: No. 4 MR. COBB: No. 5 MS. FRANZETTI: Well, you're the one who pointed out it's enforcement and not a voluntary 6 7 program. I'm trying to understand why that makes a 8 difference to you. 9 MR. COBB: These are permitted sites and they're operating under permits. These are permitted 10 units that are operating under permits. Most of the 11 12 units that are being cleaned up under TACO are not 13 under any Agency unit specific permit program. 14 MS. FRANZETTI: And that is the 15 distinction you're relying on. MR. COBB: Yes. Correct. 16 17 MR. JENNINGS: Can I ask a couple of 18 follow-up questions? Again, I'm James Jennings. 19 MR. JENNINGS: So, Rick, is it your 20 understanding that TACO applies to a certain subclass 21 of Agency programs? 22 MR. COBB: Yes. 23 MR. JENNINGS: Do you know off the top of 24 your head what those subclasses are?

Page 154 1 MR. COBB: Leaking underground storage 2 tanks, kind of abandoned sites, you know, sites that 3 aren't under subject to corrective action programs. 4 MR. JENNINGS: So are you aware of any 5 CCW surface impoundments that would be subject to the rules that govern leaking underground storage tanks? 6 7 MR. COBB: No. 8 MR. JENNINGS: Are you aware of any CCW 9 surface impoundments that would be subject to the 10 rules covering the SIP program? 11 MR. COBB: No. 12 MR. JENNINGS: Are you aware of any CCW 13 surface impoundments that would be subject to RCRA 14 Part B rules? 15 MR. COBB: No. 16 MR. JENNINGS: Are you aware, or is it 17 your understanding, that the TACO rules could apply 18 to other programs, so long as those programs don't 19 have other more direct qualifications for cleanup, or 20 in this case, groundwater standards? 21 MR. COBB: Yes. 22 MR. JENNINGS: Does Part 841 establish 23 specific cleanup standards for groundwater? 24 MR. COBB: Yes.

February 26, 2014

Page 155 1 MR. JENNINGS: Okay. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: What are the specific 3 cleanup standards that are established by Part 841? 4 MR. COBB: Well, we incorporate by reference the Part 620 standards under the 5 groundwater management zone and the alternative 6 7 restoration standards. 8 MS. OLSON: So, Rick, can you please tell 9 us what section would be for alternative groundwater quality standards at a site that has contamination? 10 What Section in 620? 11 12 MR. COBB: Section 620.450. 13 MS. OLSON: And those would be the 14 cleanup groundwater quality standards? 15 MR. COBB: Absolutely. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: And I take it you see a 17 difference between underground storage tanks that may 18 contain hazardous constituents versus a CCW unit 19 release. 20 MR. COBB: These contaminants -- the 21 contaminants are different. These are inorganic 22 contaminants that have a nondegradation potential 23 that if they were to go offsite or if there was to be 24 a well drilled onsite certainly can't be removed by

February 26, 2014

Page 156

1	the lowest common denominator of a potable water
2	supply if it's Class I groundwater, private drinking
3	water well, because most of these contaminants to
4	remove these contaminants would be more sophisticated
5	treatment than, say, removing gasoline constituents.
6	In fact, as I provided in my testimony,
7	in most cases, removing TDS or some of these other
8	inorganics would require reverse osmosis treatment
9	technology to remove it, and so Class I groundwater
10	is to protect current and future sources of drinking
11	water, which the lowest common denominator is a
12	private drinking water system, and the nondegradation
13	provisions that no person shall cause, threaten, or
14	allow additional treatment or more treatment than
15	what's already been provided in that situation.
16	Adding TDS, chlorides, sulfates, all
17	these contaminants would certainly be above and
18	beyond the naturally occurring level, and to get it
19	back down to that level, it would require some pretty
20	sophisticated treatment.
21	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving on to
22	question 5, and if you'd just give me a minute, this
23	is where I ran out of time before we came back to
24	lunch, so I haven't had a chance to read your

Page 157

1	answers.
2	Okay. Question 5 deals with the
3	situation with where ash is left in place and draws
4	the comparison to a closed solid waste landfill where
5	waste is also left in place, and asks why are these
6	CCW specific closure rules necessary instead of
7	simply applying the same closure rules that already
8	exist for solid waste landfills under Parts 811 and
9	814.
10	And the Agency Response is: These
11	surface impoundments are not landfills. The Illinois
12	Pollution Control Board has determined that a
13	site-specific rulemaking was in order for the
14	Hutsonville Ash Pond D, and then references the AS
15	09-01 Hutsonville proceeding.
16	My question is, I understand the Board
17	said that surface impoundments are not landfills, but
18	do you read the Board's decision in Hutsonville to
19	say that there is no relevance or applicability
20	potentially of the Part 811 and 814 requirements for
21	closing a solid waste landfill that are equally
22	applicable or suitable to apply to a CCW unit being
23	closed in place?
24	MR. BUSCHER: I believe that the reason

	Page 158
1	we're here is there's a radial tour gap that we're
2	trying to fill with respect to these promulgating
3	these regulations, and that's you know, these are
4	not landfills. They do not have liners. They are
5	what they are, and I don't think that applying those
6	other regulations I kind of think we're talking
7	apples and oranges.
8	MS. FRANZETTI: Did you conduct that
9	review? Did you look at the Part 811 and 814
10	requirements?
11	And first, I should say I'll take your
12	answer. That's not the case for my client's
13	impoundments, but let's first deal with that.
14	Did you look at 811 and 814 and say for
15	something that's not lined, none of these are
16	relevant or appropriate? Was that review conducted?
17	MS. OLSON: I'm sorry. Can you repeat?
18	I don't understand the question.
19	MS. FRANZETTI: The question is, in your
20	preparation of these proposed rules, did you look at
21	Part 811 and 814 provisions and determine none of
22	them would be relevant or appropriate to an unlined
23	surface impoundment?
24	MR. BUSCHER: Well, in this regulation,

February 26, 2014

Page 159 1 we considered both lined and unlined. Our 2 expectation is obviously some of them are lined; some 3 of them are not. 4 MS. FRANZETTI: Do you treat them 5 differently whether they're lined or unlined for purposes of the closure process? 6 7 MR. BUSCHER: I don't believe so. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. So that's my 9 point. So let's move to, you've got a lined CCW unit 10 like a lined landfill. Did you take a look at the Part 811 and 814 requirements and say, you know, 11 12 these are pretty similar creatures. We can apply a 13 lot of what's been in place for landfills to the CCW 14 units and not create a whole new program that has its 15 own unique requirements? 16 This is Lynn Dunaway. MR. DUNAWAY: We 17 did look at 811 and 814, and any of the aspects of 18 these rules that we felt might be applicable, we --19 not all of them necessarily, but we did incorporate 20 some of the aspects in here. 21 An example might be if you had a lined 22 facility, we required that the surface cover have a 23 hydraulic conductivity that was less than that bottom 24 liner so that we wouldn't be creating bathtubs. We

February 26, 2014

Page 160 1 think that's a good concept. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: And on what basis did you 3 reject whatever elements of 811 and 814 that you did 4 reject? What was your basis? 5 MS. OLSON: Can I just ask one question 6 to kind of clarify? Did we specifically reject any 7 of the provisions of 811 or 814? 8 MR. DUNAWAY: Not that I recall. 9 MS. FRANZETTI: All right. Is it your 10 position your requirements for closure are the same as 811 and 814 requirements? 11 12 MR. DUNAWAY: No. It wasn't as much that 13 we rejected certain ones, as we incorporated some 14 that we thought should be applicable to these types 15 of units. 16 MS. OLSON: Let me just ask a series of 17 follow-up questions that may help clarify. 18 Is this rule intended to set forth a 19 process to close a facility or to do corrective 20 action? 21 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 22 MS. OLSON: So does this rule contain all 23 of the technical components that would be necessary 24 to properly close or do corrective action?

Page 161 1 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 2 MS. OLSON: Isn't it possible that the 3 site-by-site characteristics would be explained in 4 the corrective plan or the closure plan versus being 5 detailed in these rules? MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 6 7 MS. OLSON: So when we didn't reject the 8 requirements in 811 and 814, is it possible that 9 those requirements, if a facility wanted to follow those requirements, they could put those in your 10 closure plan or their corrective action plan and 11 12 their agency would review them? 13 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 14 MS. FRANZETTI: That helps. That does 15 help. That's what we're trying to understand here, 16 but it isn't clear from the proposed rules. 17 All right. So if Midwest Generation 18 feels that it's got a CCW unit that it's closing and 19 it is analogous to a landfill, because it is lined, 20 it could go over to Part 811 and 814, look at what 21 the requirements are there, the ones it thinks are 22 appropriate, applicable, adequate, it could suggest 23 to you be applied in its approved closure plan. 24 MR. DUNAWAY: As long as they're

February 26, 2014

Page 162 consistent with the proposed rule, yes. 1 2 MS. FRANZETTI: Well, I quess I'm 3 thinking that the proposed rule allows one to do 4 that. 5 MR. DUNAWAY: Maybe I should say, as long 6 as they're not inconsistent with the proposed rule. 7 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. All right. MS. OLSON: And it would also be the fact 8 9 that they would have to be protective of groundwater? 10 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 11 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving on to 12 question 6. 13 On page 6 or your pre-filed testimony, you state: Quote, If all ash is removed from the 14 15 impoundment, a final cover system would not be 16 required, but the impounding structure would need to 17 be removed, end quote. 18 If all ash is removed, explain what the, 19 quote, impounding structure, end quote, consists of 20 and why it also must be removed in order to complete 21 the closure process. 22 Agency Response: The, quote, impounding 23 structure, end quote, refers to containment system 24 components which include the liner and liner subbase.

Page 163 1 The liner does not include the berm or impounding 2 structure. 3 MS. OLSON: We made an error. The "or 4 impounding structure" is an error. It's just 5 supposed to be the berm. I apologize. 6 MS. FRANZETTI: That's okay. That's why 7 I had that funny look on my face. 8 All right. I'm just going to keep 9 reading and then when I have a question, I'll say it. 10 So I'm on 6(a). Has the Agency considered that the same level of protection could be 11 12 achieved by allowing the alternative of cleaning the 13 liner surface of CCW compromising its integrity to allow precipitation to pass through it and then 14 15 backfilling with clean fill? 16 The Agency considered this issue Answer: 17 and believes that there will be cases where a liner 18 could be cleaned, and this approach has merit as long 19 as the closure plan is protective of groundwater. 20 So this -- am I understanding correctly 21 that this is something the Agency is willing to 22 consider favorably? 23 MR. BUSCHER: Yes. MS. FRANZETTI: And did you consider in 24

February 26, 2014

	Page 164
1	answering this question whether you think the
2	proposed language of the rule would allow for this,
3	or do we need to do we need to take a look?
4	MS. OLSON: If you would just keep
5	reading to the next question, you'll see the answer.
6	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving on to 6(b),
7	has the Agency considered what the potential
8	additional cost is to an owner or operator of having
9	to remove the impounding structure and transport and
10	dispose of it in a landfill.
11	Agency Response: Yes. The Agency has
12	taken these comments under consideration and
13	recommends the Board delete the, quote, removal of
14	containment systems components, end quote,
15	requirement found in Section 841.400(b) from the
16	proposed rules. The Agency requests the Board
17	consider this proposed change.
18	I'm not going to read the language.
19	Everybody's got a copy of this to read it and we can
20	all consider it further. Thank you.
21	Mr. Gnat was trying to inform me that you
22	did back off in your answer 6(b). Next time, you can
23	kick me under the table.
24	Okay. Closure Prioritization, question

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 165
1	7. On page 5 [sic] of your pre-filed testimony, you
2	state: "A unit is enacted if it has not received
3	coal combustion waste or leachate from coal
4	combustion waste within the most recent period of 18
5	months. If an impoundment has not received ash for
6	18 months, it is expected that the power plant has
7	other impoundments it is utilizing.
8	Question 7(a). If an impoundment is
9	undergoing some type of repair or renovation or ash
10	removal that extends for a period of over 18 months,
11	would it have any means under the proposed rules to
12	request and receive an extension of this 18-month
13	period, so that it was not required to proceed to
14	submit a closure plan given its intent to continue
15	using the unit? And your answer is no.
16	So please explain to me why you're
17	opposed to allowing an owner or operator who may have
18	what is probably not a typical situation, but is a
19	situation where that pond is going to be unused for
20	over 18 months, but they want to keep using it after
21	that point, and it could be that some work is going
22	on regarding the pond that winds up taking more than
23	18 months, whether it's due to a labor strike,
24	whether it's due to whatever, it's out of commission

February 26, 2014

Page 166 1 for more than 18 months, but not with the intention 2 not to resume using it. 3 Why is the Agency opposed to some 4 flexibility in these rules to allow what may be 5 unusual conditions, but valid conditions, to be considered? 6 7 MR. BUSCHER: Could you look at the next 8 question? 9 MS. FRANZETTI: No. Here we go again. 10 Hang on. Okay but -- no? That doesn't do it. I mean 7(b), if such an extension provision is not in 11 12 the proposed rules, is the Agency willing to consider 13 one, and you say: No. The owner or operator may elect corrective action instead of closure. 14 15 But I don't -- why do they have to go 16 into corrective action just because the impoundment, 17 due to some type of repair or renovation, is out of commission for a little more than 18 months? I don't 18 19 think that adequately addresses that situation to 20 say, well, you can elect corrective action. Or 21 explain to me why it is. 22 MR. BUSCHER: Well, if you don't have a 23 groundwater problem, you're not required to do 24 either.

	Page 167
1	MS. FRANZETTI: We can keep it inoperable
2	for more than 18 months and that's okay.
3	MR. BUSCHER: Yes. Yes.
4	MS. FRANZETTI: All right. But let's say
5	there is a hit of one constituent above a standard.
6	MR. BUSCHER: Well, then, you're going to
7	need to look at your options of closure or corrective
8	action or alternative costs. That's on the table
9	also.
10	MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to have
11	Mr. Gnat give you an example of what is of concern to
12	us.
13	MR. GNAT: Well, an example would be,
14	we've got a pond that we have some groundwater issues
15	that we're dealing with, whether or not we agree to
16	associate with the pond or not, but we've relined the
17	pond, but that pond then goes offline. We're using
18	another pond in the meantime, and it's going to take
19	us anywhere from nine months to twelve months, say,
20	to really clean out all of the ash out of that pond,
21	and as we're doing that, let's just say the
22	contractor breaches our liner.
23	So now we not only have the nine or
24	twelve months in which we're removing ash so that we

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 168
1	can use that pond, we now have a condition where the
2	pond liner has been breached through the process,
3	which can happen, and so now we've got to go into
4	repair of that liner, which may conceivably take more
5	than six months.
6	So now we have a pond where we have
7	addressed diminutive groundwater issues. The pond
8	was in operation. We took it offline to do a
9	standard maintenance and routine taking the ash out
10	of it, like we do in all of our ponds. The liner
11	gets nicked, we need more time, and this goes over 18
12	months.
13	Why can we not ask, you know, say, hey,
14	under this situation we need another six months
15	before we finish our liner repair, and then we're
16	clearly wanting to bring this pond back in service.
17	MR. BUSCHER: Do you plan to close this?
18	MR. GNAT: No. We're planning to bring
19	it back into service. We took it off service so that
20	we can remove the ash, which we do in all of our
21	ponds on a periodic basis.
22	MR. BUSCHER: And you are doing
23	corrective action? If you're doing corrective
24	action

Page 169 1 MS. FRANZETTI: Under the hypothetical, 2 you are doing it, but it's not successful yet, right? 3 MR. GNAT: Correct. MR. BUSCHER: Well, then you're not 4 5 closing it. I men --6 MS. OLSON: Let me ask a follow-up 7 question. Did the closure prioritization deadlines 8 contained in Section, I think, 401.405 apply to a 9 unit if it's not closing? 10 MR. BUSCHER: No. MS. OLSON: So if you're not closing that 11 unit, does the active/inactive distinction have any 12 13 applicability? 14 MR. BUSCHER: No. 15 MS. FRANZETTI: So as long as it's your 16 intent to use it again, and as long as you've got 17 some sort of corrective action in process, no matter 18 whether it's yet effective, totally effective, you can have that unit be out of order for more than 18 19 20 months. 21 MR. BUSCHER: With that corrective action 22 having been approved. 23 MS. FRANZETTI: Right. 24 MR. BUSCHER: Yes.

	Page 170
1	HEARING OFFICER FOX: I thought I saw
2	that there was a question back in one of the further
3	rows. He's indicating that he doesn't have it any
4	longer.
5	MS. FRANZETTI: Moving to question 8. We
6	don't have any follow-up on question 8, so I'm going
7	to skip to the questions for Lynn Dunaway.
8	Would you mind if we took a ten-minute
9	break?
10	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Franzetti, I
11	think it's probably about the time to do that. We've
12	been back at it for about two hours now. Why don't
13	we take ten minutes and resume at 10 'til 3:00.
14	(A ten-minute recess was taken.)
15	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you all for
16	returning after the break.
17	Ms. Franzetti has looked over some
18	additional questions and is ready to resume where we
19	had left off, which, as I recall, was with question
20	number 8 directed to Mr. Buscher. Am I correct?
21	MS. FRANZETTI: Yes. And based on taking
22	the break, we don't have any questions with respect
23	to question 8, and so unless anyone else does, we are
24	ready to move to the questions for Lynn Dunaway.

Γ

	Page 171
1	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. Go
2	ahead, Ms. Franzetti.
3	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. And with respect
4	to the questions for Lynn Dunaway, we're going to
5	skip questions 1 and 2 and go to question 3 on
6	determining background values because we don't have
7	any follow-up questions on the Agency responses to
8	questions 1 and 2.
9	With respect to question 3, let me go
10	ahead and read 3 and 3(a), and then I'm going to
11	actually turn it over to Mr. Gnat for some follow-up
12	questions.
13	On page 2 of your pre-filed testimony,
14	you state, quote: In the proposed Part, the term,
15	quote, background, unquote, is applied broadly,
16	because background values must be calculated for all
17	monitoring wells, not just those wells which are
18	upgradient of regulated units, end quote. Is the
19	term background in the proposed rules interpreted or
20	applied differently here than it is for solid waste
21	landfills under Parts 811 and 814 of the existing
22	Board regulations? If so, please explain what the
23	difference is and why the Agency is proposing to
24	apply the term background differently for CCW surface

Page 172

1 impoundment units versus landfills.

2 The Agency Response: In these proposed rules, background is interpreted as existing 3 concentrations of chemical constituents in 4 5 groundwater which may or may not have been impacted by a unit regulated pursuant to this proposed Part; 6 7 may originate from anthropogenic activities (other 8 than regulated units) that may or may not be owned or 9 controlled by the owner or operator of a regulated unit; or may arise from naturally occurring 10 variability in groundwater quality. CCW surface 11 12 impoundments are specifically excluded from the 13 definition of landfills.

Question 3(a): Why isn't the requirement to develop background values for all wells, both upgradient, downgradient and/or otherwise, limited to those situations where there's high spatial variability in the overall data set or where a representative upgradient data set cannot be generated?

Agency Response: The variability of conditions at the various facilities throughout the State results in multiple combinations of possible complicating factors. The proposed Part is a rule of

Page 173 1 general applicability and must be applicable in all 2 situations. 3 Mr. Gnat. MR. GNAT: I quess my question stems 4 5 from, at least the way I read the proposed rule, and Lynn, your testimony there, is if I was to have to 6 7 develop a statistical program for a site, I would not 8 only have to at this point look at upgradient versus 9 downgradient, but I would right away also have to start calculating background for each individual well 10 within the system on an intra well basis as well, so 11 12 I'll have background upgradient -- or upgradient 13 versus downgradient, and I'll also have background for each individual well. 14 15 You know, statistics can become very 16 complicated very quickly. You're generating various 17 background numbers, and at some point it's easy to 18 lose which value am I going to be looking for 19 compliance with. 20 My understanding in the approach that 21 I've normally looked at for statistics in situations 22 like this is, first, to keep it as simple as we can. 23 First, we look at the data sets for upgradient 24 background and if that data set is appropriate to

February 26, 2014

Page 174

	5
1	calculate an upgradient background, and the
2	downgradient sets suggest that you don't have that
3	spacial variability, so you can use the upgradient
4	versus downgradient comparisons. Then you will use
5	those because it's a very direct and simple
6	comparison, very easy to track, you know, still a
7	statistical analysis with a lot of robust to it, but
8	it's an easy thing.

9 The only time, then, that I would then 10 start looking at intra well comparisons and start 11 calculating a separate background data set at a 12 specific, say, downgradient well is in a situation 13 where the upgradient versus downgradient scenario 14 just doesn't work for various statistical principles.

15 So let's just say that, you know, the 16 upgradient versus downgradient works at just about 17 every well location for most of the parameters, 18 however, parameter X does not fit the scheme at wells 19 A, B, and C. So I would go to wells A, B, and C, and 20 on an intra well basis, then calculate the background 21 for that particular constituent; not for every single 22 constituent, not for every single well, but only for 23 the ones that don't meet the upgradient versus downgradient, and that then precludes you from having 24

February 26, 2014

Page 175
to do a statistical calculation for 22 parameters for
background, not just upgradient or downgradient, but
for each individual well. It should only be focused
on those that you have to go to that next level of
statistical analysis on to be able to make some type
of conclusions.
MS. FRANZETTI: Do you agree? I knew it
was coming. (Laughter.)
MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. I would certainly
agree with keeping it as simple as possible because
there certainly are a lot of constituents and there
are a lot of possible scenarios that you may have to
be looking at.
But the important thing, when you're
setting up your monitoring plan, it includes
calculating your background, is that you look at
those different constituents and you apply a
statistical method that is appropriate for meeting
the needs of your site, which would be you have to
make sure that you are meeting the nondegradation
standards, if those are applicable at your site.
You would have to be set up that if you
have, as you in your example earlier, you have an
intra well situation where you already have a GMZ in

February 26, 2014

Page 176 1 place and you're looking at ongoing compliance. 2 So I can't, you know, just sit here and 3 say that it's -- there's one way to do it, but I 4 think you have the gist of what we expect in that you 5 have to look at what your site has, and there will be 6 probably different methods that are appropriate for 7 different sets of wells because they're monitoring different units. 8 9 Some of them may be downgradient of other 10 units, so you may have to apply something a little different there than at a site where there's only one 11 12 unit. 13 MR. GNAT: So you agree that there's a 14 process of which you go through to make that 15 determination. 16 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 17 MR. GNAT: And the way I read the 18 proposed rule, however, suggests that I have to go 19 out and calculate background at each individual well 20 for every single parameter. At least that is the way 21 I read and interpret the rule the way it's written. 22 From what you're saying, that is not the 23 intent of the rule. The intent of the rule is to 24 follow the process, and if you need to do that at a

February 26, 2014

Page 177 1 specific well for a specific parameter, you do, but 2 it's not, from the get-go, you have to be calculating 3 background at each well for each parameter. 4 MR. DUNAWAY: I can't see how you can do 5 the analysis -- I think the --6 I may just have to get back to you on 7 The way I see it is that there would be a that. 8 background being calculated for all the parameters, 9 because you're going to have to do that -- you're 10 going to have to do some statistical evaluation to see which -- which analysis you're going to have to 11 12 do for each well. 13 MR. GNAT: Correct. But what I'm trying 14 to get to is that, normally, if I can calculate my 15 upgradient background, that can be used in comparison 16 and so on, and that's going to be based on one, two, 17 or three wells which are upgraded that I can pool 18 this data from and create this statistical comparison 19 value. 20 I don't have to go to each individual 21 downgradient well, which could be 10 or 12 or 15 22 wells, and right up front calculate a background for 23 each well, intra well background for each single 24 parameter. I only have to do that if the upgradient

February 26, 2014

Page 178 1 versus downgradient comparisons aren't appropriate for some other statistical reason. 2 3 The way I read right now is I have to 4 calculate an upgradient background, and then in 5 addition to that for every single well in my network right up front, I have to calculate a separate intra 6 7 well background for every single parameter that's 8 being analyzed, and that is as broadly as that's 9 written, and that's why I'm asking clarification on it, because that's usually not what's done. 10 It's something that might need to be done at some point in 11 time for a subset of parameters at a subset of wells, 12 13 but not for everything right up front. 14 MR. DUNAWAY: We're going to have to look 15 at that and get back to you. 16 MR. GNAT: Thank you. 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Mr. Dunaway, you'll be 18 happy to hear I have no follow-up questions for you, 19 based on the Agency response to questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 20 So I'm going to go to 10. 8, or 9. 21 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Could we take one 22 second to make sure that, since we would be going 23 past the number of questions, if there are any 24 follow-ups to the Agency's written responses to those

February 26, 2014

Page 179 1 questions number 3 through 9? 2 Neither seeing nor hearing any, 3 Ms. Franzetti, thanks for letting me interrupt you. 4 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Turning to 5 question 10, top of page 24. On page 6 of your pre-filed testimony, 6 7 you state, quote: If the number of non-detects is 8 large enough they may cause chemical constituent 9 concentrations to be nonparametric, in such an instance, a different statistical method may be 10 required to analyze the different chemical 11 12 constituents that are nonparametric. 13 Do you agree that the Question 10(a): 14 list of chemical constituents in Section 620.410(a) 15 and (e) that an owner or operator is required under Section 841.215 to monitor for includes certain 16 17 constituents which are not typically associated with 18 coal ash, such as perchlorate and cadmium? 19 The Agency agrees that Agency Response. 20 perchlorate is not typically associated with CCW. 21 The Agency would recommend that the Board exclude it 22 from the list of required constituents. However, CCW 23 is known to contain small amounts of cadmium and 24 various other metals .

	Page 180
1	My question is, do you know whether in
2	any of the data or information that you introduced
3	into the record here, is there information on this
4	contention that CCW is known to contain small amounts
5	of cadmium?
6	MR. DUNAWAY: I don't know if that
7	information has been introduced into the record or
8	not.
9	MS. FRANZETTI: Could you provide any
10	information that supports that statement?
11	MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
12	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. Moving, then no
13	further follow-up on the rest of the responses to
14	Questions 10(b) and (c). No follow-up on question
15	11. No follow-up on questions 12, 13, 14 or 15,
16	Mr. Dunaway.
17	You are done, as far as I'm concerned,
18	but we'll see if anyone else has anything.
19	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Is there anything
20	else on those questions as follow-up regarding the
21	Agency's written responses provided by Mr. Dunaway?
22	Neither seeing nor hearing any,
23	Ms. Franzetti, we're ready to move on.
24	MS. FRANZETTI: These are questions for

February 26, 2014

Page 181 1 Ms. Zimmer. You are not as lucky as Mr. Dunaway, but 2 you're still somewhat lucky. 3 I'm going to skip question 1(a), and I 4 have no follow-up questions to the Agency's response. 5 We do on question 1(b), so I'll read the 6 question and response: 7 Section 841.200(b)(3) of the proposed 8 rule provides a general statement that hydro geologic 9 characterizations need to provide the data necessary to, quote, develop and perform modeling to assess 10 possible changes and benefits of potential 11 12 groundwater impact mitigation alternatives, end 13 quote. When do the proposed rules contemplate this hydro geologic characterization is to be performed; 14 15 before or after a release from a unit has been identified? 16 17 Agency Response. The Agency expects much 18 of the hydro geological site characterization to take 19 place before a release from a unit has occurred, as 20 much of the data required for characterization is not 21 release dependent. The Agency acknowledges that if a 22 release were to occur, further investigation and 23 characterization of the site may be needed to fill 24 data gaps in order to effectively model potential

Page 182 1 impacts and mitigation efforts. 2 What if the proposed -- here's my 3 follow-up question. What if the proposed hydro 4 geologic assessment initially approved by the Agency 5 for a site that already had impacts, you know, 6 whether or not they were impacts from the 7 impoundments, and those assessments were okay, now, 8 do we need to expand the scope of the assessment? 9 MS. ZIMMER: That is site specific. At 10 this time, we haven't made any of those determinations. It's possible, but basically we're 11 12 going to have to go through re-submittal once these 13 rules -- the proposed rules are enacted, go through 14 the re-submittal on that, put everything together to 15 make sure when we review it that you're meeting all 16 of the requirements of the proposed rule. So we 17 haven't looked at that yet. 18 MS. FRANZETTI: Ms. Zimmer, a practical 19 follow-up question. 20 MS. ZIMMER: Okay. 21 MS. FRANZETTI: Mr. Gnat informs me that 22 doing the re-submittal of the assessment work that's 23 already been done could result in submitting a pretty 24 good stack of paper to the Agency.

February 26, 2014

Page 183 1 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. 2 MS. FRANZETTI: Is it going to be 3 acceptable to the Agency to simply reference previous 4 submittals that have been made, rather than 5 resubmitting all of the prior assessment work? 6 MS. ZIMMER: I would say no, just simply 7 referencing is not appropriate because there's a 8 potential under the proposed rules that something 9 will change, and we have the possibility of missing 10 something if it's not resubmitted. 11 MS. FRANZETTI: Well, I'm just not 12 following why you would miss something. It's been 13 previously submitted. 14 MS. OLSON: Let me ask a follow-up 15 question. 16 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. 17 MS. OLSON: Did we -- is one of the 18 reasons why we want to require entities to resubmit 19 the information to us is because we want to make sure 20 that we get the complete set of information and not 21 rely on the fact that we have previously got the 22 information because we may not have it all. 23 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. 24 MS. FRANZETTI: When you say you may not

Page 184 1 have it all, you mean you may not be able to find it 2 all? 3 MS. OLSON: That would be one of the 4 things that crossed the Agency's mind. 5 MS. ZIMMER: I think the other thing to 6 keep in mind is conditions may have changed. Most of 7 those assessments -- and they weren't really called 8 hydro geologic site characterizations, they were 9 called, I believe, site investigations. 10 Like I said, they may not meet all the requirements of the rule. It's kind of upon the 11 12 facility to go through whatever the approved rule 13 is -- I mean, right now, it's just proposed -- to 14 make sure all those requirements are in there and 15 package it up and present it to us, and we would 16 expect any new data in the last two or three years to 17 be included in that. 18 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Could you pass the 19 mic down to her? It's very difficult to hear. 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: It may need to be a 21 bit closer yet, Ms. Zimmer. It's pretty sensitive. 22 Thank you. 23 Would you mind, Ms. Franzetti, MS. LIU: 24 if I followed up on your question?

Page 185 1 MS. FRANZETTI: No. Go right ahead. 2 MS. LIU: Since in Section 841.145 it 3 would allow you to have the previous investigations 4 and plans submitted to the Agency, could you comment 5 on how the Agency would ensure that the existing or preexisting plans that were submitted are reflective 6 7 of the current conditions if, for example, it would 8 predate whatever type of current development might 9 have occurred since those plans were prepared? 10 MS. ZIMMER: Are you talking about a specific -- like a specific plan, or like a 11 12 monitoring plan, the ground monitoring system, or are 13 we talking about the characterization, or are you 14 talking about all three of those? I'm just trying to pin down if you have a specific --15 MS. LIU: The provision that you have in 16 17 Section 841.145 would apply to any hydro geologic 18 site investigation or characterization, groundwater 19 monitoring well or system, groundwater monitoring plan, groundwater monitoring management zone, or 20 21 preventive response plans, etc. 22 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Zimmer, before 23 you answer, the microphone is still not picking you 24 I hate to ask you to pull it closer, but I think up.

February 26, 2014

Page 186 1 that's the only way we'll be able to hear you as 2 clearly as possible. 3 MS. ZIMMER: Can you repeat the actual 4 question, then? I'm sorry. 5 Would you please comment on how MS. LIU: the Agency evaluates these preexisting plans that are 6 7 allowed to be resubmitted to ensure that they're 8 reflective of the current conditions; if, for 9 example, they predate current developments? Like new 10 homes moving in closer to the facility and putting in wells and things like that? 11 12 MS. ZIMMER: I think I'm going to have to 13 get back with you on the issue regarding new homes. 14 With potable wells, I was thinking more 15 along the lines I would be looking for more recent 16 groundwater data and potentiometric maps showing 17 current groundwater flow conditions. Like I said, 18 the new potable well issue is something we'll have to 19 get back to you on. 20 MS. LIU: Okay. Thank you. 21 MS. OLSON: May I ask a follow-up? 22 Would we ask the applicants or the 23 facilities owners whether or not something has 24 changed since the previous plan has been executed

February 26, 2014

Page 187 1 when we get them back under this section? 2 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. MS. OLSON: So we would know that there 3 4 had been a change. 5 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. MS. OLSON: And so then would we take 6 7 that change into mind while we review the plans? 8 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. 9 MS. OLSON: And if we saw a problem, 10 would we then contact the facility? 11 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. 12 MS. OLSON: And if we found that the previous plan was not sufficient because of any sort 13 14 changes, would we deny it? 15 MS. ZIMMER: Yes. MS. OLSON: That's all I have. 16 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further, 18 Ms. Liu? 19 No, thank you. MS. LIU: 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good. 21 MS. FRANZETTI: Ms. Zimmer, I'd like to 22 qo to question -- Subpart D of this question 1. I'll 23 read the question and the response and then explain 24 what I don't quite understand in your answer.

	Page 188
1	In your experience, do most initial site
2	hydro geologic characterizations provide all the
3	information required to develop a three-dimensional
4	3D numerical groundwater model? Isn't it more
5	typical to gather additional data once it is
6	determined that a 3D numerical model is necessary,
7	the model is constructed, and any data gaps are
8	identified?
9	And the answer is no. Most initial
10	site hydro geologic site characterizations do not
11	provide all the information necessary. Please see
12	answer to question 1(b) above, which is the question
13	relating to the modeling necessary modeling
14	necessary to be developed under Section
15	841.200(b)(3).
16	Let me, though, get to the heart of my
17	question.
18	Is it the Agency's position that in the
19	initial site hydro geologic characterizations, you
20	have got to generate enough information to develop a
21	3D numerical groundwater model, whether or not there
22	is any indication, there's any impacts on
23	groundwater, problems with groundwater that require
24	that.

	Page 189
1	That's what our concern is and what the
2	proposed language is in the rules, that it's overkill
3	to require that much right at the front end, and I
4	can't tell from your answer whether you're saying,
5	sorry, we think it's not and you've got to do it, or
6	you are answering maybe a slightly different question
7	that you thought I was asking. So with that
8	clarification.
9	MS. ZIMMER: I'm not sure if I'm totally
10	on the same page with you yet on the question.
11	MS. FRANZETTI: All right. What did you
12	think I was asking?
13	MS. ZIMMER: You're asking if I'm
14	requiring you're asking if we are requiring all of
15	the data for a 3D model.
16	MS. FRANZETTI: Right up front.
17	MS. ZIMMER: Or should it be needed? Are
18	you asking if a 3D model is required up front, or are
19	you asking if the information is required up front?
20	MS. FRANZETTI: Take that first. That's
21	what I'm asking first.
22	MS. ZIMMER: If the model is required up
23	front?
24	MS. FRANZETTI: No. Do you have to

Page 190 1 collect all the data necessary to develop a 3D model 2 up front? 3 MS. ZIMMER: You do not have to collect all of the information because that would be 4 5 impossible, I agree. You have to -- but we are 6 expecting a hydro geologic site characterization to 7 be heavily data consistent, containing much of the 8 data that would be needed that would not be specific 9 to a release sometime in the future, if that were to 10 occur. 11 I mean, there are things related to the 12 release, obviously, that -- you know, you'd have 13 monitoring data showing what's showing up where. You 14 might have some source information. But the basic 15 geologic units, that data generally does not change. You should have a lot of that information. 16 The 17 geologic site characterization should have that basic geologic information in there. 18 19 And then I agree if you need to do a 20 model, there may be data gaps that you will need to 21 go find the data. 22 Okay. Thank you. MS. ZIMMER: 23 I'm going to jump to question 2(e) on 24 page 30. Does anyone have any follow-up before I get

Page 191

1 there? Okay.

21

The question is: Can risk-based 2 evaluations be used to establish that the compliance 3 4 point is appropriately established at a property 5 boundary for the facility such as where there is no downgradient receptor? 6 7 Agency Response is: No. The compliance 8 point definition is based upon Ill. Adm. Code Part 620.240 and 620.250. 9 This, I think, hearkens back to some 10 prior questions and answers from Mr. Cobb and others 11 12 on this point. But can you explain what makes this 13 situation with CCW units so unique, especially when 14 other sites can have even worse health risks from 15 what has been released, such as from chlorinated 16 compounds, that taking this approach of applying the 17 compliance point of the property boundary is not 18 appropriate for CCW units? 19 MS. ZIMMER: I'm going to let Mr. Cobb 20 answer this question.

MS. FRANZETTI: Okay.

22 MR. COBB: Same answer as I gave before. 23 As I said, this is based on the capability of 24 downgradient private well owners having the

February 26, 2014

Page 192 1 capability of using advanced treatment technologies to remove contaminants by TDS and boron and sulfates. 2 3 It's not feasible. 4 You know, a homeowner could put a 5 granular activated carbon unit in, or benzene, or 6 trichloroethylene, or whatever. This type of stuff, 7 the removal of this, is not feasible for a private 8 well owner, I think is what I said my prior response. 9 Same response. 10 MS. FRANZETTI: And that's your same 11 response, even where there's no downgradient 12 receptor? MR. COBB: The groundwater standards 13 14 under Part 620 for Class I is for existing and future 15 uses of drinking water. So yes, that is my response because that's the Board's standards. 16 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Going to -- I don't have 18 any follow-up questions on 3 and 4. I'm moving to 19 question 5(c). 20 Okay. Do you agree that under the 21 Unified Guidance, the minimum data requirements are 22 generally eight rounds of data, and sometimes more, 23 before an evaluation can be made as to what is the 24 most appropriate statistical method to be applied?

Page 193 1 If quarterly sampling is being conducted on the monitoring wells, would this indicate that at least 2 3 two years of monitoring data should be collected before this explanation regarding the statistical 4 5 method for background should be required to be submitted to the Agency? 6 7 Under the The Agency Response: 8 assumption that eight rounds of sampling are required 9 to establish background, and the sampling frequency is quarterly, two years of sampling data would be 10 required. However, if eight rounds of sampling are 11 12 required and the same planning frequency was monthly, 13 one year would provide an adequate data set. 14 Our question is, that given the fact that 15 quarterly provides seasonal variability, eight rounds 16 of monthly sampling will not allow for evaluation of 17 seasonal, i.e., reproduced impacts. So whatever 18 statistical evaluation is done may still not be 19 appropriate using just eight months of monthly 20 sampling data. 21 Would you agree with that, given that 22 further consideration of seasonal impact? 23 I'm going to let Mr. Dunaway MS. ZIMMER: 24 answer the question.

Page 194 1 MR. DUNAWAY: That is a possibility, 2 depending on what your monitoring shows. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: And so in that situation, 4 the Agency probably would allow you to keep going in 5 collecting data to get through at least four full seasons of data. 6 7 MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I think earlier we 8 discussed that there may -- we're going to evaluate 9 the background calculations or look at the evaluation of background, so I think if you demonstrated it to 10 us that you could not make an appropriate statistical 11 12 analysis, I think we would have to consider that. 13 MS. FRANZETTI: Ms. Zimmer, hang on for a I think we're done. Give me just a moment. 14 second. 15 We're done. 16 MS. ZIMMER: Thank you. 17 MS. FRANZETTI: Thank you. 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any additional 19 follow-up questions to those that were raised by 20 Midwest Generation and Ms. Franzetti? 21 Neither seeing or hearing any, 22 Ms. Franzetti, thank you very much. 23 As we had discussed at the top of the 24 hearing, we have a second set of questions filed on

February 26, 2014

Page 195 1 behalf of Medina Valley Cogen; a set of two 2 questions, as it turns out. Ms Antoniolli is here 3 and prepared to raise those with the Agency's 4 witnesses. It looks as if the folks from Midwest 5 6 Gen, Ms. Antoniolli, are going to go back to their 7 seats, and if you could give them a moment, there 8 will be a microphone you can use to pose those as 9 clearly as possible. 10 MS. FRANZETTI: As much as I do like 11 being close to you, I'm willing to move. 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Antoniolli? 13 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Yes. 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: It looks like 15 you're ready to begin. 16 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Yes. My name is Amy 17 Antoniolli from Schiff Hardin, and I'm here, as I 18 mentioned earlier, on behalf of Medina Valley Cogen. 19 I have with me Mr. Gary King from Arcadis. 20 My name is Gary King. MR. KING: I'm 21 with the consulting firm, Arcadis. 22 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Also on behalf of Medina 23 Valley. 24 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Antoniolli, did

February 26, 2014

Page 196 1 you have a copy of your questions to the Agency that vou want to introduce into the record to be 2 3 considered as an exhibit today? 4 MS. ANTONIOLLI: I do. What number exhibit are we on? 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: We are on Exhibit 6 7 Number 7, and if you have a motion, I'd be happy to entertain that. 8 9 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Yes. I move to submit 10 our pre-filed questions on behalf of Medina Valley Cogen for entrance as Exhibit 7. 11 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And you have heard the motion to admit those as Exhibit Number 7. 13 Is 14 there any objection on the part of anyone present? Neither seeing nor hearing any, 15 Ms. Antoniolli, that will be marked and admitted into 16 17 the record as Hearing Exhibit Number 7. 18 (Exhibit Number 7 was marked for 19 identification and admitted into 20 evidence.) 21 The Agency's witnesses, of course, have 22 been sworn and appear to be ready for you to begin 23 with the first of your questions. 24 MS. ANTONIOLLI: And before I start,

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

-	-
	Page 197
1	Mr. King would like to give a statement.
2	MR. KING: I just want to make a brief
3	comment. It will only take about a minute or two.
4	HEARING OFFICER FOX: If I may,
5	Ms. Antoniolli, will this be in the nature of
6	testimony for which we should swear him in, or does
7	he wish to proceed right through the questions?
8	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Why don't you swear him
9	in, and then if it arises in the context of our
10	questions as well, he's already sworn in.
11	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Very good.
12	Ms. Court Reporter, proceed with swearing him in.
13	(Witness sworn.)
14	MR. KING: My comment's real brief. I
15	had a long career at Illinois EPA which, of
16	course, I remember the folks on the Board side are
17	familiar with me and I spent many days and many
18	hearings sitting where Rick Cobb and Joanne Olson and
19	the rest of the team are sitting answering questions.
20	And this morning when I came in here, I saw the
21	response to questions that they had put together, and
22	in less than basically three weeks in putting those
23	responses together in the concise, informative way in
24	which they did, you know, I thought that took a

February 26, 2014

	Page 198
1	remarkable effort and it was a remarkable
2	achievement, and I hope the Board will recognize
3	that, and I hope your superiors at the Agency will
4	recognize it as well.
5	That was it. That's all I have.
6	MS. ANTONIOLLI: We have two questions
7	today, and I will start with the first, which begins:
8	On pages 16 to 17 of the pre-filed testimony, Rick
9	Cobb discusses the use of GMZs. The pre-filed
10	testimony includes the following statement and I
11	will paraphrase. This statement talks about the
12	corrective action process under the GMZs.
13	Skipping to the second paragraph:
14	Proposed Sections 841.310(e)(9) and 841.410(k)
15	concerning corrective action plans and closure plans,
16	respectively, allow the use of institutional controls
17	without limiting them to restricted use ordinances.
18	By using the term ordinance, please clarify whether
19	IEPA intends to limit the use of institutional
20	controls to municipally-adopted ordinances or whether
21	the term ordinance is meant to be more generic and
22	include institutional controls such as on-site or
23	site-specific environmental land use controls.
24	And the Agency's Response is: The term

February 26, 2014

Page 199 1 ordinance is used generically and intended to include institutional controls. 2 3 MR. KING: If I could just, then, ask a 4 follow-up question to that. 5 I just wanted to clarify, because there was some discussion earlier, which I think tended to 6 7 limit the nature of the answer and, in essence, the 8 discussion was that you intended to allow any institutional control that would be allowed under the 9 Environmental Protection Act and would be applicable. 10 I think that was the testimony. 11 12 There is an Illinois law called the Uniform Environmental Covenant Act. The citation is 13 765 ILCS 122, et.seq. That also allows for 14 15 institutional controls to be in a different form. That is outside of the Illinois Environmental 16 17 Protection Act. 18 I don't think -- your rules are not --19 the way that you've got the rules written, it would 20 allow the use of the Uniform Environmental Covenants 21 I just didn't want to -- the testimony earlier Act. 22 seemed to limit that and I just wanted to seek some 23 clarification on that. 24 MR. COBB: If it's allowed under the Act,

February 26, 2014

Page 200 1 then I think you can use that type of instrument. In 2 fact, if I recall, that may have been what was done 3 under the site-specific Hutsonville rule that was 4 recommended by one of our Agency attorneys. Ameren 5 may know better than I. MR. KING: That's all I have. 6 7 MS. LIU: I have follow-up. 8 I believe the Agency's response to the 9 Board's Hearing Officer Order Question Number 46, the Board did mention the Uniform Environmental Covenants 10 Act, as prompted by the Hutsonville rule, and the 11 12 Agency response was that they would agree with 13 including that. 14 MR. KING: Okay. 15 MS. ANTONIOLLI: Thank you. 16 Thank you. I couldn't MR. COBB: 17 remember what I wrote. I knew I was close. 18 MS. ANTONIOLLI: And the second is, On 19 page 4 of her pre-filed testimony, Amy Zimmer states: 20 In addition, if a groundwater management 21 zone is approved as part of a corrective action, 22 additional points of compliance in relation to the 23 GMZ boundary and modeled or monitored extent of 24 contamination may then be required to be monitored.

Page 201

1 Ms. Zimmer's testimony implies that 2 compliance points could simultaneously include 3 locations very close to the unit and also farther 4 away, based on the approved GMZ boundary. Please 5 clarify whether it is IEPA's intention to have 6 compliance points inside the GMZ boundary or whether 7 the GMZ approval would establish the compliance 8 points for as long as the GMZ is in place, which is 9 what the definition of what "compliance point" 10 states. 11 The Agency's response is: A GMZ is 12 contaminant specific. Therefore, compliance point 13 locations close to the unit would still apply for 14 contaminants not part of the groundwater management 15 zone. 16 We don't have follow-up -- well, I would 17 say maybe the only follow-up question to this is, 18 then, when at these locations you're monitoring that 19 might be within a GMZ, would you also be monitoring 20 for those constituents that are excluded? 21 Would you exclude those contaminants for 22 which there is already a GMZ, or would you monitor 23 for those also at those additional locations? 24 MS. ZIMMER: Okay. Let me see. If I'm

February 26, 2014

	Page 202
1	understanding your question correctly, you're asking
2	if we would only at the GMZ compliance points, those
3	monitoring wells, we would only be requiring sampling
4	for the constituents that are part of the GMZ and any
5	exceedance? Is that your question?
6	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Well, let me state it
7	again.
8	Within the GMZ when there are monitoring
9	locations, would the sampling at those locations
10	exclude the contaminants that are within the GMZ for
11	which there is a GMZ?
12	MS. ZIMMER: I'm still having trouble
13	understanding which monitoring. Are we talking
14	let's specify. Are we talking the monitoring wells
15	close to the unit, or are we talking about the ones
16	that are at the boundary of the GMZ for the GMZ?
17	MS. ANTONIOLLI: The monitoring wells
18	that are close to the unit.
19	MS. ZIMMER: Okay. We're monitoring them
20	for the part the constituents that are part of the
21	GMZ also?
22	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Right.
23	MS. ZIMMER: Okay. I'm sorry about that.
24	I believe the answer is we would still require those

February 26, 2014

	Page 203
1	constituents to be monitored; it just wouldn't be a
2	compliance monitoring, it would be more of just
3	getting the information.
4	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Okay.
5	MS. ZIMMER: Okay.
6	MS. ANTONIOLLI: And one last sampling
7	question.
8	Jumping back to the proposed Section
9	841.230, the proposed section about sampling
10	frequency, and my question is, would you consider
11	following the approach adopted in the site-specific
12	rulemaking for Hutsonville Pond D, which would be to
13	drop the constituents after four consecutive samples
14	from the list of monitoring constituents?
15	MR. COBB: Earlier, this topic came up
16	during Ms. Franzetti's questions, and we indicated
17	that, you know, we would defer to the Board, but we
18	would be willing to look at a list and what they were
19	thinking of in terms of that. So I think we've kind
20	of we'll look at both, what Midwest Gen is
21	proposing and what you're proposing.
22	MS. ANTONIOLLI: Uh-huh. Either way.
23	Okay. That's all we have.
24	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Antoniolli,

Page 204

1 thank you very much.

2	We have come to the point in our
3	proceedings where we can turn to the questions that
4	were filed by the environmental groups. Naturally,
5	we have these groups' written responses, and we can
6	turn this over to you in just a moment.
7	We do have a number of questions from the
8	environmental groups placed into the record and a
9	number of questions that the Board has, also. They
10	would appear to indicate that we need to take
11	advantage of the fact that this hearing was scheduled
12	to continue until Thursday, if necessary, but we are
13	here, and Mr. Armstrong appears to be ready, and we
14	can begin with those.
15	We could also use the microphones back
16	here, if that's easier for you.
17	MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. My name is
18	Andrew Armstrong. I'm an attorney with the
19	Environmental Law and Policy Center. I'm here today
20	on behalf of the ELPC and to present pre-filed
21	questions that ELPC filed on behalf of ELPC and other
22	environmental groups.
23	I'm here with three other personnel:
24	Jessica Dexter, from the Environmental Law and Policy

February 26, 2014

Page 205 1 Center; Cindy Stukarich from the Sierra Club; and 2 Traci Barkley from Prairie Rivers Network. 3 Starting off with our first pre-filed 4 questions: 5 On page 2 of the Statement of Reasons, 6 the Agency states that dry coal combustion waste 7 (CCW) can be disposed of in a landfill. Could you 8 please identify the power generating facilities in 9 Illinois that utilize a dry ash handling system? 10 The Agency's Response was: Fly ash is the most common CCW material which is handled dry. 11 12 In most cases, bottom ash is handled wet and may be 13 dewatered and placed in a landfill. The following 14 power generating facilities have ability to handle ash dry; and seven of the facilities are identified. 15 16 My first follow-up question is, when you 17 state that the following power generating facilities 18 have the ability to handle ash dry, are you referring 19 to fly ash, then? 20 I am referring to fly ash, MR. BUSCHER: 21 and there are instances where they handle bottom ash 22 dry, but it usually would be after it has gone to 23 some type of impoundment. 24 MR. ARMSTRONG: So when you state that

February 26, 2014

Page 206 1 these facilities have the ability to handle ash dry, 2 does that mean the facilities actually do handle ash 3 dry? MR. BUSCHER: That varies from site to 4 5 site. There are some that handle it strictly dry, 6 there are some that have the ability to do both, so I 7 couldn't really discern, but there are instances 8 where that's all they do, there are instances where 9 they do it part-time. 10 MR. ARMSTRONG: So would you agree that it is technically feasible for a plant to handle all 11 12 of its CCW -- I'm sorry -- all of its fly ash and 13 bottom ash dry? 14 MS. OLSON: I don't understand when you 15 say technically feasible, are you referring about any plant in the world? 16 17 MR. ARMSTRONG: Sure. Right. 18 MR. BUSCHER: I can't speak to any plant 19 in the world, but it's my understanding that 20 generally the way that bottom ash is handled is that it is handled wet initially. At some point in time 21 22 thereafter, it can be landfilled, it could go to an 23 impoundment. That's the only instance where --24 For instance, I am aware that fly ash can

February 26, 2014

	Page 207
1	be handled dry and doesn't have to be wetted. Of
2	course, once again, it is the prerogative of each
3	operator to handle that in the manner in which they
4	see fit.
5	MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I would like to
6	introduce one exhibit just on bottom ash dry
7	handling. I have an article from Power Magazine,
8	July 2011, entitled, A Better Environmental Option:
9	Dry Ash Conversion Technology.
10	So I've handed the Agency the article
11	entitled, A Better Environmental Option: Dry Ash
12	Conversion Technology. On page 2 of the document, it
13	states that and I would move to submit this as
14	Exhibit 8.
15	HEARING OFFICER FOX: That is the correct
16	exhibit number.
17	You've heard Mr. Armstrong's motion to
18	admit the article that has been distributed to a
19	number of the participants as Hearing Exhibit Number
20	8. Is there any objection to the motion?
21	MS. OLSON: Can I just take a second?
22	I have a question for you. The article
23	appears to end on page 6, but then there are numerous
24	pages 7 through 17. Can you explain what those are?

	Page 208
1	MR. ARMSTRONG: This would be the
2	by-product of me printing it off the computer, and
3	these appear to be various advertisements and other
4	links that were associated with the article, so I
5	apologize for that, but the article itself is
6	confined to the first six pages.
7	MS. OLSON: The Agency has no objection
8	to the first six pages of this document.
9	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any other objection
10	in response to the motion?
11	Mr. Armstrong, it will be marked as
12	Exhibit Number 8, and we will note your
13	acknowledgment that the substance of the article
14	encompasses the first six pages of what you have
15	submitted into the record.
16	(Exhibit Number 8 was marked for
17	identification.)
18	MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.
19	So turning to Exhibit 8, the fourth
20	paragraph of the article states that: Now a new
21	bottom ash management technology has developed that
22	does not require the use of water and thereby avoids
23	the creation of wet ash that has to be stored in
24	surface impoundments or de-watering storage bins.

Γ

	Page 209
1	MS. OLSON: Is there a question?
2	MR. ARMSTRONG: I guess just following up
3	on that, then, given the article, does the Agency
4	believe that it's technically feasible to dry or
5	handle bottom ash?
6	MS. FRANZETTI: I'm just going to pose an
7	objection that the witness has not even had the
8	chance to read the entire article, and simply citing
9	to a sentence from it, I don't think is a fair
10	question.
11	MS. OLSON: I second that objection.
12	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any response to
13	that, Mr. Armstrong?
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll withdraw the
15	question. I will move on to my second pre-filed
16	question.
17	MS. ZEMAN: May I ask a question on
18	number 1 before moving on to 2?
19	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Please go ahead,
20	but announce your name and any affiliation you may
21	have.
22	MS. ZEMAN: My name is Christine Zeman,
23	Counsel for City Water, Light and Power in
24	Springfield.

Page 210 1 Regarding the -- and I don't know whoever 2 put the answers together for number 1 here -- but 3 regarding the list of facilities that handled ash 4 using dry handling, Dallman Unit 4 utilizes dry ash 5 handling for both bottom and fly ash. 6 Was your intent to only list those 7 facilities that utilize dry across the entire 8 facility, or all units, or did you simply omit 9 Dallman 4 accidentally? MR. BUSCHER: I was not aware -- I 10 omitted accidentally Dallman 4. 11 12 MS. ZEMAN: Okay. 13 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any further 14 questions, Ms. Zeman? 15 MS. ZEMAN: No. 16 MR. ARMSTRONG: One additional question 17 on -- a follow-up question on question 1. 18 At each of these facilities, can you tell 19 us how many of the coal ash units at these facilities 20 are currently operating? MR. BUSCHER: This is with regard to 21 22 number 1? 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. 24 MR. BUSCHER: What do you mean by

Page 211 1 operating? 2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Accepting coal combustion 3 waste. 4 MR. BUSCHER: Could you repeat the 5 question? 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: With respect to the 7 facilities listed in answer to question 1, can you 8 advise how many coal ash impoundments at each of 9 these facilities are currently receiving coal combustion waste? 10 11 MR. BUSCHER: I believe that that is 12 in --13 MS. OLSON: We're counting. 14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. So --15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Do you want to wait just a moment, Mr. Buscher, to answer that question 16 17 before you move on? MR. BUSCHER: Yeah. I'm going to have to 18 19 keep counting. 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: I've got a follow-up 21 question, too. Exhibit N has the impoundments for 22 each of the facilities, it appears. Would there be a 23 way to submit a version of the Exhibit N that just 24 lists whether these are active or inactive?

Page 212 1 MS. OLSON: We elected not to do that at 2 this stage. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. 4 MS. DEXTER: Can I just ask a question? 5 Do you anticipate presenting the list of which units are active and which are inactive at some point 6 7 during rulemaking? 8 MS. OLSON: The Board has a question 9 regarding that, and we can answer that question now 10 if you want, but we are going to address it when we answer the Board's questions. 11 12 MS. DEXTER: Just to clarify, what I would like to see is -- I think what I've seen from 13 14 the questions, your response to the Board's 15 questions, is that there's a number, but it would be 16 nice to know which units within the facility they 17 are, especially when we have a list like this here, where we have a list of facilities here. 18 19 MS. OLSON: We decided we're not going to 20 generate a list like that, primarily because we don't want to be wrong. I mean, there's a lot of reasons 21 22 why we don't want to do that. We chose not to 23 generate that list, and instead we answered the 24 questions by listing them here.

Page 213 1 MS. DEXTER: Okay. So, but are we ever 2 in the rulemaking going to see that list? 3 MS. OLSON: You're free to generate that list, if you'd like. I mean, the answers are here. 4 5 You can put it in a table and generate that list if 6 you want. 7 MS. DEXTER: Sounds good. 8 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Traci Barkley from 9 Three Rivers has advised me that there is a list on 10 the Agency's website that goes down by each facility and lists how many of the ponds are active and 11 inactive, lined and unlined, so --12 13 MS. OLSON: That may not be accurate. Ι 14 mean, I can't tell you right now whether or not 15 that's accurate. 16 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. We don't have 17 copies to submit it now, but we will -- I anticipate 18 we will bring that information to the Board's 19 attention. 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Armstrong, does 21 your reference to the materials that you've located 22 on the Agency's web page address the question you had 23 posed to Mr. Buscher a moment ago? MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, I guess we'd like 24

February 26, 2014

	Page 214
1	to get clarification if the information that we have
2	is correct, and we would like to get it into the
3	record about how many are active and inactive, lined
4	and unlined, and which ones specifically.
5	MS. OLSON: I'm not exactly sure why this
6	is relevant to the rulemaking. This rulemaking is
7	setting up a process for these units to come in and
8	do corrective action and closure and to monitor.
9	We're not looking at any particular site, we're not
10	looking at any particular surface impoundments. So
11	the site-specific data requests, I'm struggling to
12	find the relevance for the Board to make their
13	decision on the Agency's proposal.
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, we're just trying
15	to establish the scope of the issue in Illinois how
16	many active, inactive, lined and unlined impoundments
17	there are that will be addressed by the rule.
18	MS. OLSON: So was the Agency's response
19	of how many impoundments there are in Illinois an
20	answer to that question? Because they would all be
21	subject to this rule.
22	MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct. But we are
23	trying to understand the extent to which those
24	impoundments are actually already lined or unlined,

February 26, 2014

Page 215 1 to the extent to which they're no longer receiving coal combustion waste. 2 3 MS. OLSON: How does that fact change the 4 Agency's proposal to the Board? 5 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Let's step back 6 just for a moment. 7 Mr. Armstrong, I think it would be 8 helpful to rephrase or restate the question that you 9 had originally posed to Mr. Buscher. MR. ARMSTRONG: So our original question 10 was simply with respect to the seven facilities 11 12 listed in response to question 1, how many active impoundments are there at each of those facilities? 13 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And Mr. Buscher, 15 plainly you've been preparing to answer that. Are 16 you ready to do so? 17 MR. BUSCHER: I am ready to tell you that T estimated 20. 18 19 MR. ARMSTRONG: So 20 units, active 20 units, at those facilities? 21 MS. OLSON: What do you mean by active? 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Receiving coal combustion 23 waste. MS. OLSON: 24 Today, yesterday, within the

February 26, 2014

Page 216 1 last six months, within the last 18 months, within 2 the last five years? Like what do you mean by 3 active? 4 MR. ARMSTRONG: Within the Agency's 5 definition of an active impoundment. MS. OLSON: So within the last 18 months? 6 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Sure. MR. BUSCHER: I can't answer in the last 8 9 18 months, but what I can answer is they can receive -- it's my understanding, based on the 10 information I have, but as you know -- you know, 11 whether they're receiving, really depends on 12 13 operational considerations at each plant. 14 MS. OLSON: So it's possible that the 15 number that you've cited, some of those facilities could not have received waste in the last 18 months? 16 17 MR. BUSCHER: That is correct. 18 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Any additional 19 follow-up, Mr. Armstrong? 20 MS. DEXTER: I can help to clarify that. 21 So I think we've talked a bit about the applicability 22 of the rule, and there's sort of two branches: 23 Either you are operating on or after the effective 24 date of these rules, or you're not operating, but

February 26, 2014

Page 217 1 there's a groundwater -- there's evidence that 2 there's groundwater -- I can't read the exact 3 language but --4 So in order to understand whether the 5 rule covers the scope of what it needs to cover, we 6 need to have an estimate of, just take a snapshot of 7 what's happening right now, who would fall under A1 and who would follow under A2? 8 9 MS. OLSON: I'm not exactly sure that 10 snapshot today would an accurate depiction of what units would be falling under this rule until the rule 11 12 becomes finalized, because there are things that can 13 happen between now and when the Board finalizes its 14 rule that would take some of those units out of this 15 rule's reach. So it's really hard for the Agency to 16 anticipate or speculate as to what units would be 17 covered by this rule when it is adopted. 18 MS. DEXTER: Sure. And I don't think 19 it's inappropriate for us to attempt to give the rule 20 a test to see, to sort of say if this rule were 21 effective today, how it would work. 22 Wouldn't we -- wouldn't I MR. BUSCHER: 23 be required to speculate in order to answer that? 24 MS. DEXTER: It's not speculation. It's

February 26, 2014

Page 218 1 how does that policy that we're developing work? MS. OLSON: How does having a liner in 2 3 place effect whether or not the rule is applicable to 4 a coal combustion waste surface impoundment? 5 MS. DEXTER: That's two separate 6 questions we're talking about. 7 MS. OLSON: But he's asking Bill about 8 liners. 9 MS. DEXTER: He's asking about whether they are accepting coal combustion waste, which is 10 the difference of, if this were effective today, 11 12 that's the universe that would be covered by A1. 13 MR. BUSCHER: I've answered the question. 14 MS. DEXTER: And I think we've answered it to the extent we have, but I wanted to address the 15 16 relevancy of this line of questioning. 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Further follow-ups 18 on your first question, Mr. Armstrong, or are you 19 ready to go on to number 2 at this point? 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'm ready to go on to 21 number 2. 22 Question 2: On page 2 of the Statement 23 of Reasons, the Agency states that some power 24 generating facilities remove ash from surface

February 26, 2014

	Page 219
1	impoundments and dispose of it offsite. Could you
2	please identify the power generating facilities in
3	Illinois that remove CCW from impoundments for
4	disposal elsewhere? And you identified four
5	facilities that remove ash from surface impoundments
6	and dispose of it offsite.
7	I guess my one follow-up question would
8	be, do you agree, then, that CCW can be removed in a
9	safe manner from surface impoundments if disposed
10	offsite?
11	MR. BUSCHER: That's not my area of
12	expertise.
13	MS. OLSON: Can you explain that?
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: The question was directed
15	to Mr. Cobb, if anybody.
16	MS. OLSON: These questions are answered
17	by the panel, and the Agency has divided up the
18	responses amongst the witnesses, and so there's not a
19	particular witness that will answer a particular
20	question.
21	MR. ARMSTRONG: That's fine.
22	MR. RAO: Is there anyone on the panel
23	that is qualified to answer that question?
24	MR. BUSCHER: Would you repeat the

Page 220 1 question? 2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Does the Agency agree 3 that CCW can be removed from an ash impoundment and 4 disposed of offsite in a safe manner that's 5 protective of the environment? 6 MR. BUSCHER: If it goes to a disposal 7 facility that meets the required environmental 8 regulations of the State. 9 MS. OLSON: So can I ask a follow-up question? 10 11 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Go ahead. 12 MS. OLSON: Do you say this is not your 13 area of expertise because you don't permit landfills? 14 MR. BUSCHER: That is correct. And also, 15 I don't get involved with movement of ash. That's not my expertise as far as potential air issues and 16 17 so on. 18 MS. OLSON: So there's multiple media 19 involved --20 Yeah -- yes. MR. BUSCHER: MS. OLSON: -- with the movement of ash, 21 22 and you're concerned with groundwater contamination. 23 MR. BUSCHER: Yes. 24 MS. FRANZETTI: Can I ask a follow-up?

February 26, 2014

Page 221 1 Has anybody on the panel ever overseen the removal of ash from a surface impoundment and its disposal 2 3 offsite? 4 That is ongoing at this MR. BUSCHER: 5 point in time at Midwest Gen facilities. MS. FRANZETTI: 6 My question is, have any 7 of you personally overseen that, been present to 8 oversee it? 9 MR. BUSCHER: No, ma'am. 10 MS. FRANZETTI: Does anyone on the panel have a different answer? 11 12 THE PANEL: No. 13 MR. ARMSTRONG: Moving on to question 3. 14 We asked about the number of CCW impoundments in 15 Illinois, and the Agency provided Exhibit N, which 16 contains the number of impoundments of which the 17 Agency is aware and the year of -- of which each 18 impoundment commenced operation was not available for 19 all impoundments, but the available information on 20 the year the impoundments commenced operation can be found in Exhibit O. 21 22 (The court reporter asked Mr. Armstrong 23 to repeat the previous question.) 24 MR. ARMSTRONG: I was just going to note

. February 26, 2014

	Page 222
1	that the Agency did provide two exhibits that
2	contained information about the coal ash impoundments
3	in response to our question.
4	I'll move on to question 5: On page 3 of
5	the Statement of Reasons, the Agency states that some
6	of the surface impoundments are lined with
7	impermeable materials, while others are not. Could
8	you please identify which CCW impoundments are lined,
9	and with what type of lining?
10	And the Agency refers to Exhibit N.
11	Exhibit N specifies three different types of liner
12	types: No liner, synthetic, and clay. Is the Agency
13	able to provide any additional information about the
14	specific type of synthetic liners at the
15	impoundments?
16	MR. BUSCHER: I don't have that site
17	specific information with me.
18	MS. OLSON: I would like to say that the
19	Agency can go back and get it, but we don't think
20	it's relevant for these proceedings. These are not
21	site-specific rulemakings. We're not evaluating how
22	each and every single one of these ponds are closing
23	or doing corrective action or any of that. So the
24	fact that there's listed what type of liner it has, I

Page 223

1 think is sufficient.

2	MR. ARMSTRONG: Question number 6.
3	On page 3 of the Statement of Reasons,
4	the Agency states that when the CCW surface
5	impoundments are not lined with impermeable material,
6	these contaminants may leach into the groundwater
7	affecting the potential use of the groundwater.
8	Our question 6(a) was: Could you please
9	identify all CCW impoundments which from contaminants
10	currently are, or are suspected by the Agency to be
11	leaching into groundwater?
12	The Response was that the Agency cannot
13	in all instances identify specific impoundments that
14	are suspected of causing groundwater standards
15	exceedances; however, the Agency believes one or more
16	impoundments at the following generating stations are
17	causing exceedances of groundwater standards, and
18	eight facilities are listed.
19	My follow-up question is, the initial
20	question was how many facilities how many
21	impoundments from which contaminants are expected to
22	be leaching into the groundwater, not necessarily
23	causing groundwater exceedances? Does the answer not
24	include facilities in which a GMZ has been put in

Page 224 1 place? 2 MR. DUNAWAY: We took this question to 3 mean that a generating station had unlined ponds and 4 that we suspected those were causing contamination of 5 groundwater, which would be exceedances of 6 groundwater standards. 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: There are additional 8 facilities in which there are groundwater 9 exceedances; is that correct, though? 10 MR. DUNAWAY: They currently have 11 exceedances, yes. 12 MS. OLSON: Are these -- when you say facilities, are you talking -- do you know whether or 13 14 not these exceedances are caused by coal combustion 15 waste, or are you speaking generally about having a 16 groundwater standard exceedance from anything on 17 their site? 18 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, for example, the 19 Midwest Generation facilities -- well, let me pull 20 back from that question for a second. 21 I'll move on to question (b): Is the 22 Agency aware of any lined CCW impoundments from which 23 contaminants are, or are suspected by the Agency to 24 be leaching into groundwater? And the Agency's

Page 225 1 Response was no. 2 Could I also ask that question? Is the 3 Agency aware of any lined impoundments from which 4 contaminants have or have been suspected by the 5 Agency to have leached into groundwater? 6 MS. OLSON: What do you mean by have? 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Any of the impoundments 8 where -- a lined impoundment that at one time --9 MS. OLSON: Leached, but no longer does? 10 MR. ARMSTRONG: Has leached at any time 11 in the past. 12 MR. DUNAWAY: Can you repeat that question since there was a little discussion? 13 14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. 15 Is the Agency aware of any CCW 16 impoundment that while it was lined has been 17 suspected by the Agency of causing contaminants to 18 leach into groundwater? MR. DUNAWAY: I'm not aware of any that 19 20 while it was lined we suspected leached into 21 groundwater. 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: I quess the follow-up 23 question to that would be, then, with respect to the 24 Midwest Generation sites that the Agency required the

February 26, 2014

	Page 226
1	impoundments to be relined, did the Agency believe
2	that those sites those impoundments before they
3	were relined, leach contaminants into the
4	groundwater?
5	MR. DUNAWAY: Please repeat that.
6	MR. ARMSTRONG: With respect to the
7	Midwest Generation facilities at which impoundments
8	were relined, does the Agency suspect that before
9	those impoundments were relined, they caused
10	contaminants to leach into groundwater?
11	MR. DUNAWAY: The ponds, Midwest Gen
12	ponds that we had relined, we, the Agency, did not
13	think that the liners that were in those were
14	adequate.
15	MR. ARMSTRONG: And do you believe, then,
16	that the inadequate liners caused contamination to
17	leach from the inadequately lined impoundments into
18	groundwater?
19	MS. FRANZETTI: I'm going to object that
20	it calls for speculation.
21	MS. OLSON: I object on relevance. It's
22	just not relevant to these proceedings whether or not
23	Midwest Gen had a liner at some point that may have
24	leaked at some point in history. I mean, we're

February 26, 2014

Page 227 1 talking about a rule that sets up a process for 2 corrective action and closure monitoring, not what's 3 happening at Midwest Gen. 4 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I'm sorry. Do you 5 have a response to the objection you've heard? Yes. 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think it's 7 important to see how the Agency has dealt with these 8 impoundments in the past because the proposal is to 9 continue the Agency's current strategy. So I think 10 it's important to establish what groundwater contamination has taken place, the circumstances 11 12 under which it has taken place, so that we can assess 13 the adequacy of the Agency's approach. 14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: And I'm allowing 15 The very subject of this proposal is the question. 16 the protection of groundwater from any risks that may 17 be posed by CCW. 18 Mr. Armstrong, if you would repeat the 19 question, please, and if the Agency's witness has an 20 answer here, she can provide it. 21 MR. ARMSTRONG: And my question was that 22 with respect to the impoundments at the Midwest 23 Generation facilities that the Agency through a 24 compliance agreement required to be relined, those

February 26, 2014

	Page 228
1	impoundments. During the time that they were, what
2	the Agency considers to be inadequately lined, does
3	the Agency believe, suspect, that they caused
4	contaminants to leach into groundwater?
5	MS. FRANZETTI: Same objection.
6	MR. DUNAWAY: The Agency did issue
7	violation notices on certain facilities so,
8	therefore, we had suspicion that there may have been
9	a leak from one or more of their impoundments.
10	MS. OLSON: Can I ask a follow-up
11	question here?
12	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Please go ahead,
13	Ms. Olson.
14	MS. OLSON: Lynn, can you tell us what an
15	adequate liner the permeability of an adequate
16	liner is?
17	MR. DUNAWAY: An adequate liner would be
18	at least two feet of clay compacted to one times ten
19	to the minus 7th centimeters per second, or a
20	synthetic liner with an equivalent amount that
21	provides an equivalent amount of protection.
22	MS. OLSON: So if a liner has more
23	permeability than one times ten to the minus 7, the
24	Agency would consider that to be an inadequate liner?

Т

February 26, 2014

	Page 229
1	MR. DUNAWAY: Yes.
2	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further,
3	Ms. Olson?
4	MS. OLSON: No.
5	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Armstrong,
6	before you go on to your next question, do you have
7	any follow-ups on that question?
8	MR. ARMSTRONG: I do have one follow-up
9	question.
10	With respect to Exhibit N and the
11	impoundments listed on here, with respect to the
12	impoundments identified as having a synthetic liner
13	type, does the is the Agency aware of the level of
14	protection that is afforded by each of these liners,
15	the conductivity?
16	MR. BUSCHER: Could you repeat the
17	question?
18	MR. ARMSTRONG: So we just heard
19	discussion of what an adequate liner is. With
20	respect to the ash impoundments listed in Exhibit N
21	that are identified as having a synthetic liner type,
22	is it the Agency's opinion that each of these liners
23	is, as we just discussed, adequate?
24	MR. BUSCHER: Generally speaking, with

Page 230 1 regard to synthetic liners, yes, they are adequate. 2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Generally speaking. So 3 for each of these liners, the Agency believes they're 4 adequate? 5 MR. BUSCHER: Some of these liners were 6 put in prior to my being involved with them, so I 7 can't speak to each one of these, but generally that 8 is my expectation. 9 What Bill is saying is, if the MR. COBB: 10 groundwater section comprises hydro geologists and geologic engineers had input into the process, some 11 of that occurred prior to us having input. Where we 12 13 had the input, we require the same standards that we're proposing here. 14 15 MR. ARMSTRONG: And at what time point 16 was that input first delivered? 17 MR. COBB: It's project by project. The 18 applicability of the Board's Part 620 standards, they 19 became effective in 1991, and generally on or around 20 that time, we started, you know, providing input. So 21 that's approximate. 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: So just one last question 23 about the list, then. You can't just look at this 24 list, then, and say which of these liners was

February 26, 2014

Page 231 1 installed after 1991 or which does contain the 2 requirements that you believe are necessary. 3 MS. OLSON: I think the list speaks for There's no data on there that contains when 4 itself. 5 the liner was installed or the permeability of the So, you know, I think the list --6 liner. 7 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Is that a response 8 that you need to be sworn in for? 9 I'm saying I don't MS. OLSON: No. 10 believe the Agency needs to answer because I think the list speaks for itself. 11 12 MS. DEXTER: Is the answer no? 13 MS. OLSON: There is no --14 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Could we have 15 Mr. Armstrong repeat the question? 16 MR. ARMSTRONG: So the question was 17 simply, so someone can't just take a look at this 18 list and say which of these synthetic liners are 19 adequate. 20 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Buscher, do you 21 have an answer to that question? 22 MR. BUSCHER: I can't at this time, no. 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll move on to question 24 6(d). Is the Agency aware of any CCW impoundments

February 26, 2014

Page 232 1 that have caused contamination of groundwater that is 2 connected hydrologically to surface waters? 3 MS. OLSON: I'm going to object as irrelevant. This rulemaking is not about surface 4 5 water. 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: I would argue that it is 7 relevant because what we're talking about is the 8 closure and corrective action necessary at existing 9 impoundments, including the treatment of groundwater. 10 Groundwater that leaches through a nonpoint source is not necessarily going to be addressed by a NPDES 11 12 permit; however, corrective action should address 13 those sort of groundwater issues. HEARING OFFICER FOX: I'm going to allow 14 15 the question. The Agency's written answer 16 contemplates that groundwater can be a conduit to 17 surface water. 18 Mr. Armstrong, if you need to repeat the 19 question, please do so, and have the Agency's 20 witnesses answer it, if they can. 21 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think back to my 22 question first, but in reading the pre-filed question 23 the Response was: Any groundwater that has been 24 contaminated by a CCW impoundment is fairly near the

February 26, 2014

Page 233 1 land's surface. Therefore, it can be assumed that a 2 diffuse flow of groundwater has crossed the interface 3 from groundwater to surface water. 4 Has the Agency attempted to quantify the 5 amount of contaminated groundwater that has, guote, crossed the interface from groundwater to surface 6 7 water at any given facility? MR. DUNAWAY: We have had that -- that 8 9 has been done at Hutsonville with regard to Ash Pond D, the 840 site-specific rule, and that information 10 was provided for the closure at Venice. 11 12 MR. ARMSTRONG: And that would be a complete list of sites for which the Agency has 13 14 considered that has quantified the amount of 15 groundwater that has crossed the interface -- I'm 16 sorry -- the amount of groundwater that has crossed 17 the interface from groundwater to surface water? 18 MR. DUNAWAY: Those are the only facilities that I'm aware of where that -- where that 19 20 has been done. 21 MS. OLSON: Can I ask a follow-up 22 question? 23 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Please go ahead, 24 Ms. Olson.

ſ

	Page 234
1	MS. OLSON: Has it not been done at other
2	facilities because it hasn't been necessary?
3	MR. DUNAWAY: We've not undertaken the
4	assessment of the quantity of groundwater that has
5	crossed into surface water.
6	MS. OLSON: And why not?
7	MR. DUNAWAY: Because our focus is
8	remediation of groundwater, and if we remediate the
9	groundwater, any groundwater that crosses to surface
10	water will be improved if we improve the groundwater.
11	MS. OLSON: That's all I have.
12	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you
13	Ms. Olson.
14	Mr. Armstrong, I think we're back to you
15	at this point.
16	MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll move on to pre-filed
17	question number 9, and our question was: Could you
18	please identify all CCW impoundments known by the
19	Agency to have been constructed, and we had three
20	Subparts I'm sorry five Subparts.
21	First was over a mine void; the second
22	was over a groundwater recharge area; the third was
23	over a wetland; the fourth was over a shallow
24	aquifer; and the fifth was over a site with manmade

Page 235 1 aquifer-like conditions. 2 And the Agency's response to each of 3 these questions was that the Agency does not 4 currently track this information relative to CCW 5 surface impoundments and cannot generate a complete list before the first hearing. 6 7 My first follow-up question would be 8 whether it is accurate to say that these rules, then, 9 were not prepared with any consideration for the structural integrity of the impoundments. 10 11 The Department of Natural MR. COBB: 12 Resources' Office of Water Resources considers the 13 structural integrity of these types of impoundments. MR. ARMSTRONG: But the Agency's approach 14 15 to these impoundments in the rulemaking was not 16 informed by a study of any structural integrity 17 issues with the impoundments in Illinois. 18 MR. COBB: Essentially, when we started 19 the implementation of the ash impoundment strategy, we shared information back and forth between us and 20 21 the Department of Natural Resources to determine if 22 the dam structures at the sites were under a DNR 23 permit. 24 So at the very beginning of the process,

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 236
1	yes, we did consider that, and the capping and
2	closure, I think we need to look at the specific
3	rule, but I believe there's a structural requirement
4	related to closure, just like there would be for a
5	landfill, for example.
6	MS. OLSON: Can I ask a follow-up
7	question?
8	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Has Mr. Cobb
9	finished his response?
10	MR. COBB: Yes.
11	MS. OLSON: So would the Agency consider
12	whether or not a full combustion waste surface
13	impoundment is over a mine void when evaluating the
14	corrective action plan?
15	MR. COBB: The problem with doing that
16	I mean, the quick answer is no, simply because
17	there's not an existing data set out there to know
18	where all the mine voids are.
19	A simple example, in Springfield, there's
20	a subdivision built on the west side. They built the
21	whole subdivision. All of a sudden, the whole
22	subdivision started sinking in. There's an
23	electronic coverage of underground mines that exist
24	in Illinois, but it's not complete. So it's really

February 26, 2014

Page 237 1 hard to make an accurate assessment of that nature 2 when the data set you have isn't complete to begin 3 with. So the answer is no. 4 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Ms. Franzetti, do 5 you have a follow-up? Please go ahead. 6 MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. With respect to 7 question 9(b) about whether any CCW impoundments have 8 been constructed over a groundwater recharge area, do 9 any of you recall whether in the hydro geological 10 assessments that you've required owners or operators of CCW units to do, whether it would have been 11 12 revealed if the -- in that assessment, if the 13 impoundment was over a groundwater recharge area? HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Cobb, are you 14 15 the right person to answer that? 16 If you recall. MS. FRANZETTI: 17 MR. COBB: The panel can do it, but I can 18 answer it. 19 Since we know the hydro geology, we know 20 if it's an unconfined aquifer and it's kind of 21 obvious that it's recharging groundwater for all the 22 facilities that we listed that we sent VNs to because 23 of contaminants, and these were in Attachments 1 24 through 14 in my pre-filed testimony.

# Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	_
	Page 238
1	So it's pretty obvious that that was
2	recharging groundwater at those facilities. So the
3	answer is yes under those assessments.
4	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Can you clarify the
5	use of the initials VN for us, Mr. Cobb?
6	MR. COBB: Oh. Violation Notice.
7	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you.
8	MR. COBB: Sorry.
9	MS. FRANZETTI: And Mr. Cobb, do you
10	think your answer would also be in the affirmative
11	with respect to those assessments revealing whether
12	the CCW unit was over a wetland?
13	MR. COBB: Once again, the types of maps
14	that we would get would probably be showing surface
15	water types of features; for example, a USGS
16	topographic map in most cases would be available.
17	MS. FRANZETTI: And also in most cases
18	were borings available?
19	MR. COBB: Yes.
20	MS. FRANZETTI: Okay. With respect to
21	Subpart D whether the CCW impoundment is over a
22	shallow aquifer, wouldn't the hydro geological
23	assessments that you required station owner or
24	operators to do have identified whether a shallow

February 26, 2014

Page 239 1 aquifer existed? 2 MR. COBB: Yes. 3 MS. FRANZETTI: Is the mere fact that a 4 shallow aquifer exists any -- indicative of the 5 structural integrity of a surface impoundment in the way that these questions are inclined? 6 7 MR. COBB: No. 8 MS. FRANZETTI: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you. 9 Ms. Franzetti. 10 11 I think back to you, Mr. Armstrong, if 12 you have additional follow-ups with regard to question number 9. 13 14 MR. ARMSTRONG: In response to these 15 questions, the answer was: The Agency does not 16 currently track this information relative to CCW 17 surface impoundments and cannot generate a complete 18 list for the first hearing in the rulemaking. 19 Will the Agency generate a complete list 20 at any point in its rulemaking? 21 MR. COBB: Yes. It's going to take a bit 22 of time to do that analysis, and it's going to be 23 other than the site-specific information that we've 24 gotten from the assessments. You know, if we're

February 26, 2014

	Page 240
1	basing things on regional GIS coverages and that sort
2	of thing, it's going to be clearly stated that there
3	are some uncertainties there, but the assessments
4	themselves are you know, it's pretty clear that
5	where on recharge areas, they're shallow aquifers.
6	Groundwater is already contaminated in Attachments
7	mentioned in Attachments 2 through 14 of my pre-filed
8	testimony. It's clear there weren't liners in those
9	facilities.
10	MS. OLSON: May I ask a follow-up
11	question?
12	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Please, go ahead.
13	MS. OLSON: Mr. Cobb, do you know what a
14	manmade aquifer-like condition is?
15	MR. COBB: I don't know what the
16	definition of that is. I've never seen that defined
17	in the Act or in Board Regulations, so I don't know
18	how to answer that question.
19	MS. OLSON: Therefore, will the Agency be
20	able to prepare a list of all coal combustion surface
21	waste surface impoundments known by the Agency to
22	have been constructed over a site with a manmade
23	aquifer-like condition?
24	MR. COBB: No. Generally because we're

February 26, 2014

Page 241 1 following the definitions that are either under the 2 Act or under Board Regulations. That's how we do 3 business. 4 MS. OLSON: So in any response that we 5 compile to question 9, will it contain a response for subquestion (e)? 6 7 MR. COBB: The groundwater quality 8 provisions and standards -- the quick answer is no because that's not under the Board -- under the 9 classification system adopted by the Board for Part 10 620 for which groundwater applies to. 11 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Anything further, 13 Ms. Olson? 14 MS. OLSON: No. 15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thanks very much. 16 Mr. Armstrong, anything further on 17 question number 9? MR. ARMSTRONG: I have been advised that 18 19 there may, in fact, be a definition of manmade 20 aquifer-like conditions in the Act; and, if so, we will submit that. 21 22 MS. OLSON: Thank you. 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Pre-filed question number 24 10. What is the basis for the following statement on

February 26, 2014

	Page 242
1	page 10 of the Technical Support Document? The two
2	facilities that have the potential to impact offsite
3	drinking water are Havana East Pond, which is lined
4	and currently in compliance, and Edwards, which is
5	unlined, but currently in compliance.
6	And the Response is that this statement
7	means that the groundwater flow direction is from
8	under these units to offsite, and offsite groundwater
9	is Class I Potable Resource Groundwater.
10	My follow-up question is, does this mean
11	that the offsite groundwater that's directly adjacent
12	to the site is Class I Potable Resource Groundwater?
13	Is that the meaning of your answer?
14	MR. COBB: Which facility are you
15	referring to?
16	MR. ARMSTRONG: In question 10, you
17	stated that the two facilities that have potential to
18	impact offsite drinking water are the Havana East
19	Pond and Edwards, and the answer was that they have
20	the potential to impact offsite groundwater that is
21	Class I Potable Resource Groundwater.
22	My question is, does your answer refer to
23	the fact that the immediately adjacent offsite
24	groundwater is Class I Potable Resource Groundwater,

February 26, 2014

Page 243 1 and that is why these have been identified? 2 MR. COBB: Yes. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. So --4 MR. COBB: And on site as well. 5 MR. ARMSTRONG: So I just want to clarify that the reason that these two were identified is 6 7 because the immediately adjacent groundwater is Class 8 I and, therefore, if there is -- for example, a 9 facility that has immediately adjacent groundwater that isn't Class I, but Class I groundwater might be 10 further offsite, that would not be taken into account 11 12 in this description? 13 MR. COBB: So you're saying it's Class II 14 offsite, possibly? Is that what you're saying? 15 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right, just immediately 16 adjacent groundwater. 17 MS. OLSON: Immediately adjacent to what? 18 MR. ARMSTRONG: To the facility. 19 MS. OLSON: To the site boundary or to 20 the unit? MR. COBB: The site boundary or the unit 21 22 that's subject to these regulations? 23 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, again, the answer 24 states that this statement means that the groundwater

February 26, 2014

Page 244 1 flow direction is from under these units to offsite, 2 and offsite groundwater is Class I Potable Resource 3 Groundwater. MR. COBB: You said units that time 4 instead of site or facilities. 5 6 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, your answer uses 7 both units and site. MS. OLSON: Well, I think the answer is 8 9 the property boundary, but I just want to be sure that we're talking about the same thing. So is it 10 the property boundary that you're referring to? 11 12 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. 13 MS. OLSON: The groundwater on the other 14 side of the property boundary? 15 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. So your answer is 16 based on the fact that the reason that these two 17 sites were identified is the groundwater immediately 18 adjacent to the property boundary was Class I 19 groundwater, is that correct? MR. COBB: Correct. I think I answered 20 21 that one. 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. So this doesn't 23 exclude the possibility of sites where the 24 groundwater immediately adjacent to the property

February 26, 2014

Page 245 1 boundary is not Class I groundwater, but there could 2 be Class I groundwater nearby. 3 MR. COBB: That wasn't really what I was intending by the statement. I was talking about 4 5 conditions where we have the potential, so you've got Class I geologic materials. 6 7 So it's not -- they aren't tight geologic 8 materials. They have a permeability and contaminants 9 can move through them. However, the downgradient wells don't have contaminants in them at a 10 concentration that even threatens offsite 11 groundwater. So my intent wasn't to say -- you know, 12 13 to try to come up with a scenario where we were 14 including in this a tight geologic material. 15 If it's Class II, they're geologic materials that have a hydraulic conductivity of less 16 17 than 10 to the minus 4 centimeters per second, so 18 groundwater doesn't flow within those. So if you did have that, that would limit flow offsite, but that 19 20 wasn't really what I was intending by the statement. 21 You could also have Class III, which is 22 certainly highly permeable and, once again, I was 23 talking about these two specific situations, and I 24 know it's Class I onsite and offsite, and the flow is

February 26, 2014

	Page 246
1	moving from onsite to offsite, but the downgradient
2	wells relative to the units don't have concentrations
3	that would even threaten a nondegradation standard
4	offsite. That's what I'm saying. That's a good
5	thing.
6	MR. ARMSTRONG: Moving on to question
7	number 12.
8	On pages 2 to 3 of your pre-filed
9	testimony you state: Corrective actions were
10	implemented at surface impoundments where groundwater
11	contamination resulted from CCW prior to the TVA
12	event under consent orders that included approved
13	groundwater management zones at Havana, Wood River,
14	and Hennepin. The corrective action conducted under
15	the consent order GMZ at Dynegy's Havana Station has
16	restored contaminated groundwater to meet the
17	numerical groundwater standards. Have numerical
18	groundwater standards been met at Wood River and
19	Hennepin?
20	The answer is that the numerical
21	standards have not yet been achieved at all wells at
22	either Wood River or Hennepin. However, both sites
23	are in compliance with the requirements of their
24	GMZs.

. February 26, 2014

	Page 247
1	My question is: First, what was the date
2	in which these GMZs were put in place at Wood River
3	and Hennepin?
4	MR. DUNAWAY: I don't recall the specific
5	dates, but I could find it.
6	MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, I do have a list of
7	GMZs that we received from the Agency in the form of
8	a response. Oh, I'm sorry. It appears to be in
9	Exhibit 1 Exhibit N, and the GMZ was established
10	for the Hennepin Station in 1996, for example. So
11	the GMZ has been in place now for 18 years.
12	My question is, how long does how long
13	does the Agency anticipate it will take Hennepin to
14	reach compliance with the numerical water quality
15	standards?
16	MR. COBB: Well, before we get to that
17	question, I don't know if modeling's been done to
18	predict that, but the reason the GMZ provisions were
19	in place, this groundwater doesn't clean up
20	overnight. It can take decades to clean up
21	groundwater. Groundwater moves in centimeters per
22	second, not feet per day like surface water, so there
23	was a there was a meaningful
24	When that was proposed to the Board and

February 26, 2014

	Page 248
1	the Board adopted it, there was an understanding that
2	groundwater can take a significant amount of time to
3	clean up. We've had sites that had been finally
4	cleaned up, but it took 20 years.
5	Now I'll turn it over to the panel to see
6	if there is any specific knowledge.
7	MR. DUNAWAY: At both Wood River and
8	Hennepin, there was a predictive modeling done for
9	the amount of time that each well would take to reach
10	the groundwater quality standard. Some of those
11	wells have reached that level; some of them have not.
12	I can't tell you sitting right here now which ones
13	have and which ones have not or the exact number at
14	either station.
15	MR. COBB: The issue is that before we
16	approve the GMZ we require predictive modeling, but
17	it's modeling, and that's why we always require
18	monitoring to go along with that to see if a
19	corrective action plan needs to be amended, and in
20	this case, if some of the wells are cleaning up
21	like I said, groundwater takes a significant amount
22	of time to clean up.
23	Now, if there were an offsite threat to
24	groundwater in other words, there were

	Page 249
1	contaminants threatening to go offsite then we
2	wouldn't just be sitting there watching the
3	groundwater management zone, we would the
4	corrective action would have to deal with that as
5	well. So I just want to make sure that's clear that
6	you know how we do business on that.
7	MR. ARMSTRONG: Is the Agency able to
8	tell us at this point at what point the model
9	predicts there will be compliance with the numerical
10	standards?
11	MR. DUNAWAY: I could look at the most
12	recent annual report submitted under those GMZs and
13	look at the graphs for the wells.
14	MR. ARMSTRONG: So one more question
15	about on the Hennepin station on Exhibit N. There
16	are seven impoundments listed in total. Ponds 1
17	through 4 are identified as having no liner. Is the
18	Agency aware of whether those ponds have been closed?
19	MR. DUNAWAY: I'm sorry. Which station?
20	MR. ARMSTRONG: The Hennepin station, on
21	page 2 of Exhibit N.
22	MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. I have Exhibit N in
23	front of me. Now, what is your question?
24	MR. ARMSTRONG: Of those Ponds 1 through

February 26, 2014

	Page 250
1	4 that are stated as having no liner, is the Agency
2	aware of whether those impoundments have been closed?
3	MR. DUNAWAY: They are no longer
4	receiving ash, which was the stipulation of the GMZ.
5	MR. ARMSTRONG: But to your knowledge,
6	they don't have a cap at this point?
7	MR. DUNAWAY: I cannot answer the
8	question specifically for all of them, but for Pond
9	2, it has it's having a landfill constructed on
10	top of it, which will serve as a capping mechanism.
11	MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll move on to question
12	14. Under the ash impoundment strategy referenced on
13	page 3 of your pre-filed testimony, has the Agency
14	assessed the potential for groundwater flow from
15	impoundments to surface waters; and the answer is
16	yes.
17	Could you give an example of a case in
18	which you assessed the potential for groundwater flow
19	from impoundments to surface waters?
20	MR. COBB: Well, when you're determining
21	or evaluating groundwater flow, you develop what's
22	called a potentiometric surface, which is basically a
23	map of the water table and groundwater flows from
24	upgradient to downgradient perpendicular to those

February 26, 2014

,	Page 251
1	contours, and typically those maps then are overlain
2	on either digital area photographs or USGS
3	topographic maps, and surface water features are
4	shown on those maps, so and then a geologic
5	cross-section may also show surface water features.
6	So yes, we can see where groundwater is
7	flowing towards surface water and surface water
8	features are shown on potentiometric surface maps and
9	groundwater flow direction maps.
10	MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll move on to question
11	18. On page 9 of your pre-filed testimony, you
12	discussed several impacts of contamination of
13	groundwater by total dissolved solids, boron, and
14	sulfate, and my question was: Did you review the
15	evidence of human health risks from TDS, boron,
16	sulfate or manganese. If so, please describe those
17	impacts.
18	You responded that those factors were
19	considered in the Class I Potable Resource
20	Groundwater standards adopted by the Board for these
21	constituents pursuant to Section 8 of the Illinois
22	Groundwater Protection Act and Section 27 of the Act.
23	The records in R89-14 and R89-14(B) include this
24	information.

February 26, 2014

	Page 252
1	And I do have to submit as exhibits
2	Drinking Water Health Advisories from the United
3	States Environmental Protection Agency that post date
4	the 1989 proceedings that include additional studies
5	of health impacts from those constituents.
6	MR. COBB: The 1989?
7	MR. ARMSTRONG: I'm sorry?
8	MR. COBB: 1989, you say?
9	MR. ARMSTRONG: They post date the
10	Rulemaking 89-14.
11	MR. COBB: Well, R89-14(B) was adopted in
12	1981.
13	MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.
14	MR. COBB: And I actually did this
15	research myself in proposing the standards, and I'm
16	familiar with drinking water advisories because I am
17	the Deputy Division Manager of the Division of Public
18	Water Supplies, so if we have new USEPA MCLs, or
19	whatever, we've had multiple times that we've updated
20	and amended standards since 1991, and I've been
21	involved in every one of those situations.
22	HEARING OFFICER FOX: By MCL, you mean
23	MR. COBB: Maximum contaminant level.
24	HEARING OFFICER FOX: Thank you for

February 26, 2014

Page 253 1 clarifying. Sorry to interrupt. MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, we do have these --2 3 the most recent drinking water advisories. Are you aware whether these have been concluded in the 4 Pollution Control Board dockets? 5 6 MS. OLSON: Do you mean included? 7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Included. 8 MR. COBB: Boy, I would certainly think 9 so, yes. MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, just for the sake 10 of the record, I do have --11 12 MR. COBB: I don't know for sure. Can 13 you provide us your copies and we'll cross-reference 14 those with the standards. These are health advisories, can I ask? 15 16 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Armstrong had 17 some questions. Why don't we let him distribute that 18 and see if there are specific questions that ensue 19 from that. 20 MR. ARMSTRONG: I have three documents 21 that are being distributed; The Drinking Water Health 22 Advisory for Manganese from January 2004; the 23 Drinking Water Advisory: Consumer Acceptability 24 Advice and Health Effects Analysis on Sulfate from

February 26, 2014

Page 254 1 February 2003; and then Drinking Water Health 2 Advisory for Boron, from May 2008. 3 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I'm sorry. If we could wait just a moment, we're still under way with 4 5 the distribution. MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. I move to submit 6 7 these exhibits as Exhibits 8, 9 and 10. 8 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Armstrong, we have admitted Exhibit number 8. It would be 9, 10 9 10 and 11. MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. 11 12 HEARING OFFICER FOX: I want to be 13 absolutely clear on which is which. Have you 14 numbered them already? Can we do it in alphabetical 15 order? MR. ARMSTRONG: That sounds reasonable. 16 17 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Why don't we call 18 the document entitled Drinking Water Health Advisory 19 for Boron as Exhibit Number 9, merely labeling it at 20 this point; the Drinking Water Health Advisory for 21 Manganese as Exhibit Number 10; and the Drinking 22 Water Advisory: Consumer Acceptability Advice and 23 Health Effects Analysis on Sulfate as Exhibit Number 24 11, naturally. But I interrupted you, Mr. Armstrong.

February 26, 2014

Page 255 1 We can go back to you to complete what you were 2 preparing to say. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: And I move to have these exhibits entered as Exhibits 9, 10 and 11. 4 HEARING OFFICER FOX: The environmental 5 6 groups have circulated copies of these. I can see 7 many of the participants. Having heard 8 Mr. Armstrong's motion to admit these three documents 9 as Exhibits 9, 10 and 11, is there any objection? Neither seeing nor hearing any objection, 10 Mr. Armstrong, they will be marked and admitted into 11 12 the record as those exhibit numbers. 13 (Exhibit Numbers 9, 10 and 11 were marked for identification and admitted 14 15 into evidence.) 16 Please go ahead. 17 MR. ARMSTRONG: Our question was, did you 18 review the evidence of human health risks from TDS, 19 boron, sulfate, or manganese? If so, please describe 20 those impacts. 21 In your pre-filed testimony, you stated, 22 for example, that boron contamination may prevent 23 watering of sensitive plants. Are you aware of any 24 other human health impacts on top of that?

February 26, 2014

Page 256 1 MR. COBB: No, I'm not. USEPA has not 2 established a drinking water standard for boron. 3 Drinking water standards take into account health 4 advisories, such available treatment technology and 5 analytical treatment techniques. I have not reviewed these documents, but that is the general framework 6 7 for how drinking water MCLs are established by the 8 USEPA. They are promulgate health advisories as 9 drinking water standards, and we still have them for 10 boron. 11 MR. ARMSTRONG: Are you aware of any 12 negative human health impacts from manganese? 13 MR. COBB: USEPA has not established a 14 primary drinking water standard for manganese. 15 They've established an aesthetic secondary standard, 16 so no, I'm not, but I'm familiar with the USEPA 17 drinking water standards process. 18 MR. ARMSTRONG: And are you aware of 19 whether sulfate has any negative human health impacts 20 beyond your statement in your pre-filed testimony 21 that participants in the study of health effects from 22 exposure to high levels of sulfate in drinking water 23 studies complained that they cannot drink the water 24 because it smelled and tasted so bad?

February 26, 2014

Page 257 1 MR. COBB: USEPA has not established a 2 primary drinking water standard for sulfate. 3 MR. ARMSTRONG: So you're not aware of 4 any studies that show any health impacts from 5 sulphate? 6 MR. COBB: No. If there was an MCL, 7 that's what we apply to drinking water to protect 8 public health and -- to protect public health that 9 consume the community water supplies across the state and across the nation, actually. Those are found 10 in -- by the way, in Illinois Pollution Control Board 11 12 Regulations 35 Ill. Adm. Code Part 611. 13 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll move on to question 14 20. With respect to groundwater management zones --15 HEARING OFFICER FOX: Mr. Armstrong, I'd 16 like to interrupt, if we could, and we certainly can 17 return to your questions. 18 We have reached the time of 5 o'clock, 19 and we have been under way for guite a while. We 20 certainly have made some progress on your questions, 21 your pre-filed questions, but those that remain and 22 the Board's questions, approximately 60, would 23 require us to go to a very late night to wrap them 24 up.

	Page 258
1	What I would like to propose is that we
2	break for the day today. This hearing was scheduled
3	to continue, if necessary, tomorrow morning in this
4	very same place at 9:00 a.m., since we are all here
5	in town, and I'd like to break there and allow us to
6	resume at 9 o'clock tomorrow, at which point we can
7	take up question number 20, continue through all of
8	the remaining questions.
9	I believe you have exactly 50 questions
10	that you have submitted. We can continue with the
11	follow-ups, then turn to the questions that the Board
12	has filed as well and wrap up as soon as possible
13	tomorrow.
14	I don't see any objections to that as I
15	watch people closing their notebooks. We will plan
16	to see you back here at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.
17	Thank you for your patience for a long
18	day.
19	(Hearing concluded at 5:02 p.m.)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Electronic Filing - Received, Clerk's Office : 03/11/2014 February 26, 2014

	Page 259
1	STATE OF ILLINOIS )
2	) SS COUNTY OF MACON )
3	
4	I, LISA K. HAHN, CSR, RMR, do hereby state
5	that I am a court reporter doing business in the City
6	of Decatur, County of Macon, and State of Illinois;
7	that I reported by means of machine shorthand the
8	proceedings held in the foregoing cause, and that the
9	foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my
10	shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.
11	
12	
13	Lisa K. Hahn, CSR, RMR
14	Notary Public, Macon County, Illinois
15	CSR #84-2149
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

February 26, 2014

Page 260

				ruge 200
A	246:21	169:21 198:12	148:8 152:1	254:9 255:11
A-V-I-L-A	achievement	198:15 200:21	212:10 213:22	255:14
30:19	198:2	214:8 222:23	218:15 232:12	adopt 150:20
<b>A.D</b> 1:19	acidic 97:20	227:2 232:8,12	addressed 130:3	adopted 95:6
<b>a.m</b> 1:20 258:4	acknowledges	236:14 246:14	148:4,7 152:5	120:3 121:1
<b>A1</b> 217:7 218:12	181:21	248:19 249:4	153:1 168:7	122:20 123:7
AI 217.7 218.12 A2 217:8	acknowledgm	actions 61:17	214:17 232:11	125:17 137:15
A2 217.8 abandoned 29:9	208:13	63:2 84:19	addresses 15:4	137:23 203:11
	acre 61:9	246:9	129:13 166:19	217:17 241:10
154:2	acres 122:1,4	activated 192:5	addressing	248:1 251:20
<b>ability</b> 205:14	127:22	active 31:10,13	102:3 146:24	252:11
205:18 206:1,6	acronym 143:20	58:23 211:24	adequacy	advanced 192:1
<b>able</b> 69:1 71:15	act 63:3,3,4	212:6 213:11	227:13	advantage
84:15,20 96:18	91:15,20,24	212:0 215:11 214:3,16	adequate 161:22	204:11
141:22 148:23	92:4,7,9,18,22	215:12,19,21	193:13 226:14	adverse 104:23
175:5 184:1	121:2,3 124:9	216:3,5	228:15,15,17	advertisements
186:1 222:13	121.2,5 124.9	active/inactive	229:19,23	208:3
240:20 249:7	145:14,15	169:12	230:1,4 231:19	Advice 253:24
aboveground	147:8 199:10	<b>activities</b> 61:15	adequately	254:22
119:8,12		61:19 97:7	166:19	
absolutely 13:2	199:13,17,21			advise 71:7
16:17 18:13	199:24 200:11	148:17 172:7	adjacent 119:22	211:8
137:24 155:15	240:17 241:2	actual 140:11	242:11,23	advised 213:9
254:13	241:20 251:22	186:3	243:7,9,16,17	241:18
Acceptability	251:22	add 74:13	244:18,24	advisories 252:2
253:23 254:22	action 15:20	111:23	adjourn 11:2	252:16 253:3
acceptable	32:2 42:3,11	Adding 156:16	adjust 128:4,7	253:15 256:4,8
113:24 132:17	50:14,23 51:4	addition 43:12	<b>adjusted</b> 73:21	Advisory 253:22
132:24 146:14	51:5,9,24 56:4	84:1 92:2	73:23 74:1	253:23 254:2
146:20 149:15	59:3,18,23,24	95:10 100:1	128:11,18	254:18,20,22
183:3	60:20,24 61:4	178:5 200:20	129:5	advocate 13:15
accepted 7:1	61:7,14 62:2	additional 10:24	Adm 1:8 50:15	aesthetic 256:15
accepting 41:13	62:10 63:4	45:11 47:21	123:19 143:21	affect 66:4
211:2 218:10	64:9,11,21	107:14 156:14	143:24 146:17	affiliation 12:11
accessible 8:17	66:8,10 68:20	164:8 170:18	191:8 257:12	209:20
accidentally	92:19 95:24	188:5 194:18	administrative	affirmative
103:8 210:9,11	118:8 119:1	200:22 201:23	6:9 38:6,10	238:10
<b>account</b> 31:24	129:24 130:1,5	210:16 216:18	39:7	afforded 229:14
243:11 256:3	138:12 143:20	222:13 224:7	<b>admit</b> 44:20	aforesaid 259:10
accumulates	143:23 146:5,7	239:12 252:4	46:5 49:9	afraid 12:17
119:7	149:20 154:3	address 10:5	196:13 207:18	afternoon 100:4
accurate 74:19	160:20,24	11:17 58:15,16	255:8	agency 1:17
213:13,15	161:11 166:14	80:15 91:12	admitted 5:2	2:11 6:23 7:5
217:10 235:8	166:16,20	96:5,11,21	45:23 46:3	7:14 9:16 10:6
237:1	167:8 168:23	97:3 132:14	49:12,16	10:9,13 21:7
achieved 163:12	168:24 169:17	145:19,20	196:16,19	41:4,5,15

February 26, 2014

Page 261

				Page 201
	166 0 10 151 5	02 00 05 5	1 40 10 151 0	
42:13,20 43:17	166:3,12 171:7	93:20 95:7	143:13 171:2	alternatives
44:6 46:8,17	171:23 172:2	98:9 103:15	171:10 185:1	181:12
50:4 51:21	172:21 178:19	106:9 107:15	209:19 220:11	amended 248:19
53:4 59:10	179:19,19,21	109:8 116:13	228:12 233:23	252:20
60:1,19,23	181:17,17,21	121:20 128:14	237:5 240:12	<b>Ameren</b> 41:17
61:13,18,21	182:4,24 183:3	137:19 142:1	255:16	95:12 96:6
62:9,17,21	185:4,5 186:6	145:4,20 146:6	<b>aid</b> 143:6	200:4
63:2,15 64:4	191:7 193:6,7	178:24 180:21	<b>air</b> 34:18 42:16	<b>Ameren's</b> 41:17
66:8,21 67:2,7	194:4 196:1	181:4 184:4	220:16	<b>amount</b> 67:16
67:9,16,23	198:3 200:4,12	188:18 195:3	aircraft 145:10	67:23 107:20
72:20 73:1	205:6 207:10	196:21 198:24	Alisa 2:9 6:21	228:20,21
78:21 83:17,21	208:7 209:3	200:8 201:11	Alliance 16:13	233:5,14,16
84:13 86:13	217:15 218:23	205:10 213:10	33:21	248:2,9,21
87:3 88:14,21	219:17 220:2	213:22 214:13	<b>allow</b> 16:16 61:5	amounts 179:23
89:1,12 90:4,6	221:15,17	214:18 215:4	73:17 84:15	180:4
91:6 93:23	222:1,5,10,12	216:4 224:24	143:19 156:14	<b>ample</b> 101:8
94:2,4,7 95:5	222:19 223:4	227:9,13,19	163:14 164:2	Amy 3:4 4:15
95:10,16,21	223:10,12,15	229:22 232:15	166:4 185:3	7:20 43:3 44:1
96:1,24 97:5,5	224:22,23	232:19 235:2	193:16 194:4	114:20 195:16
97:8,19 98:6	225:3,5,15,17	235:14	198:16 199:8	200:19
98:19 99:4	225:24 226:1,8	agent 151:13	199:20 232:14	analogous
100:13 101:22	226:12 227:7	agents 119:13	258:5	161:19
103:7,7,24	227:23 228:2,3	aging 25:20	<b>allowed</b> 18:11	<b>analysis</b> 65:10
104:3,12,17	228:6,24	<b>ago</b> 19:22 52:5	39:7 92:17	66:1,2 72:11
106:5,17	229:13 230:3	75:10 213:23	119:19 128:23	130:23 131:1,4
107:19 109:22	231:10,24	<b>agree</b> 63:15	186:7 199:9,24	131:7,11,13
110:14 116:15	233:4,13	72:17 80:12	<b>allowing</b> 73:4	132:4,12
119:18,24	233.4,15	121:12 142:11	85:5 163:12	132:4,12
122:5 126:1,3	236:11 239:15	148:3 167:15	165:17 227:14	175:5 177:5,11
	239:19 240:19		allows 92:23	194:12 239:22
126:5,5,18		175:7,10 176:13 179:13	142:8 162:3	
128:9 129:4,18	240:21 247:7			253:24 254:23
129:21,21	247:13 249:7	190:5,19	199:14	analytical 83:17
131:6 132:16	249:18 250:1	192:20 193:21	alphabetical	256:5
134:9 136:21	250:13 252:3	200:12 206:10	254:14	<b>analyze</b> 179:11
137:3,3,7	Agency's 7:6,20	219:8 220:2	alternate 55:18	analyzed 83:16
139:1,4 140:13	8:1,13,20,23	<b>agreed</b> 9:7 88:14	55:20 56:13,22	178:8
143:15,22	9:12,20 41:24	93:23	57:4,5 116:17	Anand 2:9 6:20
144:3,11	42:4 47:12	agreement 90:1	142:6	74:15
146:13,16,18	57:7 59:20	227:24	alternative 17:7	ancient 18:22
147:3 149:14	60:11,14 64:10	Agreements	55:24 56:17	and/or 62:14
151:14 153:13	65:12 68:6	91:5 136:22	57:19 59:1	150:21 172:16
153:21 157:10	69:3 70:4	<b>agrees</b> 103:7	71:13 139:13	Andrew 3:8
161:12 162:22	76:18 79:6,12	179:19	149:24 150:7	4:17 63:24
1 1 ( ) 1 ( ) 1 ( ) 1	86:7,21 87:14	<b>ahead</b> 41:10	155:6,9 163:12	74:17 204:18
163:10,16,21			,	
163:10,16,21 164:7,11,11,16	91:13,17 92:4	49:14 66:24	167:8	announce

February 26, 2014

Page 262

				Taye 202
200.20	242.10.22	210.15 221.1	121.1 161.02	61.22 02.0
209:20	242:19,22	219:15 221:1	131:1 161:23	61:23 82:8
<b>annual</b> 37:14	243:23 244:6,8	anymore 23:19	171:15,20	85:6 102:12
42:2 104:9	244:15 246:20	150:4	192:24	105:9 107:2,3
249:12	250:7,15	apologize 64:16	<b>applies</b> 53:19	113:5 116:4
answer 7:22	answered 55:7	163:5 208:5	103:3 109:10	127:10,13
37:16 46:9	55:12,12 83:21	appear 127:19	126:16 151:17	130:10 146:23
47:20 50:7	85:15 102:1	196:22 204:10	152:13 153:20	149:23 150:9
51:17 52:13	132:11 134:15	208:3	241:11	150:16 151:8
55:22 56:18	212:23 218:13	appeared 2:15	<b>apply</b> 50:24	152:13 158:16
59:11,20 60:23	218:14 219:16	2:19 3:5,9 11:1	52:21 54:9	158:22 161:22
67:1 77:24	244:20	appearing 8:21	61:16 67:14,15	173:24 175:18
78:24 80:7,23	answering 164:1	49:20	80:18 88:23	176:6 178:1
83:14 86:22	189:6 197:19	appears 12:10	93:1 95:9	183:7 191:18
87:7 89:10	answers 4:13,14	47:7 127:2	102:15 111:11	192:24 193:19
90:14 92:16	4:16 10:7,10	132:14 204:13	114:24 115:7	194:11
95:1 96:13	20:6 21:8,12	207:23 211:22	115:21 116:2	appropriately
102:10,13	44:5 46:16	247:8	134:5 151:21	191:4
110:4,20	47:12 62:9	apples 158:7	154:17 157:22	approval 60:1
115:13,17	99:24 101:22	applicability	159:12 169:8	64:9 65:12
119:24 121:7	116:16 157:1	55:19 56:2,8	171:24 175:17	90:4 201:7
122:8 129:10	191:11 210:2	56:15 57:14,17	176:10 185:17	<b>approve</b> 75:16
132:1 134:13	213:4	80:18 100:7	201:13 257:7	248:16
135:7 137:14	anthropogenic	101:5,11 102:4	applying 157:7	approved 30:2
141:22 144:8	172:7	128:12 134:12	158:5 191:16	59:22 61:18
144:10 158:12	anti 65:10,21	157:19 169:13	appreciate	64:12 161:23
163:16 164:5	66:1	173:1 216:21	11:20 15:10	169:22 182:4
164:22 165:15	anticipate	230:18	26:18 54:13	184:12 200:21
185:23 187:24	137:12 212:5	applicable 60:6	appreciated	201:4 246:12
188:9,12 189:4	213:17 217:16	60:8 91:20	15:22	approximate
191:20,22	247:13	114:15 126:6,9	<b>apprise</b> 137:21	230:21
193:24 199:7	Antoniolli 3:4	127:10 130:7	approach 69:18	approximately
202:24 211:7	4:15 114:19,20	134:19,23	71:13 74:4	8:22 11:19
211:16 212:9	115:5,12,17	145:18,22	104:14,20	257:22
212:11 214:20	116:8,10,11	150:13 157:22	104.14,20	<b>April</b> 41:17 96:6
212.11 214.20 215:15 216:8,9	195:2,6,12,13	159:18 160:14	119:19,20	<b>aquifer</b> 234:24
			,	-
217:23 219:19	195:16,17,22	161:22 173:1	123:24 124:1,3	237:20 238:22
219:23 221:11	195:24 196:4,9	175:21 199:10	129:18,22	239:1,4
223:23 227:20	196:16,24	218:3	143:19,23	aquifer-like
231:10,12,21	197:5,8 198:6	applicants	148:24 151:7	235:1 240:14
232:15,20	200:15,18	186:22	152:7 163:18	240:23 241:20
236:16 237:3	202:6,17,22	application	173:20 191:16	aquifers 240:5
237:15,18	203:4,6,22,24	60:22 62:15	203:11 227:13	Arcadis 195:19
238:3,10	anybody 16:22	64:13	235:14	195:21
239:15 240:18	16:23 34:7	applied 39:9	appropriate	<b>area</b> 14:3 23:3
241:8 242:13	35:23,24,24	41:18 92:24	50:14,16 51:4	23:10 25:5
	l			

February 26, 2014

Page 263

				-
28:15 30:23	216:4,7,19	14:1,3,20	<b>asking</b> 47:18	assumed 34:20
34:3,11 35:6	218:18,20	15:21 16:14,22	63:171:16	233:1
35:11,18	219:14,21	17:11 18:23	73:15 86:8	assuming 36:5
111:20,21	220:2 221:13	19:3,3 27:2	108:10 117:22	89:5
114:11 116:1,6	221:22,24	28:5,17 29:11	119:17 178:9	assumption
116:7 120:6	223:2 224:7,18	31:5,10,13,23	189:7,12,13,14	193:8
121:23 123:3	225:7,10,14,22	32:5,9 38:16	189:18,19,21	assurance 32:21
124:14,20	226:6,15 227:6	38:24 40:5,7	202:1 218:7,9	assurances
125:17 219:11	227:18,21	41:18 76:10	asks 109:15	17:23
220:13 234:22	229:5,8,18	82:5 84:9,14	157:5	<b>asthma</b> 34:10
237:8,13 251:2	230:2,15,22	86:2,11,12,20	aspects 130:14	asthmatics
<b>areas</b> 25:24	231:15,16,23	86:20 87:1,2,4	159:17,20	36:13
26:17 27:22	232:6,18,21	87:5,9,13,15	assess 82:14	asymptotic
28:1,4 115:15	233:12 234:14	87:18,20,22	181:10 227:12	147:12 150:3
124:10,11	234:16 235:14	88:4 134:6,6	assessed 250:14	attached 45:2,12
240:5	239:11,14	134:17,18,23	250:18	99:10
<b>argue</b> 128:23	241:16,18,23	134:23 157:3	assesses 28:23	attachment 8:12
232:6	242:16 243:3,5	157:14 162:14	assessment	45:7 76:18
arguing 18:3	243:15,18,23	162:18 165:5,9	32:11 125:2	77:2 86:3,10
argument 142:9	244:6,12,15,22	167:20,24	129:14,19,22	86:18 88:9
<b>arises</b> 197:9	246:6 247:6	168:9,20	130:15 137:11	93:20,23 95:3
Armstrong 3:8	249:7,14,20,24	179:18 205:9	182:4,8,22	136:24 145:5
4:17 63:23,24	250:5,11	205:10,12,15	183:5 234:4	attachments
64:7 65:3,6,17	251:10 252:7,9	205:18,19,20	237:1,12	10:10 45:8,17
65:22 66:11,13	252:13 253:2,7	205:21 206:1,2	assessments	68:15 237:23
66:14 72:12	253:10,16,20	206:12,13,20	94:22 129:14	240:6,7
74:16,17 75:24	254:6,8,11,16	206:24 207:6,9	136:21 137:4	attack 101:10
76:8,14,20,21	254:24 255:3	207:11 208:21	138:6 182:7	attempt 217:19
77:1,5 78:13	255:11,17	208:23 209:5	184:7 237:10	attempted 233:4
78:20 79:6,20	256:11,18	210:3,4,5,19	238:3,11,23	attempting
79:24 80:1	257:3,13,15	211:8 218:24	239:24 240:3	129:4
106:2,5,9,17	Armstrong's	219:5 220:3,15	assign 43:21	attention 33:8
106:20,23	207:17 255:8	220:21 221:2	assigning 99:21	213:19
107:7,11	arrangement	222:2 229:20	Assistant 41:12	Attenuation
204:13,17,18	17:7	233:9 235:19	43:15	119:18,20
205:24 206:10	arrival 77:10,15	250:4,12	assisted 49:21	120:17 122:14
206:17 207:5	arrive 36:19	<b>aside</b> 126:14	associate 81:3	123:17,19,24
208:1,11,18	arrived 107:19	asked 14:23	167:16	124:3 125:12
209:2,13,14	<b>arsenic</b> 31:16	37:15 45:11	<b>associated</b> 30:7	127:7 128:4,7
210:16,23	32:8 40:8	50:3 53:13	53:1 72:5	attorney 204:18
211:2,6,14,20	article 207:7,10	55:13 60:5,18	104:9 139:2	attorneys 200:4
212:3 213:8,16	207:18,22	93:21 104:6	179:17,20	attributable
213:20,24	208:4,5,13,20	110:10 134:14	208:4	54:24 102:18 102:21
214:14,22 215:7,10,19,22	209:3,8 <b>ash</b> 1:5 13:10	144:7 221:14 221:22	<b>assume</b> 53:4 57:1 114:8	
213.7,10,19,22	<b>asii</b> 1.3 13.10	221.22	37.1 114.0	Audrey 12:9
	I	I	I	1

February 26, 2014

Page 264

Ĩ				rage 201
authority 147:6	64:15 66:7,7	105:6 107:17	85:22 235:24	80:10 113:4
authorization	66:17 71:10	<b>barriers</b> 104:19	begins 198:7	115:10,24
147:8	73:6,14 85:22	base 17:20	<b>behalf</b> 2:15,19	156:18 256:20
authorized	101:21 102:3	<b>based</b> 7:6 8:1,13	3:5,9 8:8	big 28:18 39:9
91:14,19,23	107:16 111:16	9:21 51:16	114:20 195:1	121:13,17
92:7 142:4	116:12 120:12			149:11
		61:13 73:4,18	195:18,22 196:10 204:20	<b>Bill</b> 43:6 44:2
authorizes 92:4	120:23 122:6	76:3 78:7 79:8		
<b>available</b> 10:11	136:5 144:4	82:4 90:22	204:21	79:1,22 138:11
20:6,6 47:13	147:24 150:24	98:5,11 134:14	<b>believe</b> 34:8	142:14 218:7
48:15 91:11	156:19,23	135:8 136:10	35:16 36:8	230:9
132:20 221:18	164:22 168:16	138:5 141:9	64:2 69:5 83:5	bills 32:23
221:19 238:16	168:19 170:2	170:21 177:16	90:13 108:2	bins 208:24
238:18 256:4	170:12 177:6	178:19 191:8	113:14 126:15	biological 31:20
avenue 1:18	178:15 186:13	191:23 201:4	127:1 133:22	Biologist's 31:19
2:11 132:18	186:19 187:1	216:10 244:16	136:2 142:10	<b>birth</b> 25:12
avoid 11:22 16:2	191:10 195:6	baseline 71:11	152:7 157:24	<b>bit</b> 15:24 18:21
avoids 208:22	203:8 204:15	71:23	159:7 184:9	74:9,9 78:22
aware 12:5	215:5 222:19	<b>basic</b> 190:14,17	200:8 202:24	103:12 107:23
87:18 106:6,9	224:20 232:21	basically 119:21	209:4 211:11	108:20 122:17
106:16,17	234:14 235:20	134:9 182:11	226:1,15 228:3	133:2 184:21
124:23 127:22	239:11 255:1	197:22 250:22	231:2,10 236:3	216:21 239:21
132:16 154:4,8	258:16	<b>basing</b> 240:1	258:9	<b>bluff</b> 28:11
154:12,16	backfilling	<b>basis</b> 69:15,24	believes 31:3	Blumenshine
206:24 210:10	163:15	83:18 86:13,21	32:10 51:21	4:8 12:18 26:8
221:17 224:22	background	90:23 104:9,23	61:18 83:21	26:12,14 30:5
225:3,15,19	21:14 27:4	105:22 108:11	95:5 96:1	30:8,10,11,14
229:13 231:24	60:9 131:14	110:11 122:8	138:4 163:17	<b>Board</b> 1:1 2:2,6
233:19 249:18	171:6,15,16,19	122:12,15	223:15 230:3	2:7,7,8,8 6:4,9
250:2 253:4	171:24 172:3	123:4,6 133:11	beneficial 87:1	6:12,13,14,16
255:23 256:11	172:15 173:10	133:18 139:8	100:14,16,22	6:17,23 7:1 8:4
256:18 257:3	173:12,13,17	146:21 149:17	150:16	8:11,15,23
	173:24 174:1	160:2,4 168:21	benefit 49:19	9:22 10:20,22
<u> </u>	174:11,20	173:11 174:20	73:13	13:17,19 14:9
<b>b</b> 5:1 42:17	175:2,16	241:24	benefits 117:16	15:19 19:6,24
53:19 61:24	176:19 177:3,8	bathtubs 159:24	181:11	20:5,12,20
86:15 104:22	177:15,22,23	battles 16:3	benzene 192:5	26:19 37:5
130:3 144:19	178:4,7 193:5	beach 35:11	<b>berm</b> 163:1,5	40:15 41:13
154:14 174:19	193:9 194:9,10	beaches 34:21	best 29:12,14	62:22 63:6
174:19 224:21	<b>bad</b> 98:17	bear 14:15	39:18,18 48:5	71:2 72:3
B-L-U-M-E-N	256:24	<b>beat</b> 58:4	69:8	74:12 81:5
26:14	<b>bald</b> 23:9	beautiful 23:7	better 21:15	93:12 101:6
B-O-R-G-I-A	Barkley 205:2	<b>began</b> 36:18	27:12 32:2	116:16 120:3
22:8	213:8	46:14 47:4	39:19 65:6	121:1,1 122:21
back 20:22	<b>barrier</b> 104:14	59:11	200:5 207:8,11	125:17,17
35:19 37:19	104:15,19	beginning 34:1	beyond 79:12,13	128:3,6,16
	,	0 0		· · ·
	•	•	•	•

February 26, 2014

Page 265

				_
142:12 157:12	208:21 209:5	95:22 108:1	<b>businesses</b> 17:14	38:11
157:16 164:13	210:5	124:2 236:20	by-product	cap 250:6
164:16 171:22	boundary 110:9	236:20	208:2	capability
179:21 197:16	110:13 113:11	<b>burden</b> 14:15		191:23 192:1
198:2 200:10	114:5,9 115:18	<b>bureau</b> 43:2,4	C	capable 145:10
203:17 204:9	115:20 116:20	43:10 151:13	<b>c</b> 2:1 3:1 42:15	capital 91:10
212:8 214:12	125:22,24	151:16	50:23 62:11	capping 29:11
215:4 217:13	128:5,7 191:5	Burke 2:7 6:17	90:22 91:7	236:1 250:10
240:17 241:2,9	191:17 200:23	Buscher 7:19	95:23,23	captioned 30:6
241:10 247:24	201:4,6 202:16	43:6,6 44:2	103:14,17	carbon 192:5
248:1 251:20	243:19,21	79:1,1,10,18	104:4 108:10	care 14:4 18:4
253:5 257:11	244:9,11,14,18	79:21 87:18,24	115:2 131:1	18:12,19 48:9
258:11	245:1	88:3 89:10,14	138:12 144:14	career 197:15
<b>Board's</b> 6:15,20	<b>Box</b> 2:12	90:17 130:17	144:15,22	carefully 139:6
7:9 8:12 9:13	<b>Boy</b> 253:8	138:12 139:14	174:19,19	Carolina 22:20
42:15,17 48:11	brain 32:9	140:1,16	180:14	39:4,23
73:2 82:13	branches 216:22	141:11,19,23	cadmium	<b>Carrie</b> 2:8 6:18
96:3 123:14	breached 168:2	142:7,16 143:2	179:18,23	case 10:17 17:6
127:3 128:11	breaches 167:22	143:6 144:13	180:5	107:8 116:3
157:18 192:16	break 39:22	144:17,23	calculate 174:1	132:19 133:22
200:9 212:11	85:24 99:19,21	145:2,8,14,24	174:20 176:19	138:1 139:4
212:14 213:18	100:1,8,9	147:5 157:24	177:14,22	140:7 142:19
230:18 257:22	101:7,17 170:9	158:24 159:7	178:4,6	147:16 154:20
<b>boat</b> 34:15	170:16,22	163:23 166:7	calculated	158:12 248:20
boating 34:24	258:2,5	166:22 167:3,6	171:16 177:8	250:17
<b>bodies</b> 23:17	breaking 22:18	168:17,22	calculating	case-by-case
<b>body</b> 139:9	brief 9:16 197:2	169:4,10,14,21	173:10 174:11	146:21 149:17
<b>book</b> 38:18 39:1	197:14	169:24 170:20	175:16 177:2	cases 68:19
<b>books</b> 39:16	briefly 59:9	205:20 206:4	calculation	106:18,21
<b>Borgia</b> 4:6 12:8	117:15	206:18 210:10	175:1	115:21 156:7
22:3,4,7 24:5,7	<b>bring</b> 33:7 37:19	210:21,24	calculations	163:17 205:12
borings 238:18	168:16,18	211:4,11,16,18	194:9 <b>Calhoun</b> 30:21	238:16,17
<b>born</b> 34:11	213:18	213:23 215:9	call 11:12 88:1	category 144:21
boron 28:12	brings 26:8	215:14,17	139:15 254:17	cause 32:9 42:10
98:21,23 99:4	broad 70:22	216:8,17	<b>called</b> 16:20,21	55:18 56:1,14
99:6 100:11	broaden 92:20	217:22 218:13	37:8 44:23	56:22 57:4,6
101:2 192:2	broader 71:10	219:11,24	107:9 184:7,9	57:19 98:1,17
251:13,15	<b>broadly</b> 171:15	220:6,14,20,23	199:12 250:22	139:13 140:15
254:2,19	178:8 <b>broke</b> 101:23	221:4,9 222:16	calls 226:20	142:2 156:13 179:8 259:8
255:19,22 256:2,10	brought 27:15	229:16,24 230:5 231:20	campground	caused 50:16
<b>bottom</b> 75:7	35:4	230.3 231.20	35:9	57:5 224:14
159:23 205:12	<b>building</b> 39:12	<b>business</b> 32:24	cancer 32:9 34:5	226:9,16 228:3
205:21 206:13	<b>builds</b> 17:6	147:18 241:3	34:7	232:1
206:20 207:6	built 27:23	249:6 259:5	Canton 25:10	causes 54:2,19
	•	-	•	•

, February 26, 2014

Page 266

				- 5
55:20 98:7	220:3 221:14	128:17 139:8,9	chlorinated	144:12 160:6
103:4	222:8 223:4,9	151:4 164:17	191:15	160:17 198:18
causing 14:11	224:22 225:15	183:9 187:4,7	<b>chocked</b> 38:16	199:5 201:5
32:13 51:2	227:17 231:24	190:15 215:3	chooses 62:23	212:12 216:20
145:11 223:14	232:24 234:18	changed 19:2	chose 105:11	238:4 243:5
223:17,23	235:4 237:7,11	27:22 30:1	107:24 124:5,7	clarifying 12:17
224:4 225:17	238:12,21	184:6 186:24	212:22	21:13 59:6
CCA 89:24	239:16 246:11	changes 36:12	Christine 4:9	113:8 253:1
<b>CCAs</b> 137:5	<b>CCWs</b> 71:5	36:14,14 70:20	12:19 30:18	class 98:4,11
CCW 6:7 50:13	ceased 52:14,18	71:3 83:9	209:22	110:18,23
50:17,21 51:1	<b>center</b> 3:6,10	139:11 181:11	chronic 34:10	111:1,10,14,18
51:18,23 52:1	4:16 8:8 64:1	187:14	<b>CIHCA</b> 35:4	113:4,5,6
52:5,8,9,14,19	77:5 204:19	changing 61:5	Cindy 205:1	114:12,15,23
56:10 67:5	205:1	149:2	circulated 255:6	115:5,9,10,15
68:9 69:5	centimeters	characteristics	circumstances	115:15,19,22
74:23 82:8	107:6 108:12	161:3	85:6 227:11	115:24 116:6
87:10 88:21,22	108:19 228:19	characterizati	citation 199:13	150:16 156:2,9
89:3,3,7,7	245:17 247:21	18:24 19:4,8	<b>cite</b> 63:3	192:14 242:9
95:20 96:5,12	Central 16:12	181:14,18,20	cited 18:23	242:12,21,24
96:14,22 97:1	22:13 23:15	181:23 185:13	19:10 96:8	243:7,10,10,13
97:8,8 103:3,3	24:3 33:20	185:18 190:6	216:15	244:2,18 245:1
103:18,18	35:4	190:17	cities 34:16	245:2,6,15,21
104:8,21,22	centuries 77:8	characterizati	citing 209:8	245:24 251:19
105:21 109:7,8	certain 70:19	19:11 181:9	citizen 20:7	classification
109:11,12,13	92:23 93:18	184:8 188:2,10	23:24 32:1	241:10
109:13,14	153:20 160:13	188:19	citizens 13:17	classifications
120:11 121:9	179:16 228:7	cheap 72:7	18:12 37:8	39:15
121:13,19,21	certainly 15:2	<b>check</b> 62:18	38:6,8 39:6	clay 39:13 77:14
126:16,18	16:24 22:21	90:11 101:18	<b>city</b> 38:22	222:12 228:18
127:12 129:19	48:7,20,24	checked 35:24	209:23 259:5	<b>clean</b> 17:15
129:22 134:9	80:18 114:6	checking 40:21	City/County	20:15 23:1
139:11 140:14	121:13 122:1	chemical 40:1	18:6	48:17,22
145:18 148:8	127:2 142:16	67:3,4,7,12	clarification	147:11 163:15
148:16,18	155:24 156:17	80:9 83:23	9:24 21:5	167:20 247:19
151:2,5 154:5	175:9,11	84:3,11 172:4	47:21 89:19	247:20 248:3
154:8,12	245:22 253:8	179:8,11,14	90:15 93:5	248:22
155:18 157:6	257:16,20	chemicals 13:24	106:12 116:17	cleaned 17:4
157:22 159:9	Chairman 2:8	40:9	178:9 189:8	22:11,17 29:1
159:13 161:18	6:15	chemistry 40:10	199:23 214:1	153:12 163:18
163:13 171:24	<b>chance</b> 42:21	<b>Chicago</b> 2:3,17	clarify 44:9	248:4
172:11 179:20	47:17 100:2	3:3,7	54:12 55:3	cleaning 22:23
179:22 180:4	156:24 209:8	childhood 22:15	56:7 59:11	23:19 147:19
191:13,18	change 63:16	children 22:10	77:2 87:10,22	163:12 248:20
205:7,11	70:13 71:7,9	27:8 35:10	105:14 111:12	cleanup 16:9
206:12 219:3,8	71:12 87:9	chlorides 156:16	111:17 112:5	22:21 150:4
	l	I		l

, February 26, 2014

Page 267

<b></b>				5
154:19,23	closing 14:11	81:3 82:21,23	136:10,16	125:15
155:3,14	29:16 147:19	120:19 125:21	137:9,17,24	colleagues 52:23
cleanups 152:10	147:23 151:5	148:17 165:3,3	138:9 147:9,24	65:4
<b>clear</b> 31:19 72:1	157:21 161:18	179:18 205:6	148:10,14	<b>collect</b> 109:6,11
129:3 161:16	169:5,9,11	210:19 211:2,8	149:1,7,11,19	190:1,3
240:4,8 249:5	222:22 258:15	211:9 215:2,22	151:11,20	collected 83:16
254:13	closure 18:4,12	218:4,10 222:2	152:7,16,21	109:24 111:6
clearest 47:19	18:18 32:13,16	224:14 240:20	153:2,4,9,16	193:3
clearly 13:6	42:3 50:24	coal-fired 26:24	153:22 154:1,7	collecting 78:21
47:23 168:16	60:20 61:7,15	<b>Cobb</b> 7:19 42:23	154:11,15,21	194:5
186:2 195:9	62:2 64:12	42:23 43:5,8	154:24 155:4	collects 86:12
240:2	88:19 95:24	44:3 54:23	155:12,15,20	<b>college</b> 131:23
<b>Clerk</b> 24:21	125:10,13	55:7 63:19	191:11,19,22	<b>column</b> 77:6
26:4 30:13	129:24 130:8	64:14 65:4,14	192:13 197:18	combination
Clerk's 8:17	147:15 157:6,7	65:19 66:6	198:9 199:24	134:6,18,23
client's 158:12	159:6 160:10	67:9,9,21	200:16 203:15	combinations
climatic 75:4	161:4,11,23	68:10 69:6,16	219:15 230:9	172:23
close 12:17 13:4	162:21 163:19	70:6 71:14	230:17 235:11	combustion 1:5
17:4 30:1 33:5	164:24 165:14	72:1,6,23 73:6	235:18 236:8	6:7 29:18 31:2
42:12 87:1	166:14 167:7	73:8,20 74:15	236:10,15	32:20 41:22
96:7 101:7	169:7 198:15	74:24 76:12,19	237:14,17	42:5,9 53:21
112:7 149:3	214:8 227:2	76:23 77:3,19	238:5,6,8,9,13	53:22 54:1,2,8
160:19,24	232:8 233:11	78:17,22 79:11	238:19 239:2,7	54:8 70:13
168:17 195:11	236:2,4	79:22 80:7,16	239:21 240:13	80:15 81:3
200:17 201:3	Club 8:9 12:10	80:23 81:5,16	240:15,24	82:21,23
201:13 202:15	22:9 26:15	82:10,18 83:7	241:7 242:14	120:20 125:21
202:18	30:20 31:3	84:18 85:8,11	243:2,4,13,21	165:3,4 205:6
<b>closed</b> 17:10	32:10 205:1	85:13,15 91:22	244:4,20 245:3	211:2,10 215:2
50:17 51:18,20	<b>clue</b> 35:1	92:7 93:2,4,9	247:16 248:15	215:22 218:4
51:23 52:1,5	<b>coal</b> 1:5 6:6	100:17,24	250:20 252:6,8	218:10 224:14
52:15,15 86:23	13:10 14:1,3	102:1 105:2	252:11,14,23	236:12 240:20
87:4 148:22	14:16,20 15:21	106:8,12,19,22	253:8,12 256:1	<b>come</b> 6:2 11:15
149:7 151:2,9	16:13,14,22	107:1,9,21	256:13 257:1,6	27:9 29:3,9
151:24 152:5	17:10 18:8	108:4,7,18	Cobb's 50:10	33:9 37:13
157:4,23	22:11,17,22,24	109:1 120:14	94:21 95:18	66:6,7 81:11
249:18 250:2	23:4 27:2	121:6,10,15,22	<b>Code</b> 1:8 6:9	82:5 117:23
<b>closely</b> 140:18	29:18 31:2,5	122:11 123:9	50:15 123:19	204:2 214:7
140:22	31:10,23 32:5	123:15,21	143:21,24	245:13
closer 111:24	32:8,20 37:9	124:2,7,23	146:17 191:8	<b>comes</b> 39:20
113:12,12,15	37:18 38:16,24	125:4,7 126:13	257:12	coming 101:18
114:6,7 126:1	39:13 40:5,7	126:22 127:16	<b>Cogen</b> 3:5 4:15	175:8
127:15 184:21	41:22 42:5,9	128:19 134:11	8:6 10:2	<b>comma</b> 113:11
185:24 186:10	53:21,22 54:1	134:20 135:1	114:21 195:1	116:20
closes 17:18	54:1,7,8 70:12	135:11,15,18	195:18 196:11	commenced
20:19 26:1	76:10 80:15	135:21,24	cognizant	221:18,20

. February 26, 2014

Page 268

r				
<b>comment</b> 4:4,5,6	community's	120:2,7 123:3	172:4 179:9	184:6 185:7
	13:22	120.2,7 125.3	246:2	
4:7,8,9,10,11				186:8,17 235:1
8:23 9:1,4 11:2	compacted	125:12,22	concept 113:20	241:20 245:5
11:13 21:23,24	228:18	126:6 127:4	160:1	conduct 72:20
23:23 24:21	companies	128:5,7 131:21	concepts 79:13	126:18 158:8
26:5 33:4	20:13 22:22,23	133:8,16,20	concern 20:18	conducted 4:13
36:20,23 40:18	27:10 32:22	136:22 144:3	22:16 23:3	4:15 94:22
40:20,22 41:2	137:21	173:19 176:1	62:24 128:20	126:24 158:16
47:12 73:8	company 17:6	191:3,7,17	150:8 167:11	193:1 246:14
90:12 101:19	company's 33:4	200:22 201:2,6	189:1	conductivity
105:15 185:4	comparative	201:7,9,12	concerned 13:17	107:5 108:17
186:5 197:3	121:16	202:2 203:2	16:13 18:21	159:23 229:15
comment's	compare 71:15	227:24 242:4,5	23:13 26:24	245:16
197:14	compared 78:12	246:23 247:14	28:21 32:3,7	<b>conduit</b> 232:16
commentors 9:8	131:19 137:5	249:9	34:14 38:1,13	confined 208:6
comments 4:3	comparison	complicated	63:5 70:12	confirm 94:5
4:12 9:9,11	157:4 174:6	173:16	119:14 180:17	confirmation
11:8,17,19,21	177:15,18	complicating	220:22	86:9 94:19
13:6 15:10,14	comparisons	140:4 172:24	concerning	<b>confirmed</b> 86:14
20:8 21:3	174:4,10 178:1	comply 125:3	198:15	103:15
23:24 24:1,6	· · ·		<b>concerns</b> 25:6	
,	compile 241:5	components	33:7	confirming
25:1 26:2,8	complained	136:22 137:1,4		131:3
30:13 33:15	256:23	160:23 162:24	concert 152:8	<b>confuse</b> 85:19
36:18 37:5	<b>complete</b> 32:15	164:14	concise 197:23	confused 144:11
48:3 103:24	32:24 59:22	compounds	conclude 141:15	connected 232:2
164:12	87:2 162:20	191:16	concluded 9:18	<b>Connie</b> 36:17
<b>Commerce</b> 7:10	183:20 233:13	comprises	10:19 253:4	connotation
commission	235:5 236:24	230:10	258:19	52:16
165:24 166:18	237:2 239:17	compromising	conclusion 41:1	consecutive
Commitment	239:19 255:1	163:13	141:5,11,16	203:13
90:1 91:5	completely	computer 208:2	142:11	<b>consent</b> 246:12
136:22	70:10	conceivably	conclusions	246:15
<b>common</b> 156:1	complex 78:22	168:4	175:6	conservative
156:11 205:11	132:4	concentration	conclusively	123:2
communication	compliance 43:7	78:9 98:2,8	89:14	consider 49:12
20:3	59:17 60:7,8	111:2,4,8,19	condition 24:4	63:15 67:2
communities	60:14 62:5	113:23 115:3	168:1 240:14	81:6,14 85:3,5
14:10,14 18:13	70:18 90:1	115:24 116:3,5	240:23	126:1 129:21
20:16,23 27:24	91:5 110:5,7	138:21 150:12	conditions 30:1	163:22,24
29:8,24 31:5	110:15,16	245:11	75:4 78:4	164:17,20
community	111:10 112:14	concentrations	97:20 98:2,3,4	166:12 194:12
14:13,20 16:12	112:17,22	60:10 75:10	98:8,10 104:24	203:10 228:24
25:9 32:18	112:17,22	77:11 98:16	124:11 139:5	236:1,11
33:21 34:1	116:15,24	131:3,17	144:3 152:12	consideration
	, ,	,		
257:9	117:5,8,12,19	138:17,22	166:5,5 172:22	9:7 17:5 69:18
	I	l	l	

, February 26, 2014

Page 269

				5
71:2 85:2	construction	223:6,9,21	continuing	213:17 253:13
164:12 193:22	61:8,9 118:13	224:23 225:4	148:9	255:6
235:9	consult 52:22	225:17 226:3	contours 251:1	<b>copy</b> 25:2 26:4
considerations	consulting 49:24	226:10 228:4	contractor	48:12,17
216:13	195:21	237:23 245:8	167:22	164:19 196:1
considered	<b>consume</b> 257:9	245:10 249:1	<b>contrast</b> 41:20	<b>Corps</b> 35:15
28:16 32:16	Consumer	contaminate	contribute 66:2	36:2
67:10 89:13,15	253:23 254:22	14:4	contributed	<b>correct</b> 12:4,20
109:9 126:22	<b>Cont'd</b> 3:1	contaminated	54:20	33:5 44:12,14
129:18 135:4	<b>contact</b> 187:10	17:8 23:11	contributes 54:2	45:6,18 51:17
135:22 136:8	contain 14:3	40:1,8 232:24	103:4	52:5,6 55:17
159:1 163:11	54:7 95:24	233:5 240:6	contributing	56:15 57:14
163:16 164:7	128:10 155:18	246:16	145:11	59:15 79:20
166:6 196:3	160:22 179:23	contamination	<b>control</b> 1:1 2:2,6	90:2 93:22
233:14 251:19	180:4 231:1	14:11,21 53:1	6:4 13:17 14:8	105:24 111:22
considers 228:2	241:5	54:24 55:4	15:18 19:1,6	112:8,9 113:24
235:12	contained 29:2	74:20,22 76:2	19:24 20:5,12	124:18 126:12
consistent	41:18 134:17	79:8 84:23	40:15 72:3	128:5,14 134:4
110:16 117:7	169:8 222:2	94:23 98:23	91:11,19	135:14,24
162:1 190:7	containing 31:2	102:18,22	120:24 133:6	141:19,24
consists 162:19	53:21 97:7	127:6,8 141:7	146:3,15,20	147:6 153:16
constituent	190:7	155:10 200:24	147:10 149:16	169:3 170:20
140:8 150:14	containment	220:22 224:4	149:23 150:8	177:13 207:15
167:5 174:21	29:14 64:22	226:16 227:11	150:21 157:12	214:2,22
174:22 179:8	65:8,12 66:4	232:1 246:11	199:9 253:5	216:17 220:14
constituents	162:23 164:14	251:12 255:22	257:11	224:9 244:19
67:3,5,8,12,15	contains 45:8	contemplate	controlled	244:20 259:9
68:3,5,7 69:2	221:16 231:4	16:15 181:13	118:17 119:5	correction 88:11
69:10 80:10,13	contaminant	contemplated	124:14 172:9	corrections
81:1 82:6,17	75:13 78:3,6,7	16:8	<b>controls</b> 92:3,22	93:24
82:18 85:7	129:17 201:12	contemplates	93:9,11 125:10	corrective 32:2
138:19,23	252:23	232:16	146:8,24	42:3,10 50:14
155:18 156:5	contaminants	contemplating	198:16,20,22	50:23 51:4,5,9
172:4 175:11	25:8,13 32:5	17:18	198:23 199:2	51:24 56:4
175:17 179:12	35:2 68:12	contention	199:15	59:3,18,23,24
179:14,17,22	70:15,17,21	180:4	Conversion	60:20,24 61:4
201:20 202:4	72:6 73:4,18	<b>context</b> 135:3	207:9,12	61:7,14 62:2
202:20 203:1	75:2 82:19	197:9	conveyance	64:9,11,21
203:13,14	83:5 85:1	continue 18:8	134:7,19 135:4	66:7,10 84:19
251:21 252:5	124:14 131:3	69:13,22 70:14	135:10,13,22	92:19 95:24
construct 145:9	139:22 148:6	83:5 91:10	136:2,8,15	129:24 130:1,5
constructed	155:20,21,22	151:2 165:14	Coordinator	138:12 143:20
188:7 234:19	156:3,4,17	204:12 227:9	30:21	143:23 146:5,7
237:8 240:22	192:2 201:14	258:3,7,10	<b>copies</b> 10:9,15	149:20 154:3
250:9	201:21 202:10	continued 50:20	21:19,20	160:19,24
	I	l	I	l

. February 26, 2014

Page 270

1				
161:4,11	197:12 221:22	<b>cubic</b> 103:21	70:1 71:24	158:13 249:4
166:14,16,20	259:5	104:10 105:10	73:12 74:7	<b>dealing</b> 74:8
167:7 168:23	Covenant	105:16,22	77:20 78:21	78:16 117:12
168:23 169:17	199:13	107:14,19,22	79:9,15,19	151:8 167:15
169:21 198:12	Covenants	107.14,17,22	83:18 94:5,9	deals 109:5
198:15 200:21	199:20 200:10		94:13 104:18	157:2
		culpability 41:21		
214:8 222:23	cover 42:14 88:4		105:2 121:16	<b>dealt</b> 57:6 65:1
227:2 232:8,12	97:6 159:22	cumulative	172:18,19	110:5 227:7
236:14 246:9	162:15 217:5	28:14	173:23,24	<b>Deanna</b> 2:8 6:15
246:14 248:19	coverage 236:23	current 19:7	174:11 177:18	death 58:5
249:4	coverages 240:1	20:1 84:2,10	180:2 181:9,20	<b>debris</b> 118:14
correctly 13:2	<b>covered</b> 42:15	156:10 185:7,8	181:24 184:16	119:6
69:8 137:14	42:16,18	186:8,9,17	186:16 188:5,7	decades 27:10
163:20 202:1	135:19 145:6	227:9	189:15 190:1,7	74:21,21,23
<b>cost</b> 14:13 18:12	148:16 217:17	currently 32:17	190:8,13,15,20	75:2,19,23
20:13 27:10	218:12	83:24 105:4	190:21 192:21	247:20
72:16,17 164:8	covering 32:23	118:7,24	192:22 193:3	Decatur 259:6
<b>costs</b> 29:7 72:4	154:10	210:20 211:9	193:10,13,20	December 7:13
73:10 167:8	covers 41:21	223:10 224:10	194:5,6 214:11	94:6
counsel 41:12	217:5	235:4 239:16	231:4 236:17	decide 67:7
43:13,15 49:20	Crawford 86:5	242:4,5	237:2	74:12 96:24
54:11 76:5	create 159:14	<b>curve</b> 75:8	date 7:16 8:4	decided 70:22
209:23	177:18	<b>cycle</b> 33:2	50:17,21 53:23	212:19
Counties 30:21	created 88:4	cycles 33:1	53:24 54:4,21	decision 157:18
counting 211:13	creating 159:24		55:1 88:23	214:13
211:19	creation 208:23	D	102:16,19,22	deep 37:20,20
county 1:15	creatures	<b>d</b> 4:1 50:24 87:5	103:2,6 216:24	37:22
15:16 16:20	159:12	89:20 90:22	247:1 252:3,9	<b>Deer</b> 37:9 38:5
17:13 20:17,19	Creek 28:10	143:9,12	dated 6:24 7:13	39:6
23:4 31:9 37:9	criteria 92:24	157:14 187:22	dates 247:5	defects 25:12
37:10 38:14	99:5 105:11	203:12 233:10	daughter 34:14	defer 72:15
40:12 88:10,16	149:17	238:21	36:12	203:17
89:18,24 90:6	critical 13:16	<b>Dallman</b> 210:4,9	day 1:19 26:12	defined 74:5
91:3 93:19	cross 62:19 63:7	210:11	33:4 247:22	117:8 119:20
121:23 259:2,6	63:16,20	<b>dam</b> 31:11 32:18	258:2,18	121:2 240:16
259:14	cross-reference	39:22 42:18	days 197:17	defines 82:12
couple 112:4	253:13	235:22	<b>DCEO</b> 20:11,12	definition 32:19
142:14 153:17	cross-section	damage 32:9	<b>de</b> 104:2,3	110:6 116:14
coupled 125:1	251:5	damaged 13:24	de-watering	116:24 117:4,7
course 7:2 48:11	crossed 184:4	dams 39:13,14	90:9 208:24	117:11,11
82:2 114:13	233:2,6,15,16	39:15,17	<b>deadline</b> 47:6	118:3 123:13
196:21 197:16	233.2,0,13,10	danger 22:18	deadlines 169:7	126:11 134:5
207:2	<b>crosses</b> 234:9	data 18:23 20:1	<b>deal</b> 16:19 63:4	134:11,22
<b>court</b> 24:10	<b>CSR</b> 1:15 259:4	67:17,24 68:2	64:23 84:22	134.11,22
46:22 49:18		68:6,21 69:3	103:12 130:22	172:13 191:8
40.22 49.10	259:13,14	00.0,21 09.5	103.12 130.22	1/2.13 191.8
	I	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 271

r				rage z/r
201:9 216:5	110:15 124:2	74:3 80:14	difficult 184:19	disperse 109:18
240:16 241:19	127:18	95:18 96:5	difficulty 12:1	dispersion 75:6
definitions	<b>describes</b> 54:23		diffuse 233:2	77:23 79:14
		104:2,3 188:14		
110:2 121:3,4	99:6	208:21	dig 37:19,22	84:22
241:1	describing 58:24	developing	digital 251:2	disposal 86:11
<b>deg</b> 65:21	133:23	218:1	diligence 30:4	86:20 87:4,6
degradation	description 39:3	development	diminutive	118:9,11 219:4
65:10 66:1	243:12	185:8	168:7	220:6 221:2
degraded 32:14	design 31:21	developments	direct 19:6 20:1	disposals 32:5
deicing 119:13	125:8	186:9	20:12 154:19	<b>dispose</b> 164:10
delay 15:21	designed 127:17	develops 112:6	174:5	219:1,6
delayed 38:9	destroys 37:18	deviates 133:1	directed 7:14,23	disposed 205:7
<b>delete</b> 164:13	38:24	dewatered	61:6 85:13	219:9 220:4
delivered 230:16	detail 75:6	205:13	170:20 219:14	dissolved 251:13
demolition	132:20	<b>Dexter</b> 3:8 4:16	direction 139:8	distance 110:8
118:14 119:6	detailed 125:1	44:22 45:2	139:11 141:14	110:12,18
demonstrate	161:5	54:15,18 55:15	242:7 244:1	111:11 113:4
42:8 89:2	detected 67:20	72:4 113:8,18	251:9	113:10 114:7
demonstrated	69:4 83:20	204:24 212:4	directly 16:15	115:24 116:19
59:17 142:5	138:19	212:12 213:1,7	35:20 242:11	117:1 119:19
194:10	determination	216:20 217:18	dirt 36:3	119:23 120:2
demonstration	131:2 133:15	217:24 218:5,9	dirtier 19:3	124:6 126:2,2
55:18 56:23	133:18 146:13	217.24 218.3,9 218:14 231:12		· · · ·
			disappointed 20:4	126:4,6,20,23 127:14
57:20 139:13	146:19 149:14	<b>difference</b> 70:3		
denominator	176:15	110:23 113:15	discern 206:7	distances 127:9
156:1,11	determinations	115:13 129:2	discharge 61:1,3	distinction
density 107:4	132:10 182:11	141:21 152:20	61:3 64:24	122:8 147:18
<b>deny</b> 187:14	determine 10:24	153:8 155:17	65:8,11	148:19 149:11
Department	139:1 143:3	171:23 218:11	discharged 70:8	151:19 153:15
7:10 16:21	149:22 158:21	different 16:3	discharges	169:12
42:19 235:11	235:21	19:3,16 28:17	69:22,22 70:4	distribute
235:21	determined	41:19 52:8,13	disconcerted	253:17
depend 141:2	46:14 94:22	52:16,20 63:21	16:1	distributed
dependent	137:1 150:12	66:7 70:10,21	disconcerting	207:18 253:21
181:21	151:13 157:12	74:9 75:4	17:2	distribution
depending	188:6	83:23 106:13	discovers 55:3	254:5
194:2	determining	125:5 151:23	discussed 194:8	disturbs 61:8
depends 79:4	120:1,7 171:6	155:21 175:17	194:23 229:23	ditches 37:20,22
147:7 216:12	250:20	176:6,7,8,11	251:12	divided 85:14
depiction 217:10	develop 74:3	179:10,11	discusses 198:9	219:17
<b>Deputy</b> 42:23	172:15 173:7	189:6 199:15	discussing 9:5	<b>Division</b> 42:24
252:17	181:10 188:3	221:11 222:11	47:3	42:24 43:13
describe 75:6	188:20 190:1	differently	discussion 199:6	252:17,17
251:16 255:19	250:21	159:5 171:20	199:8 225:13	<b>DNR</b> 235:22
described	developed 41:15	171:24	229:19	docket 6:9
	utveropeu +1.15	1/1.27	<i>227</i> .1 <i>7</i>	<b>UULKU</b> 0.7
	I	I	I	1

February 26, 2014

Page 272

1				Taye 272
120:15	dramatically	111:5,22 112:9	99:24 101:22	effectuates
dockets 253:5	30:2	112:12,16,19	122:7 127:18	63:16
document 49:6	draw 142:11	112:21 113:3	175:23 194:7	efficiently 11:17
49:9 55:11	drawn 122:9	113:14,19	195:18 199:6	effort 147:11
68:11,11,22	draws 157:3	114:5,11,17	199:21 203:15	150:2,21 198:1
89:5 103:9	drilled 155:24	115:1,8,14,22	early 22:15	efforts 10:13
	drink 256:23		early 22.13 easier 204:16	
207:12 208:8		117:2,4,14,20		21:2 26:18
242:1 254:18	drinking 23:18	118:2,6 131:12	east 1:18 2:11	182:1
documentation	31:7 77:10	131:22 132:21	3:6 28:20	<b>eight</b> 41:19
130:6,10	98:14 100:18	133:22 159:16	242:3,18	192:22 193:8
documents	105:8 156:2,10	159:16 160:8	easy 141:6	193:11,15,19
44:20 45:16	156:12 192:15	160:12,21	173:17 174:6,8	223:18
46:5 253:20	242:3,18 252:2	161:1,6,13,24	Economic 7:10	<b>Eileen</b> 4:6 12:8
255:8 256:6	252:16 253:3	162:5,10 170:7	7:11	either 50:23
<b>doing</b> 82:11	253:21,23	170:24 171:4	edge 23:5 110:9	145:6 166:24
120:14 122:21	254:1,18,20,21	175:9 176:16	113:10,16,22	203:22 216:23
132:17 133:20	256:2,3,7,9,14	177:4 178:14	114:3 116:19	241:1 246:22
137:7,12	256:17,22	178:17 180:6	119:22	248:14 251:2
167:21 168:22	257:2,7	180:11,16,21	Edmiston 4:11	<b>elect</b> 166:14,20
168:23 169:2	<b>drive</b> 3:2,6	181:1 193:23	36:19,22 37:6	elected 126:5
182:22 222:23	28:18 37:20	194:1,7 224:2	37:6 40:17	212:1
236:15 259:5	<b>drop</b> 203:13	224:10 225:12	educator 22:15	electronic
dollars 72:9,11	drove 13:13	225:19 226:5	Edwards 14:2	236:23
double 122:1	drug 38:11	226:11 228:6	16:13 17:18	elements 160:3
<b>doubt</b> 10:14	dry 32:17 205:6	228:17 229:1	24:16 25:4,20	elevation 139:9
142:2	205:9,11,15,18	233:8,18 234:3	28:6 33:23	142:18,20
downgradient	205:22 206:1,3	234:7 247:4	35:19 242:4,19	eligible 92:5
70:17 125:23	206:5,13 207:1	248:7 249:11	effect 51:18	eliminating
133:12 138:20	207:6,9,11	249:19,22	56:21 218:3	147:20
138:23 140:9	209:4 210:4,4	250:3,7	effective 50:17	ELPC 74:17
140:10 141:8	210:7	duplicate 62:12	50:21 51:21	204:20,21,21
172:16 173:9	<b>Duck</b> 28:10	dynamics 70:9	53:23,24 54:4	<b>ELUCs</b> 91:10,13
173:13 174:2,4	<b>due</b> 51:22 57:4	<b>Dynegy</b> 31:9,12	54:21 55:1	92:2,15,18,21
174:12,13,16	58:13 68:9	<b>Dynegy's</b> 246:15	88:22 102:16	emergency
174:24 175:2	69:5 139:8,17	· · · ·	102:19,22	16:18
176:9 177:21	139:22 165:23	E	103:2,6 128:24	emissions 42:16
178:1 191:6,24	165:24 166:17	e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1	169:18,18	emphasize 97:20
192:11 245:9	Duke 39:23	5:1 77:2	216:23 217:21	employed 133:6
246:1 250:24	Dunaway 7:20	120:18 179:15	218:11 230:19	enact 126:17
downloaded	43:9,9,24	241:6	effectively 17:11	enacted 165:2
8:18	50:19,19 51:7	E-D-M-I-S-T	181:24	182:13
Dr 2:8 6:15	51:11,15 52:1	37:7	effects 19:12,13	enacting 126:17
31:19	52:6,11,24	E-L-U-C 91:10	22:11,17	enactment 88:18
draft 55:3 113:9	53:6,15,18	eagles 23:9	253:24 254:23	encompasses
drafting 30:24	54:10 110:24	earlier 47:13	255:24 254:25	45:16 208:14
ar ar un un 190.2 r	01.10110.2 f		200.21	10.10 200.11
1	1	1	1	1

, February 26, 2014

Page 273

				2
<b>energy</b> 14:16	64:1 91:15,20	estimated	81:13 104:15	executed 186:24
39:23 95:12	91:24 92:3	215:18	104:20 116:1	exempted
96:6	145:15 198:23	et.seq 199:14	124:17 133:1	105:18,23
enforced 152:23	199:10,13,16	evacuate 35:16	159:21 167:11	exemption
152:23	199:20 200:10	36:2	167:13 175:23	103:13 104:2,3
enforcement	204:4,8,19,22	evacuated 35:17	185:7 186:9	119:11
62:7,10 63:2	204:24 207:8	evaluate 81:17	224:18 236:5	<b>exhibit</b> 5:3,4,5,6
152:16,18	207:11 220:7	140:23 141:21	236:19 238:15	5:7 43:24 44:1
153:6	252:3 255:5	142:24 194:8	243:8 247:10	44:2,3,4,7,23
engineers 35:15	<b>EPA</b> 15:20	evaluated 83:4	250:17 255:22	44:24 45:8,15
36:2 230:11	16:21 30:24	126:22 132:8	examples 60:19	45:23 46:2,9
ensue 253:18	33:11 41:12,21	139:6	60:23	48:13 49:2,5
ensure 20:22	43:16 49:7	evaluates 186:6	exceedance 42:7	49:13,15 99:7
29:5 33:12	98:14 197:15	evaluating 60:14	42:10,11 50:16	99:8,9 108:13
104:16 185:5	<b>EPA's</b> 18:24	133:5 134:16	50:20 51:3	196:3,5,6,11
186:7	76:6,8 78:16	134:21 140:19	54:3,20 56:5	196:13,17,18
enter 27:15	126:19	222:21 236:13	57:18 58:12,23	207:6,14,16,19
44:18	equal 142:18,20	250:21	58:24 59:2	208:12,16,19
entered 9:14	equally 157:21	evaluation	103:4 150:15	211:21,23
91:6 136:23	equipment	126:19 141:10	202:5 224:16	221:15,21
255:4	145:10	177:10 192:23	exceedances	222:10,11
entertain 43:22	equivalent	193:16,18	31:16,16 68:17	229:10,20
48:24 196:8	228:20,21	194:9	138:22 223:15	247:9,9 249:15
entertaining 7:5	error 102:11	evaluations	223:17,23	249:21,22
entire 77:6	163:3,4	72:21 132:17	224:5,9,11,14	254:9,19,21,23
149:4 209:8	especially	191:3	exceeded 50:13	255:12,13
210:7	191:13 212:17	event 246:12	68:7,8 116:3	exhibits 10:10
entirety 15:1	essence 199:7	everybody 35:6	exceeds 150:13	27:16 43:18
entities 33:12	essentially 116:4	36:2,24 117:24	exception 94:1	44:18,23 45:6
86:18 183:18	149:21 150:10	everybody's	exclude 152:3	45:6,12,13,14
<b>entitled</b> 6:6 44:4	235:18	129:7 164:19	179:21 201:21	45:17,21 46:6
49:6 207:8,11	establish 50:4	evidence 46:3	202:10 244:23	99:13,22
254:18	130:7,11 144:8	49:17 139:1	excluded 50:22	108:13 222:1
<b>entity</b> 14:16	154:22 191:3	196:20 217:1	103:22 172:12	252:1 254:7,7
18:11 32:4	193:9 201:7	251:15 255:15	201:20	255:4,4,9
75:14 142:8	214:15 227:10	255:18	excludes 134:5	exist 115:16
entrance 196:11	established	exact 78:1 217:2	excluding 120:4	157:8 236:23
environment	71:11 125:23	248:13	120:13	existed 239:1
25:15 27:14	127:3 131:18	exactly 77:21	exclusion 109:5	<b>existence</b> 84:2,5
150:18 220:5	133:4 147:2	113:13 125:7	109:10,20	122:13
environmental	155:3 191:4	214:5 217:9	144:9	existing 50:13
1:17 2:11 3:6,9	247:9 256:2,7	258:9	excuse 86:15	61:20 62:4,13
4:16 6:22 8:7,8	256:13,15	<b>example</b> 51:14	96:17 118:13	62:19 84:1,22 07:3 127:4
10:4,19 13:15	257:1	64:20,22 66:5 78:18 80:22 24	123:17 138:13	97:3 127:4
26:16 44:5	estimate 217:6	78:18 80:22,24	140:17 145:15	131:3,17
	I	l	1	1

February 26, 2014

Page 274

				2
137:20 145:6	exposure 104:7	facility 54:7	<b>families</b> 15:7,16	112:11,14,16
171:21 172:3	256:22	56:2,3,8 57:16	17:24 22:9	112:18 113:1,2
185:5 192:14	express 128:22	72:22 112:6	27:8 34:23	113:10,22
232:8 236:17	expressed 76:9	118:7,24	family 14:5 31:8	114:3 115:9,11
exists 84:23	extends 165:10	125:24 145:10	34:5,6,7	115:16,18,23
95:19 97:2,10	extension	148:11 149:3,4	<b>far</b> 6:16 48:3	116:6,19
239:4	165:12 166:11	149:12 159:22	68:13 180:17	119:21 126:2
expand 51:8	extensive 17:6	160:19 161:9	220:16	127:12 228:18
182:8	<b>extent</b> 74:18	184:12 186:10	farm 37:21	247:22
expanded 13:21	150:15 200:23	187:10 191:5	farmers 35:16	felt 82:11 93:19
17:1 18:5	214:23 215:1	210:8 212:16	36:1 37:20	159:18
27:24	218:15	213:10 220:7	farther 113:1	fertilizers
expansion 18:2	extremely 14:14	233:7 242:14	201:3	119:13
expect 27:19	eyes 38:20	243:9,18	Favilla 4:9	field 37:21
89:2,9 176:4		facility's 110:13	12:19,21,21,22	fifth 234:24
184:16	F	fact 23:1 29:21	30:16,18,19	<b>fight</b> 19:17
expectation	<b>f</b> 30:19 130:2	56:9 61:19	favorably	<b>figure</b> 69:1
40:21 159:2	F-R-A-N-Z-E	62:3,6 64:15	163:22	figured 37:17
230:8	49:20	69:4 74:4,5	fear 20:18	filed 6:23 7:7
expected 59:21	face 163:7	105:9 126:15	fears 35:4	9:19,22,24
165:6 223:21	facilities 1:7 6:8	126:20 140:3	feasible 192:3,7	10:17,21 41:16
expecting 29:14	14:12 31:3	156:6 162:8	206:11,15	47:5,6 48:11
190:6	41:19,23 53:21	183:21 193:14	209:4	55:9 95:11
expects 181:17	67:13 68:13,16	200:2 204:11	<b>features</b> 238:15	108:14 194:24
expense 22:23	78:23 80:19	215:3 222:24	251:3,5,8	204:4,21
expensive 72:9	82:7 95:20	239:3 241:19	<b>February</b> 1:19	258:12
experience	96:23 126:24	242:23 244:16	8:3,11 44:11	<b>filing</b> 15:23 31:1
188:1	147:16 148:4	<b>factor</b> 140:5	254:1	76:18
expertise 63:21	148:15 172:22	factors 172:24	<b>federal</b> 15:21	<b>filings</b> 8:16
219:12 220:13	186:23 205:8	251:18	34:21 67:5	fill 95:19 158:2
220:16	205:14,15,17	facts 141:2	68:5 69:2 76:3	163:15 181:23
<b>explain</b> 51:8	206:1,2 210:3	failed 62:7 106:7	76:9,15,17,21	<b>final</b> 137:15,15
95:16 98:24	210:7,18,19	fails 62:1 104:15	80:11 125:21	137:23 138:5
110:10 129:17	211:7,9,22	failure 20:15	<b>feel</b> 13:16 16:4,5	162:15
142:14 162:18	212:18 215:11	63:4	37:3 52:23	<b>finalized</b> 217:12
165:16 166:21	215:13,20	fair 85:8 209:9	105:8 118:4	<b>finalizes</b> 217:12
171:22 187:23	216:15 218:24	fairly 118:2	126:10 129:6	<b>finally</b> 14:18
191:12 207:24	219:2,5 221:5	232:24	142:4 152:2	18:20 19:15
219:13	223:18,20,24	fairness 76:6	feeling 21:16	20:10 33:3
<b>explained</b> 21:15	224:8,13,19	fall 31:4 34:23	123:6	248:3
161:3	226:7 227:23	217:7	feelings 40:16	<b>financial</b> 17:23
explaining 99:1	228:7 233:19	<b>falling</b> 217:11	feels 137:21	20:14 32:21
explanation	234:2 237:22	<b>falls</b> 56:14 57:16	161:18	<b>find</b> 16:23 63:8
60:5 109:16	238:2 240:9	<b>familiar</b> 197:17	feet 110:8,12,13	81:7,10 94:4
193:4	242:2,17 244:5	252:16 256:16	111:8,24 112:1	126:20 184:1
				120.20 10
	•	•	•	•

. February 26, 2014

Page 275

				1090 110
190:21 214:12	16:19 25:6	95:13,15 96:8	18:11	47:2 48:4,7,19
247:5	35:9 36:6	96:19 97:11	foreclose 129:5	48:23 49:3
<b>fine</b> 15:12 48:19	floodplains	98:12 102:8	foregoing 259:8	59:8 66:12,16
81:23 86:7	32:18	103:11 106:2	259:9	79:23 80:2
219:21	flow 75:13 79:14	109:4 113:9	Forest 31:18	90:21 94:11
<b>finish</b> 168:15	139:5,7,11,18	123:10 129:9	forever 38:17	99:18 101:1,4
finished 25:2	140:19,19	130:21 138:14	forgetting 94:17	101:16 116:9
101:24 236:9	141:3,15,16,21	143:9,13,16	forgive 11:24	143:11 170:1
firm 49:24	143:1 186:17	153:18 160:17	Fork 23:6	170:10,15
195:21	233:2 242:7	169:6 170:6	form 23:3 45:14	171:1 178:21
<b>first</b> 6:11 7:3,15	244:1 245:18	171:7,11	199:15 247:7	180:19 184:20
8:5 9:23 11:23	245:19,24	178:18 180:13	forth 25:12,23	185:22 187:17
12:3,12,14	250:14,18,21	180:14,15,20	50:12 103:13	187:20 194:18
14:24 21:9	251:9	180.14,15,20	103:16 160:18	195:12,14,24
35:3,17 41:12		181:4 182:3,19	235:20	195.12,14,24
47:6 49:14	flowing 251:7 flows 139:19	185.14 180.21	<b>forward</b> 15:22	196.6,12 197.4
50:1 76:16	250:23	190.24 192.18	fought 13:20	207:15 208:9
		200:7 201:16	found 32:4	
77:14,17	fly 18:23 19:3			209:12,19
106:13,15	205:10,19,20	201:17 205:16	68:13,16	210:13 211:15
120:8 137:9	206:12,24	210:17 211:20	123:14 164:15	213:20 215:5
144:4,5 158:11	210:5	216:19 219:7	187:12 221:21	215:14 216:18
158:13 173:22	<b>flyaway</b> 25:18	220:9,24	257:10	218:17 220:11
173:23 189:20	focus 234:7	223:19 225:22	four 31:10 38:7	227:4,14
189:21 196:23	focused 175:3	228:10 229:8	42:20 45:8	228:12 229:2,5
198:7 205:3,16	focusing 82:22	233:21 235:7	88:11 108:5	231:7,14,20
208:6,8,14	folks 9:4 11:24	236:6 237:5	194:5 203:13	232:14 233:23
218:18 230:16	12:24 38:17	240:10 242:10	219:4	234:12 236:8
232:22 234:21	39:17 102:2	follow-ups	fourth 12:8	237:4,14 238:4
235:6,7 239:18	195:5 197:16	90:22 178:24	67:18 208:19	238:7 239:9
247:1	follow 57:13	218:17 229:7	234:23	240:12 241:12
fish 23:10,18	114:22 119:18	239:12 258:11	Fox 1:14 2:4 4:5	241:15 252:22
25:17 31:19	126:6 161:9	followed 184:24	6:1,5 12:5,16	252:24 253:16
34:16	176:24 217:8	following 11:14	12:22 14:23	254:3,8,12,17
fishing 34:23	follow-up 9:24	86:3 144:5	15:5,9,12,13	255:5 257:15
<b>fit</b> 133:12	10:2,22 47:22	183:12 198:10	15:15,15 21:4	frame 59:9
174:18 207:4	50:7 53:9	203:11 205:13	21:4,6,7,10,18	framework
five 26:24 33:24	54:15 55:23	205:17 209:2	21:20,22,22	256:6
37:13 43:17	57:9 59:6 60:3	223:16 241:1	22:2 24:5,8,19	Francis 34:12
44:20 55:5	60:18 63:24	241:24	24:24 26:3,7	Francisco 34:11
216:2 234:20	66:23 72:12	<b>foot</b> 110:18,23	30:5,9,12,15	<b>Frank</b> 30:19
flexibility 84:13	74:16 78:13	111:11,20	33:14 36:16	frankly 39:1
166:4	81:24 84:6	114:9 115:20	40:17 41:9	Franzetti 2:16
<b>flip</b> 53:12	86:8,16 88:8	117:1 119:23	43:20 44:9,15	2:18 4:13
<b>flood</b> 25:7 35:20	89:21 91:7	123:8 125:1	44:19 45:5,15	46:13 47:7,16
flooding 16:19	92:10 94:10,13	for-profit 14:16	45:19 46:11,21	47:24 48:1,5
	l	I	l	I

February 26, 2014

Page 276

				rage 270
48:14,16,21,22	139:24 140:6	frequency 193:9	G-N-A-T 49:23	generated
49:1,4,12,18	140:21 141:1	193:12 203:10	gap 95:19 96:2	118:10,12,16
49:19 51:7,13	141:24 143:8	frequently 40:2	97:2,10 158:1	119:4 143:13
51:16 52:4,7	143:11,14	friends 14:5	gaps 181:24	172:20
52:13 53:3,8	144:15,20,24	<b>front</b> 11:9 47:8	188:7 190:20	generating 1:7
53:11 54:11,17	145:3,13,16	100:18 127:17	Garlish 4:10	6:8 31:2 41:23
55:16 56:6,13	146:1 147:22	141:4 177:22	12:23 33:16,19	53:20 54:6
56:18 57:1,11	148:2,13,20	178:6,13 189:3	33:19	173:16 205:8
58:4 59:4,9,13	149:6,9,13	189:16,18,19	Gary 195:19,20	205:14,17
64:5 66:17,19	150:23 151:17	189:23 190:2	gas 25:21	218:24 219:2
67:21 68:24	151:22 152:14	249:23	gasoline 156:5	223:16 224:3
69:7,17 71:3	152:19,22	<b>fronts</b> 117:17	gather 188:5	Generation 2:19
71:19 72:14,24	153:3,5,14	fuel 119:12	<b>Gen</b> 47:5 86:1	4:13 8:6 9:23
73:9 76:5,11	155:2,16	full 38:16 83:22	87:12 88:10	49:6,21,23
80:2,5,21,24	156:21 158:8	102:1 194:5	89:24 91:3,5	64:19 84:7
81:10,20 82:1	158:19 159:4,8	236:12	95:2 104:1	86:10,19 94:20
83:12 85:3,9	160:2,9 161:14	<b>fund</b> 18:4	107:21 108:16	105:9 106:22
85:17,21 87:21	162:2,7,11	<b>funny</b> 163:7	136:23,24	161:17 194:20
88:2,6 89:11	163:6,24 164:6	further 17:21	138:4 145:4	224:19 225:24
89:16 90:19,23	166:9 167:1,4	46:24 66:12	195:6 203:20	226:7 227:23
91:1 92:1,12	167:10 169:1	79:23 85:4	221:5 226:11	generations 27:8
93:3,14 94:11	169:15,23	87:22 90:11	226:23 227:3	29:2,8
94:15 99:11,14	170:5,10,17,21	93:5 97:22	Gen's 64:16	generic 106:15
99:17,18	171:2,3 175:7	101:1 107:11	87:17 89:18	198:21
100:10,23	178:17 179:3,4	116:9 132:3	93:17 105:15	generically 93:6
101:2,3,10,23	180:9,12,23,24	133:3 147:14	general 41:21	199:1
102:6 105:14	182:18,21	148:24 164:20	66:21 80:18	generously 10:9
106:4 107:13	183:2,11,16,24	170:2 180:13	117:24 127:20	geochemistry
108:4,9,22	184:23 185:1	181:22 187:17	128:12 130:14	77:21,22
109:2 111:3,7	187:21 189:11	193:22 210:13	173:1 181:8	geologic 181:8
111:15 112:2	189:16,20,24	218:17 229:2	256:6	181:14 182:4
113:19 114:8	191:21 192:10	241:12,16	generally 59:21	184:8 185:17
114:16 116:12	192:17 194:3	243:11	92:23 93:23	188:2,10,19
117:3,10,15,21	194:13,17,20	Furthermore	117:17 120:5	190:6,15,17,18
118:4 119:16	194:22 195:10	18:14	120:10,22	230:11 245:6,7
121:5,11,17	209:6 220:24	future 29:5	121:8,12,19	245:14,15
122:5 123:5,23	221:6,10	70:14 78:10	190:15 192:22	251:4
124:5,22	226:19 228:5	83:22 137:8	206:20 224:15	geological
125:20 126:14	237:4,6,16	156:10 190:9	229:24 230:2,7	181:18 237:9
127:11,24	238:9,17,20	192:14	230:19 240:24	238:22
128:20 130:19	239:3,8,10		generate 77:20	geologist 43:4
131:22 134:2	Franzetti's	G	188:20 212:20	43:11
135:6 136:17	203:16	<b>G</b> 96:5	212:23 213:3,5	geologists
137:13,18	free 37:4 52:23	G-A-R-L-I-S-H	235:5 239:17	230:10
138:4,10	213:3	33:20	239:19	geology 79:14

February 26, 2014

Page 277

237:19	133:1 134:1	28:19 35:1	49:3 66:16	77:7,9 79:3,7
geometry	164:21 167:11	36:5,7,7 38:3	100:1 111:15	79:14 80:9,19
139:20 141:5	167:13 168:18	38:15 46:13	111:16 160:1	82:3,13 84:22
get-go 125:9,9	169:3 171:11	56:10 59:13	171:1 182:24	91:12 93:17
177:2	173:3,4 176:13	60:14 61:1	187:20 197:11	94:23 95:8
getting 37:24	176:17 177:13	66:20 69:13	213:7 246:4	96:12,14,22
65:20 148:24	178:16 182:21	70:10,21 75:12	Google 29:24	97:4,14 100:11
203:3	go 32:24 35:19	75:14,16 81:11	goosy 20:20	102:17,21
GIS 240:1	41:10 46:8	83:9 85:10,22	<b>gotten</b> 108:6	103:5 104:24
gist 176:4	47:17 49:14	85:23 90:17	239:24	110:18,23
give 38:21 42:21	63:8 64:15	91:8 103:11	govern 154:6	111:1,20 112:6
47:9 48:17	65:24 66:24	109:3 110:19	Grand 1:18 2:11	113:4,5 114:2
69:17 81:13	71:10 80:10	117:23 125:11	grandchildren	114:23 115:6,9
85:4 88:24	90:24 111:16	130:16,18,20	38:3	115:10,15,19
94:16 100:2	116:12 118:1	131:24 132:5,9	grandmother	115:22 116:7
115:17 123:2	119:16 122:5	133:15 134:2	38:2	120:15 124:8
156:22 167:11	135:7 138:15	135:6 138:15	granular 192:5	124:12,16
194:14 195:7	142:12 143:13	140:2 142:4	graphs 249:13	125:2 127:6,8
197:1 217:19	144:4 148:3	148:5 149:17	grass 100:19	129:13,16
250:17	150:23 155:23	163:8 164:18	gravely 32:7	130:5,9,15,24
given 14:19	161:20 166:9	165:19,21	great 16:1 22:16	133:4,7,9,16
23:22 38:5	166:15 168:3	167:6,10,18	55:15	138:17,18,22
87:8 95:6	171:1,5,9	170:6 171:4,10	greater 110:13	139:5,7,10,18
121:11 126:16	174:19 175:4	173:18 177:9	114:9 121:23	140:19 141:3
139:11 165:14	176:14,18	177:10,11,16	grievously 27:18	141:14,15,21
193:14,21	177:20 178:20	178:14,20,22	ground 31:6	142:21 143:1
209:3 233:7	182:12,13	181:3 182:12	118:21,22	147:12 149:21
glaring 17:22	184:12 185:1	183:2 186:12	119:9,12	149:24 150:12
<b>Glosser</b> 2:8 6:15	187:22 190:21	190:23 191:19	185:12	151:6,14,18,20
GMZ 130:7,11	195:6 206:22	192:17 193:23	groundwater	151:21,24
131:5 132:9	209:19 218:19	194:4,8 195:6	14:4 16:6 17:9	152:1,12,15
152:13 175:24	218:20 220:11	209:6 211:18	27:20 28:22,24	154:20,23
200:23 201:4,6	222:19 228:12	212:10,19	32:5,13 38:23	155:6,9,14
201:7,8,11,19	229:6 233:23	213:2 221:24	42:1,6,7 43:1,4	156:2,9 162:9
201:22 202:2,4	237:5 240:12	226:19 232:3	43:10 51:3,22	163:19 166:23
202:8,10,11,16	248:18 249:1	232:11,14	52:2 53:1 54:3	167:14 168:7
202:16,21	255:1,16	239:21,22	54:20,24 55:4	172:5,11
223:24 246:15	257:23	240:2	55:21 56:1,14	181:12 185:18
247:9,11,18	goes 70:9 110:20	good 6:3 12:8,23	57:3,5,18	185:19,20
248:16 250:4	119:21 167:17	12:24 21:18	58:12 59:18	186:16,17
GMZs 198:9,12	168:11 213:10	22:2 26:12,12	60:7,9,12	188:4,21,23,23
246:24 247:2,7	220:6	30:9 41:9	67:11,16,24	192:13 200:20
249:12	going 16:3 20:19	44:15 45:19	68:17 69:20	201:14 217:1,2
Gnat 49:23	21:16 22:10	46:11,21,24	70:5,10 73:3	220:22 223:6,7
131:24 132:2	23:9,19 28:13	47:2 48:4,23	75:3,12,20	223:11,14,17
	,		2 2 2	

. February 26, 2014

Page 278

				_
223:22,23	192:21	75:23 217:7	253:14,21,24	179:2 180:19
224:5,6,8,16	guys 36:10	227:3	254:1,18,20,23	180:22 184:20
224:24 225:5	<b>Suj</b> 5 5 0.10	happenings 40:3	255:18,24	185:22 187:17
225:18,21	<u> </u>	happens 28:23	256:3,8,12,19	187:20 194:18
226:4,10,18	<b>H</b> 5:1	38:21 40:2	256:21 257:4,8	194:21,24
227:10,16	H-A-B-B-E-N	105:5	257:8	195:12,14,24
228:4 230:10	24:14	happy 23:10,21	healthy 16:12	196:6,12,15,17
232:1,9,10,13	H-A-R-A-N-T	27:3 46:8	24:3 33:21	197:4,11 200:9
232:16,23	15:3	81:17 178:18	hear 36:24	203:24 204:11
233:2,3,5,6,15	H-O-B-B-E-R	196:7	136:5 178:18	207:15,19
233:16,17	12:10	Harant 4:4 12:3	184:19 186:1	208:9 209:12
234:4,8,9,9,10	Habben 4:7	13:1,8,12 15:2	heard 44:19	209:19 210:13
234:22 237:8	12:14 24:13,13	15:3,7,11	45:20,21 83:10	211:15 213:20
237:13,21	24:14,22 25:3	hard 13:20	196:12 207:17	215:5,14
238:2 240:6	26:6	136:5 217:15	227:5 229:18	216:18 218:17
241:7,11 242:7	Hahn 1:14 259:4	237:1	255:7	220:11 227:4
242:8,9,11,12	259:13	Hardin 3:2	hearing 1:14 2:5	227:14 228:12
242:20,21,24	half 28:8	195:17	4:3 6:1,4,5 7:2	229:2,5 231:7
242:24 243:7,9	half-contained	harm 31:5	7:3,4,9,14,15	231:14,20
243:10,16,24	29:10	100:12	7:23 8:11,19	232:14 233:23
244:2,3,13,17	hand 12:6 24:17	hate 185:24	9:3,5,9 10:7	234:12 235:6
244:19,24	36:21	haul 105:12	11:6 12:16,22	236:8 237:4,14
245:1,2,12,18	handed 207:10	Havana 242:3	14:23 15:5,9	238:4,7 239:9
246:10,13,16	handle 205:14	242:18 246:13	15:12 21:4,7	239:18 240:12
246:17,18	205:18,21	246:15	21:10,18,22	241:12,15
247:19,21,21	206:1,2,5,11	hazard 13:20	22:2 24:5,8,19	252:22,24
248:2,10,21,24	207:3 209:5	31:11 39:13,14	24:24 26:3,7	253:16 254:3,8
249:3 250:14	handled 65:15	39:17	30:5,9,12,15	254:12,17
250:18,21,23	205:11,12	hazardous 18:2	33:14 36:16	255:5,10
251:6,9,13,20	206:20,21 207:1 210:3	19:18 118:10	40:17,19 41:9	257:15 258:2
251:22 257:14		118:16,20	41:14 43:20	258:19
groundwater's	handles 151:23	119:10 155:18	44:9,12,15,19	hearings 15:19
150:17 152:4	handling 119:14 205:9 207:7	HDPE 90:7,8,13	45:5,15,19	197:18
<b>group</b> 16:11	203.9 207.7 210:4,5	108:15,17	46:5,11,14,21	hearkens 191:10
37:8 38:19	handwriting	head 37:7 76:13	47:2,4 48:4,7	heart 188:16
40:10	12:2	101:18 109:19	48:13,19,23	heavily 190:7
groups 10:4,19	hang 117:20	110:1 121:20	49:3,5,11 59:8	heavy 23:11
26:16 204:4,5	166:10 194:13	153:24	65:15 66:12,16	27:4,9,12 32:7
204:8,22 255:6	happen 20:19	health 13:22	79:23 80:2 90:21 94:11	35:9 Hoights 24:15
guarantee 14:12 guess 108:5	36:12 37:12,23	14:5 16:20 19:12 27:13	90:21 94:11 99:18 101:1,4	Heights 24:15 held 18:9 152:24
162:2 173:4	140:3 168:3	28:2 29:7 32:1	101:16 116:9	259:8
209:2 213:24	217:13	33:13 35:13	143:11 170:1	<b>help</b> 36:11,24
219:7 225:22	happened 39:3	150:18 191:14	170:10,15	56:19 63:8
Guidance	happening 36:9	251:15 252:2,5	171:1 178:21	143:3 144:11
Guidante	11 8	231.13 232.2,3	1/1.1 1/0.21	175.5 177.11
1	I	I	I	1

. February 26, 2014

Page 279

				ruge 275
160:17 161:15	198:2,3	79:14 84:21	1.17 10 2.2 2 6	140:15 142:3
	,		1:17,19 2:2,3,6	
216:20	hopefully 19:3	Hydrogeology	2:11,12,17 3:3	151:6,24
helped 35:15	112:5	43:7	3:7 6:3,9,22	181:12 193:22
36:1	horizontally	hydrologically	13:16,23 14:6	242:2,18,20
helpful 10:16	122:18	232:2	14:8 15:18,20	impacted 152:4
74:14 215:8	horrible 22:20	hypothetical	16:12,20 18:9	172:5
helping 94:8	<b>hour</b> 6:1	169:1	18:24 19:6,23	impacting 52:2
helps 161:14	hours 99:20		20:4,12 22:13	impacts 27:7,13
Hennepin 28:8	170:12	<u> </u>	23:15 24:3,15	28:15 32:12
246:14,19,22	housekeeping	<b>i.e</b> 103:17	25:11 26:17	42:14 55:21
247:3,10,13	47:11	193:17	28:9,11,19	56:1 91:12
248:8 249:15	huge 28:5	<b>idea</b> 16:1 85:4	31:4,23 32:22	96:11,14,22
249:20	human 251:15	89:1,4	33:7,13,20,22	97:1,4 104:23
hey 168:13	255:18,24	identification	35:4 37:12,15	129:15,19,22
<b>Hi</b> 15:15	256:12,19	44:8 49:16	40:7,15 41:12	152:1 182:1,5
high 13:20 31:11	humped-over	196:19 208:17	41:20,23 42:19	182:6 188:22
31:20 32:17	17:9	255:14	43:15 44:5	193:17 251:12
39:13,14,16	hundred 72:10	identified 12:11	49:7 67:11	251:17 252:5
98:14 107:4	77:14,17	30:6 86:9	78:8,16,16	255:20,24
111:21 172:17	119:21 123:7	181:16 188:8	80:8 91:15,19	256:12,19
256:22	124:24 125:3	205:15 219:4	91:23 92:3	257:4
higher 36:6	124.24 125.5	229:12,21	95:8 124:8	impairment
140:8 141:7	hundreds 77:12	238:24 243:1,6	157:11 197:15	150:2
highly 40:8	Hutsonville	244:17 249:17	199:12,16	imperative
245:22	64:20,22 65:14	identify 15:6	205:9 214:15	23:21
Hillsboro 38:23	66:5 73:24	22:5 68:8	214:19 219:3	
		205:8 219:2		impermeable 84:24 222:7
<b>history</b> 71:14,16	87:5 157:14,15	222:8 223:9,13	221:15 235:17	223:5
83:8 226:24	157:18 200:3	234:18	236:24 251:21	
hit 167:5	200:11 203:12	identity 43:21	257:11 259:1,6	implementation
Hobber 12:9,12	233:9	<b>IDNR</b> 38:12	259:14	235:19
24:9	hydraulic 64:21	<b>IEPA</b> 20:1 26:18	imaginary	implemented
Hold 72:14 81:8	65:8,12 66:4	28:23 33:3	114:13	246:10
holding 7:3	107:4 108:17		imagine 35:5	implies 201:1
32:20 41:14	109:19 110:1	55:3 198:19	immediate 6:12	importance
hole 19:21	159:23 245:16	<b>IEPA's</b> 201:5	105:7	13:10
		<b>H</b> 54.10 042.12		
homeowner	hydro 43:3	<b>II</b> 54:18 243:13	immediately	important 14:14
192:4	79:13 181:8,14	245:15	114:13 242:23	175:14 227:7
192:4 <b>homes</b> 186:10	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3	245:15 III 245:21	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17	175:14 227:7 227:10
192:4 <b>homes</b> 186:10 186:13	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24	175:14 227:7 227:10 <b>imposing</b> 13:21
192:4 homes 186:10 186:13 homework	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24 <b>impact</b> 7:11	175:14 227:7 227:10 imposing 13:21 impossible
192:4 <b>homes</b> 186:10 186:13	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19 190:6 230:10	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14 III 1:8 50:14	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24	175:14 227:7 227:10 <b>imposing</b> 13:21
192:4 homes 186:10 186:13 homework	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14 III 1:8 50:14 123:19 143:21	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24 <b>impact</b> 7:11	175:14 227:7 227:10 imposing 13:21 impossible
192:4 homes 186:10 186:13 homework 99:21	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19 190:6 230:10	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14 III 1:8 50:14 123:19 143:21 143:24 146:17	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24 <b>impact</b> 7:11 20:15 25:16	175:14 227:7 227:10 imposing 13:21 impossible 190:5
192:4 homes 186:10 186:13 homework 99:21 honest 28:23	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19 190:6 230:10 237:9,19	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14 III 1:8 50:14 123:19 143:21 143:24 146:17 191:8 257:12	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24 <b>impact</b> 7:11 20:15 25:16 27:1 51:21	175:14 227:7 227:10 imposing 13:21 impossible 190:5 impounding
192:4 homes 186:10 186:13 homework 99:21 honest 28:23 hope 16:24 19:5	79:13 181:8,14 181:18 182:3 184:8 185:17 188:2,10,19 190:6 230:10 237:9,19 238:22	245:15 III 245:21 ILCS 91:15 199:14 III 1:8 50:14 123:19 143:21 143:24 146:17	114:13 242:23 243:7,9,15,17 244:17,24 <b>impact</b> 7:11 20:15 25:16 27:1 51:21 56:14 57:3,5	175:14 227:7 227:10 imposing 13:21 impossible 190:5 impounding 118:15 119:3

February 26, 2014

Page 280

				ruge 200
163:1,4 164:9	106:10,24	inclined 239:6	108:23 116:18	initials 238:5
impoundment	108:16 120:20	include 32:19	indicating 11:10	innocent 38:8
32:19 39:4,8	122:3 123:13	42:1 44:23	47:19 101:20	inoperable
42:6,9,12	123:18 129:20	60:12,24 71:18	170:3	167:1
50:22 51:1	129:23 139:6	82:22,24 95:2	indication	inorganic 72:6
52:1 53:2 54:7	139:18 144:1	98:6 100:20	143:12 188:22	72:11 82:20
58:9,14,21,22	145:5 154:5,9	130:5 135:14	indicative 239:4	155:21
61:6 74:23	154:13 157:11	162:24 163:1	individual 132:7	inorganics 82:21
76:16 77:22	157:17 158:13	198:22 199:1	133:11 149:2	82:22 156:8
78:15 83:24	165:7 172:12	201:2 223:24	173:10,14	input 230:11,12
87:10 103:22	182:7 208:24	251:23 252:4	175:3 176:19	<b>-</b> ,
106:18 109:7		<b>included</b> 8:12	177:20	230:13,16,20
	211:8,21			inputs 78:1,12
109:12,24	214:10,16,19	14:19 29:13	indulging 21:2	inside 201:6
121:24 127:20	214:24 215:13	62:18 68:3,16	<b>influent</b> 71:4	inspection 42:2
127:21 134:8	219:1,3,5,9	82:16 94:20	83:22,23 84:2	install 145:9
135:17 136:3,9	221:14,16,19	123:13 128:8	84:11	installation
139:23 148:18	221:20 222:2,6	137:2 184:17	<b>inform</b> 164:21	107:3
158:23 162:15	222:8,15 223:5	246:12 253:6,7	information	installed 29:18
165:5,8 166:16	223:9,13,16,21	includes 110:7	19:1 36:17	90:10 112:21
172:1 205:23	224:22 225:3,7	120:19 130:1	37:17 45:12	231:1,5
206:23 216:5	226:1,2,7,9,17	144:17,20,24	89:1,4,8	instance 179:10
218:4 220:3	227:8,22 228:1	175:15 179:16	104:18 108:23	206:23,24
221:2,18 225:8	228:9 229:11	198:10	139:16 141:4	instances 45:11
225:16 232:24	229:12,20	including 31:6	180:2,3,7,10	79:2 104:20
235:19 236:13	231:24 232:9	33:1 52:19	183:19,20,22	205:21 206:7,8
237:13 238:21	234:18 235:5	99:1 104:1	188:3,11,20	223:13
239:5 250:12	235:10,13,15	105:8 129:16	189:19 190:4	institutional
impoundments	235:17 237:7	200:13 232:9	190:14,16,18	91:11,18 92:2
1:6 6:7 29:19	239:17 240:21	245:14	203:3 213:18	92:22 93:9,11
31:1,20 32:13	246:10 249:16	inconsistent	214:1 216:11	146:3,8,14,20
38:14,21 40:7	250:2,15,19	102:23 162:6	221:19 222:2	146:24 147:10
41:22 53:20	improve 20:3	incorporate	222:13,17	149:15,23
67:6 68:9 74:5	234:10	146:7 155:4	233:10 235:4	150:8,20
74:21 75:21	improved 26:21	159:19	235:20 239:16	198:16,19,22
76:2 77:9,13	234:10	incorporated	239:23 251:24	199:2,9,15
77:18 78:8,21	inactive 211:24	160:13	informative	instrument
79:8 82:9 84:1	212:6 213:12	incorrect 75:1	197:23	200:1
84:4,8,12,19	214:3,16	increase 116:5	informed 40:11	intakes 25:10
84:24 86:2,9	inadequate	independent	235:16	28:9
86:12,17,22	226:16 228:24	81:18	informs 182:21	integrity 8:9
87:2,3,16,23	inadequately	indicate 9:1	initial 148:7	163:13 235:10
88:11,12,14,17	226:17 228:2	61:15 102:11	188:1,9,19	235:13,16
90:2 95:20,22	inappropriate	193:2 204:10	223:19	239:5
96:6,12,15,23	107:8 126:20	indicated 203:16	initially 94:6	intend 42:13
97:1,7 106:6	217:19	indicates 69:3	182:4 206:21	97:6
				2
	1	1	1	1

, February 26, 2014

Page 281

				10.90 101
intended 8:20	41:6 42:21	J	167:1 173:22	125:14 131:9
81:21 96:10,20	48:12 49:1,4	<b>J</b> 1:14 2:4 146:9	184:6 194:4	133:7 139:14
97:20 144:1	196:2 207:6	<b>J-O-Y-C-E</b> 15:3	211:19	140:1,2 150:10
146:18 160:18	introduced	<b>J-О-Т-С-Е</b> 15.5 26:13	keeping 175:10	151:2 153:23
199:1,8	180:2,7		keeps 40:11	154:2 158:3
intending 63:20	introduction	jackets 35:11	152:8	159:11 168:13
245:4,20	9:16	James 2:14	key 18:6	173:15 174:6
intends 198:19	Introductory	43:14 153:18	kick 164:23	174:15 176:2
intent 57:7	4:3	<b>January</b> 7:16 253:22	kill 23:12	180:1,6 182:5
64:11 68:19	investigated		killed 39:5	187:3 190:12
91:17 92:5	32:6	Jennifer 2:7 6:17	kind 38:3 39:18	192:4 197:24
93:1 124:8	investigation		39:19 74:3,3	200:5 203:17
132:2 142:10	181:22 185:18	Jennings 2:14	80:6 105:19	210:1 212:16
165:14 169:16	investigations	43:14,14	117:19 121:15	216:11,11
176:23,23	27:21 136:18	153:17,18,19	122:13 125:5	224:13 230:20
210:6 245:12	184:9 185:3	153:23 154:4,8	129:4 154:2	231:6 236:17
intention 137:19	involve 61:2,4	154:12,16,22	158:6 160:6	237:19,19
146:6 166:1	involved 61:13	155:1	184:11 203:19	239:24 240:4
201:5	122:24 220:15	Jerome 2:7	237:20	240:13,15,17
interest 64:4	220:19 230:6	<b>Jerry</b> 6:13	<b>King</b> 195:19,20	245:12,24
interested 25:4	252:21	Jersey 30:21	195:20 197:1,2	247:17 249:6
interface 233:2	involves 61:8	<b>Jessica</b> 3:8 4:16	197:14 199:3	253:12
233:6,15,17	irrelevant 232:4	204:24	200:6,14	knowledge
<b>Internal</b> 70:16	issue 59:9 63:7	Joanne 2:13	knew 175:7	123:12 248:6
interpret 176:21	74:12 100:6	4:12 41:11	200:17	250:5
interpreted	101:5 116:14	197:18	<b>know</b> 10:15 16:3	known 18:17
105:24 171:19	130:3 163:16	<b>jobs</b> 17:20 27:11 <b>Joliet</b> 86:5 89:18	17:10,17 18:1	35:6 179:23
172:3	186:13,18	<b>Joyce</b> 4:4,8 12:3	19:12,13,21	180:4 234:18
interrupt 92:13	214:15 228:6	12:18 13:12	20:10,18 21:12	240:21
179:3 253:1	248:15	15:3 26:13	21:16,18 24:11	knows 76:12
257:16	issued 73:22	July 207:8	25:11 27:12,12	<b>KPRG</b> 49:24
interrupted	144:2,11	jump 59:14	30:17 33:18	
254:24	issues 11:4 18:1	90:20 102:3	34:3,19 36:11	L
intertwined	47:4 145:19	140:24 190:23	36:13,18 37:3	L 99:7,8,9
136:14	167:14 168:7	<b>Jumping</b> 203:8	37:19 38:17	labeling 254:19
intertwines	220:16 232:13	justify 144:9	39:19 40:2,15	labels 28:24
133:2	235:17	Jusuiy 144.7	48:16,17 58:17	labor 165:23
intra 131:4,6,12	IV 110:18,23	K	63:8 70:16	laboratory 94:5
131:20 132:6	111:1,10,18	<b>K</b> 1:14 259:4,13	71:15 72:4	lack 16:18 17:23
132:11,23	113:4 114:12	Katherine 4:11	73:5 76:13	lacking 27:18
133:18,23	114:23 115:5,9	37:6	77:3,22,23	29:13
173:11 174:10	115:10,15,19	kayak 23:7	78:11,18 82:4	laid 132:5
174:20 175:24	115:22,24	keep 70:22	84:18 85:16	Lake 121:22
177:23 178:6	116:6	85:23 163:8	90:14 110:19	lakes 139:7
introduce 6:11		164:4 165:20	121:16 122:14	land 109:23
	-	-	-	-

, February 26, 2014

Page 282

				1090 101
118:14 119:2	105:12 179:8	leaking 22:18	35:5,11	222:12,24
198:23	larger 120:6	23:5,6 154:1,6	Light 209:23	226:23 228:15
land's 233:1	127:19	learn 34:2	liked 33:9	228:16,17,20
<b>landfill</b> 13:21	largest 121:24	leave 17:8,9 72:2	<b>limit</b> 11:19	228:22,24
18:1,2,6 73:2	122:3 127:21	leaves 17:11	52:15 96:24	229:12,19,21
73:16,17	LaSalle 2:16	102:2	198:19 199:7	231:5,6 249:17
109:13 121:8	late 23:2 257:23	leaving 129:4	199:22 245:19	250:1
121:18,21	lateral 110:8,11	led 73:24 74:3	limitation 51:19	liners 25:5 38:16
122:12 124:24	111:21 113:10	<b>left</b> 6:14,19 29:9	limited 18:15	38:17 74:6,8
128:1 129:13	116:18 126:2	32:23 37:21	23:16 97:8	77:14 84:20
157:4,21	latest 29:12	49:23 101:9	172:16	107:2 127:16
159:10 161:19	Laughter 64:6	157:3,5 170:19	limiting 198:17	158:4 218:8
164:10 205:7	82:1 175:8	legacy 148:17	limits 38:22	222:14 226:13
205:13 236:5	law 3:6,9 4:16	legal 43:13	60:13,16	226:16 229:14
250:9	8:7 64:1	68:20	Lindley's 31:19	229:22 230:1,3
landfilled	199:12 204:19	length 11:20	line 114:12,13	230:5,24
206:22	204:24	84:5	114:13,22	231:18 240:8
landfilling	leach 223:6	lengthy 59:7	125:24 127:14	lines 83:12
118:14 119:2	225:18 226:3	let's 28:22,23	218:16	142:18,20
landfills 17:10	226:10,17	111:16 117:24	lined 31:10	186:15
17:10 18:15	228:4	147:24 151:4	38:15 84:14	lining 222:9
27:2 32:17	leachate 19:17	158:13 159:9	90:7,8,12,13	links 208:4
74:2,4,6,10	52:19 53:22	167:4,21	158:15 159:1,2	Lisa 1:14 259:4
77:8,10,16	54:1,8 83:15	174:15 202:14	159:5,9,10,21	259:13
120:4,6,11,13	83:20 88:4,22	215:5	161:19 213:12	list 27:4 44:24
120:18,22	89:3,7 96:14	letter 24:16	214:3,16,24	45:5 67:2,4,7
121:14,19	97:8 103:3,19	148:24	222:6,8 223:5	67:14 68:5
122:1,9 123:1	104:9 109:9,13	letting 37:3	224:22 225:3,8	69:3 73:4
123:8,13,16	129:15 134:4	179:3	225:16,20	81:17,23 82:6
125:15 127:8	134:12,22	level 58:13	226:17 228:2	83:6,19,22
127:16,18	135:5,9,11	74:20 76:2	242:3	84:16 85:7
157:8,11,17	136:11 165:3	98:3 100:11	liner 85:1 89:19	179:14,22
158:4 159:13	leached 225:5,9	132:20 147:12	90:3,4,5,7,8,13	203:14,18
171:21 172:1	225:10,20	150:3 156:18	103:17 104:12	210:3,6 212:5
172:13 220:13	leaches 232:10	156:19 163:11	104:21 105:3	212:17,18,20
lands 24:3	leaching 223:11	175:4 229:13	105:17,21	212:23 213:2,4
landscape	223:22 224:24	248:11 252:23	106:6,10,15,16	213:5,9 230:23
118:12,13	lead 2:7 6:13	levels 63:21 69:4	107:3,4,8	230:24 231:3,6
119:6	32:8 35:3	76:9 98:14	108:15,17	231:11,18
language 102:24	70:20	138:22 140:8	159:24 162:24	233:13 235:6
110:7 116:17	lead-in 151:11	256:22	162:24 163:1	239:18,19
129:5 130:13	leads 39:16	levy 35:18,21	163:13,17	240:20 247:6
149:2 164:2,18	leak 38:15 228:9	36:3	167:22 168:2,4	listed 45:24
189:2 217:3	leakage 25:15	liability 25:24	168:10,15	86:18 95:3
large 23:17	leaked 226:24	life 33:1,2 34:17	218:2 222:11	145:5 211:7
				1.0.0
1		1	1	

. February 26, 2014

Page 283

r				2
215:12 222:24	202:9,9	182:17	Madison 30:21	49:15 196:16
223:18 229:11	long 18:8 20:21	looking 16:6,22	31:9	196:18 208:11
229:20 237:22	21:3 27:13	18:23 54:5	Magazine 207:7	208:16 255:11
249:16	37:16 38:10	74:13 84:21	magnesium	255:14
listen 11:21	52:5 59:16	117:22 132:6	31:17	marketed 87:19
13:17 48:2	69:13 70:11	133:10,14	maintenance	match 67:4
listing 212:24	75:10 78:20	149:19,22,23	168:9	matching 79:15
lists 11:9 211:24	104:11 118:2	150:11 173:18	majority 74:7	material 52:9,19
213:11	147:5 154:18	174:10 175:13	makeup 83:23	70:12 107:9
liter 98:5,9,20	161:24 162:5	176:1 186:15	84:3,12	205:11 223:5
little 15:24	163:18 169:15	214:9,10	making 24:2,20	245:14
18:21 59:7	169:16 197:15	looks 195:5,14	26:19 27:11	materials 78:8
74:8,9 88:5	201:8 247:12	lose 173:18	47:7 58:6 63:7	213:21 222:7
100:2 103:12	247:12 258:17	losing 20:23	81:15 133:15	245:6,8,16
107:23 108:20	long-term 20:14	37:11	manage 39:19	matter 1:3 52:4
122:17 133:2	22:16 27:7	loss 20:20	management	63:20 64:24
166:18 176:10	longer 18:15,18	losses 17:20	28:22,24 133:5	72:2 111:21
225:13	72:2 170:4	lost 112:2	133:7,9,16	169:17
Liu 2:9 6:21	215:1 225:9	lot 16:7 28:17	149:21 151:15	maximum
184:23 185:2	250:3	69:20 71:15	151:20 155:6	103:20 111:24
185:16 186:5	Longwall 37:8	105:7 108:23	185:20 200:20	252:23
186:20 187:18	look 19:5,7 20:1	121:14 127:19	201:14 208:21	MCL 252:22
187:19 200:7	20:13 34:22	159:13 174:7	246:13 249:3	257:6
live 26:15 27:1	47:17 60:14	175:11,12	257:14	MCLs 252:18
30:22 31:8	64:17 68:24	190:16 212:21	Manager 42:24	256:7
35:7	73:1,21 90:15	low 84:20 97:14	43:1,7 252:17	mean 21:12 58:9
lived 14:6 22:14	90:17 117:2	97:16 104:11	manganese 32:8	100:15,21
livestock 119:6	122:6 133:10	lower 138:23	251:16 253:22	113:2,3 116:5
119:13	137:20 140:18	lowest 156:1,11	254:21 255:19	124:19 140:22
living 38:4	141:14 158:9	lucky 181:1,2	256:12,14	146:11 166:11
LLC 2:20 8:6,7	158:14,20	lunch 99:21	manmade	184:1,13
LLC's 49:6	159:10,17	101:6 156:24	234:24 240:14	190:11 206:2
LLP 2:16 3:2	161:20 163:7	Lynn 7:19 43:9	240:22 241:19	210:24 212:21
loaned 38:20	164:3 166:7	43:24 50:19	manner 207:3	213:4,14
local 16:21	167:7 173:8,23	159:16 170:7	219:9 220:4	215:21 216:2
located 113:22 120:2 139:7	175:16 176:5 178:14 194:9	170:24 171:4 173:6 228:14	<b>map</b> 142:15,17 142:17,18,19	224:3 225:6 226:24 236:16
213:21	203:18,20	1/3.0 220.14	142:17,18,19	242:10 252:22
location 31:21	203.18,20	M	250:23	253:6
61:3 110:12	236:2 249:11	<b>M</b> 2:13 108:13	maps 186:16	meaning 242:13
113:24 114:3	249:13	<b>ma'am</b> 36:16	238:13 251:1,3	meaningful
114:10 133:20	looked 17:21	221:9	251:4,8,9	247:23
139:11 174:17	18:22 20:4	machine 259:7	Maria 49:22	means 56:3 99:1
locations 201:3	73:16 85:2	<b>Macon</b> 1:16	marked 5:2	118:1,7,23
201:13,18,23	170:17 173:21	259:2,6,14	43:23 44:4,8	165:11 242:7
, , ,			Í	
L				

. February 26, 2014

Page 284

				10.90 201
243:24 259:7	mere 239:3	226:7,11,23	12:1	213:23 215:6
meant 95:17	merely 48:14	227:3,22	misquote 55:9	254:4
198:21	62:18 254:19	Midwesterners	misreported	money 23:1
<b>measure</b> 133:6	merit 163:18	34:15	93:20 94:7	<b>monitor</b> 70:15
mechanism	met 67:13 111:1	migrations	misreporting	82:7 122:15
250:10	112:22 246:18	124:15	93:22	179:16 201:22
<b>media</b> 151:13	metals 23:11		<b>missed</b> 92:14	214:8
		migratory 19:13		
220:18	27:4,9,12 32:8	miles 35:10,19	<b>missing</b> 27:6	<b>monitored</b> 67:4
Medina 3:5 4:14	97:13 179:24	37:15	138:2 183:9	68:6 69:10 82:15 84:17
8:6 10:2	meter 126:20,23	<b>milligrams</b> 98:5	<b>mistake</b> 55:8,11	83:15 84:17
114:21 195:1	127:14	98:8,19	mistaken 80:3	85:7 111:1,3,8
195:18,22	meters 125:23	million 31:23	mitigate 150:2	111:18,20
196:10	126:1,4	mind 170:8	mitigation	113:23 115:3
meet 114:14	method 132:23	184:4,6,23	181:12 182:1	115:23 116:3
124:19 174:23	175:18 179:10	187:7	model 75:12	133:7 200:23
184:10 246:16	192:24 193:5	mine 37:9 38:5	77:7 78:1,6,7	200:24 203:1
meeting 35:4	methodology	39:5,6 234:21	78:10 129:17	monitoring
37:14 175:18	19:22	236:13,18	181:24 188:4,6	27:20 29:17,21
175:20 182:15	<b>methods</b> 176:6	mined 116:1	188:7,21	29:22 32:2
meets 108:21	<b>mic</b> 184:19	mines 38:14	189:15,18,22	42:1,7 58:13
138:6 220:7	microphone	236:23	190:1,20 249:8	67:8 69:3,11
<b>Melinda</b> 12:6,6	11:15 13:3,5	minimized	modeled 200:23	69:11 70:16
member 2:7,7,8	36:24 185:23	124:16 150:15	modeling 75:15	71:10 73:3,5
6:13,14,18	195:8	150:18	78:2 125:9	74:19 75:19
14:18 16:12	microphones	minimizing	127:17 130:6,9	79:3,9,13,16
33:20 34:5	204:15	104:7	181:10 188:13	82:4,15 83:18
38:19 43:13	<b>middle</b> 23:3,6	minimum	188:13 248:8	93:17,18 94:4
136:4 184:18	28:13	108:18,21	248:16,17	111:6 112:7,11
members 2:6	Midwest 2:19	192:21	modeling's	112:13,22
6:16 30:22	4:13 8:5 9:23	minimus 104:2	247:17	113:22 114:3
101:6	47:5 49:6,21	104:3	models 75:13	114:10 126:23
memorized	49:22 64:16,18	mining 37:8,18	78:3	127:2,2 130:5
76:12	84:7 86:1,10	<b>minor</b> 38:9	moderate 39:16	130:24 131:21
<b>men</b> 169:5	86:19 87:12,17	minus 107:5	modification	133:9 138:20
menaces 23:20	88:10 89:17,24	108:12,19,24	62:8 63:12	150:13 171:17
mention 29:16	91:3,5 93:17	228:19,23	modify 59:24	175:15 176:7
74:11 200:10	94:19 95:2	245:17	61:19 62:4,16	185:12,12,19
mentioned	104:1 105:9,15	<b>minute</b> 131:15	63:9,11 66:9	185:19,20
10:21 11:7	106:22 107:21	156:22 197:3	82:20	190:13 193:2,3
28:7 47:3	108:16 136:23	minutes 11:19	modifying 61:5	194:2 201:18
48:13 92:15,21	136:24 138:4	21:17 37:4	moment 9:10	201:19 202:3,8
124:13 195:18	145:4 161:17	101:12 170:13	47:9 99:19	202:13,14,17
240:7	194:20 195:5	mirror 130:13	140:17 150:24	202:19,11,17
mercury 35:2	203:20 221:5	miscopied 103:8	194:14 195:7	203:14 227:2
94:3,5	224:19 225:24	mispronounce	204:6 211:16	248:18
,,.	221.17 223.2T	mispionounce	201.0211.10	210.10
	I	I	I	I

. February 26, 2014

Page 285

Montgomery	220:15,21	24:13 26:10,13	78:1 87:21	208:20 252:18
37:9 38:14	moves 247:21	26:13 30:6,16	95:5 104:18	Newman 36:18
monthly 193:12	moving 15:22	30:18 33:17	106:24 113:19	40:22
193:16,19	32:16 50:6	37:2,7 41:11	122:17 132:8	nice 212:16
months 165:5,6	54:14 59:5	43:9 49:19	139:5,15	nicely 59:12
165:10,20,23	60:2,17 61:11	55:10 114:20	140:18 152:3	nicked 168:11
166:1,18 167:2	62:11 75:3,3	195:16,20	162:16 164:3,3	night 39:2
167:19,19,24	86:15 88:7,16	204:17 209:20	167:7 168:11	257:23
168:5,12,14	89:16 93:15	209:22	168:14 176:24	<b>NIJMAN 2:16</b>
169:20 193:19	95:14 96:16	names 11:12	178:11 181:9	nine 19:19 31:15
216:1,1,6,9,16	98:13,21	nation 257:10	182:8 184:20	167:19,23
morning 6:3	103:10 109:2	nationally 83:2	190:19,20	nitpick 18:20
12:4 13:13	109:15 110:2	natural 42:19	204:10 217:6	non-detect
21:9 22:6	125:20 127:24	113:6 114:15	231:8 232:18	69:12,12,12
26:13 49:10	130:19 135:2	235:11,21	236:2	70:1 72:5
197:20 258:3	136:17 143:18	naturally 156:18	needed 61:10	non-detected
258:16	146:2 156:21	172:10 204:4	62:8 83:22	71:21
mother 34:9	162:11 164:6	254:24	94:1 106:10,18	non-detects 83:4
38:1	170:5 180:12	<b>nature</b> 74:18	181:23 189:17	179:7
<b>motion</b> 44:16,20	186:10 192:18	139:17 197:5	190:8	nondegradation
45:20,22,24	209:18 221:13	199:7 237:1	needs 17:18	60:13,15
48:24 49:8	246:1,6	<b>NDPES</b> 64:8	32:11,21 125:2	114:24 115:1,6
196:7,13	<b>multi</b> 105:6	near 122:3	175:19 217:5	115:20 152:9
207:17,20	multiple 69:23	139:7 232:24	231:10 248:19	155:22 156:12
208:10 255:8	96:8 104:14,19	nearby 31:15	negative 256:12	175:20 246:3
<b>motions</b> 43:22	104:19 107:17	245:2	256:19	nonhazardous
move 25:21	172:23 220:18	nearly 77:15	<b>neither</b> 9:3 11:6	73:2
43:18 44:17	252:19	necessarily	22:24 49:11	nonparametric
48:5 49:1	municipal 18:6	71:17 141:17	179:2 180:22	179:9,12
66:20 83:13	118:11	148:22 159:19	194:21 196:15	<b>nonpoint</b> 109:18
85:10 91:8	municipally-a	223:22 232:11	255:10	232:10
100:2 122:16	198:20	necessary 61:17	network 8:10	<b>noon</b> 101:14
134:2 143:9	<b>MW-12</b> 94:6	129:6 139:3	22:9 178:5	normally 173:21
159:9 170:24	<u> </u>	157:6 160:23	205:2	177:14
180:23 195:11	$\frac{1}{N2:13:14:1}$	181:9 188:6,11	networks 29:17	North 1:18 2:11
196:9 207:13	211:21,23	188:13,14	29:21	22:19 39:3,23
209:15 211:17	221:15 222:10	190:1 204:12	never 17:12	88:13 N 5 2 7
222:4 224:21	222:11 229:10	231:2 232:8	114:1 131:22	Nos 5:3,7
231:23 234:16	229:20 247:9	234:2 258:3	240:16	<b>notary</b> 1:15
245:9 250:11	249:15,21,22	<b>need</b> 13:4 14:10	<b>new</b> 1:8 6:8 28:1	259:14 <b>note</b> 10:6 11:14
251:10 254:6 255:3 257:13	name 6:5 12:1,9	15:3 23:14	28:2 50:4,13	116:13 208:12
255:3 257:13 moved 27:24	12:12,13,14	31:22,24 32:1 40:4 52:22	65:11 71:11 90:3 144:8	221:24
34:10 49:4	13:12 14:24	40.4 <i>32.22</i> 58:23 61:19	90.3 144.8 159:14 184:16	notebooks
movement	22:5,7 24:11	62:4 63:9,11	186:9,13,18	258:15
movement	,	02.4 03.7,11	100.7,13,10	230.13
	I	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 286

				rage 200
noted 96:3	241:17,23	obviously 36:14	197:11 200:9	53:8,15 54:14
103:24 117:10	246:7 248:13	159:2 190:12	203:24 207:15	56:13,23,24
notes 88:10	254:9,19,21,23	occur 77:8 98:3	208:9 209:12	59:4,13 66:11
259:10	258:7	181:22 190:10	209:19 210:12	67:21 68:24
<b>notice</b> 14:19	numbered	occurred 50:20	211:15 213:20	69:17 72:24
68:19 76:3,10	254:14	151:6 181:19	215:5,14	74:15 81:11
76:12 238:6	numbers 43:22	185:9 230:12	216:18 218:17	82:15 83:11
notices 68:18	44:7 45:23	occurring 87:16	220:11 227:4	85:3,23,23
228:7	46:2 173:17	156:18 172:10	227:14 228:12	87:21 88:2,6
notify 71:6	255:12,13	October 6:24	229:2,5 231:7	89:11,16 90:19
<b>noting</b> 109:8	Numeral 99:5	<b>odor</b> 98:1,7	231:14,20	90:19 91:1
November 7:1	<b>numeric</b> 60:13	offer 7:9 8:22,24	232:14 233:23	92:16 93:3,14
NPDES 60:22	60:16 81:2	11:1,11 36:20	234:12 236:8	94:15,18
61:5,16,20,23	numerical 50:11	36:23 37:4	237:4,14 238:4	100:23 108:4,9
62:4,8,14,19	116:1 150:14	office 8:17 16:21	238:7 239:9	109:2 114:16
63:9,12,13	188:4,6,21	235:12	240:12 241:12	114:18 116:8
64:13,23,24	246:17,17,20	<b>Officer</b> 1:14 2:5	241:15 252:22	118:2 119:16
65:1,9,15,24	247:14 249:9	4:3 6:1,6 7:14	252:24 253:16	121:11 122:5
69:19,21	numerous	7:23 8:12,19	254:3,8,12,17	123:5 124:22
144:17,20	207:23	12:16,22 14:23	255:5 257:15	125:19 126:14
145:6,17		15:5,9,12 21:4	offices 1:16	128:20 129:8
232:11	0	21:7,10,18,22	offline 167:17	131:12 137:13
nuclear 25:22	<b>O</b> 221:21	22:2 24:5,8,19	168:8	138:10 143:9
number 5:2 6:10	<b>o'clock</b> 6:2	24:24 26:3,7	offset 17:19	143:14,18
38:7 45:14,15	257:18 258:6	30:5,9,12,15	offsite 67:13	144:20 145:8
49:5,13,15	258:16	33:14 36:16,17	94:24 95:7,9	145:13 146:1
67:22 69:9	O'Leary 2:7	40:17 41:9	127:5 143:5	149:6 155:1
73:18 83:4	6:13	43:20 44:9,15	150:7,21	156:21 157:2
85:18 86:1	<b>object</b> 100:6	44:19 45:5,15	155:23 219:1,6	159:8 162:7,11
90:24 94:14	226:19,21	45:19 46:11,21	219:10 220:4	163:6 164:6,24
100:5 101:24	232:3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	221:3 242:2,8	166:10 167:2
	<b>objection</b> 44:21	47:2 48:4,7,19	-	
102:3 110:3	45:21 49:8	48:23 49:3	242:8,11,18,20	171:3 175:9
111:21 147:3	62:22 196:14	59:8 66:12,16	242:23 243:11	179:4 180:12
170:20 178:23	207:20 208:7,9	79:23 80:2	243:14 244:1,2	182:7,20
179:1,7 196:4		90:21 94:11	245:11,19,24	183:16 186:20
196:7,13,17,18	209:7,11 227:5	99:18 101:1,4	246:1,4 248:23	190:22 191:1
200:9 204:7,9	228:5 255:9,10	101:16 116:9	249:1	191:21 192:20
207:16,19,19	objectionable	143:11 170:1	<b>oh</b> 12:7 37:12	200:14 201:24
208:12,16	98:1,7	170:10,15	39:17,18 64:16	202:19,23
209:18 210:2	objections	171:1 178:21	94:18 99:11	203:4,5,23
210:22 212:15	258:14	180:19 184:20	111:15 238:6	207:5 210:12
216:15 218:19	obligation 63:17	185:22 187:17	247:8	211:14 212:3
218:21 221:14	obtained 99:24	187:20 194:18	okay 24:22 25:3	213:1,8 237:6
221:16 223:2	<b>obvious</b> 237:21	195:12,14,24	48:16 50:1	238:20 243:3
234:17 239:13	238:1	196:6,12 197:4	51:16 52:7,24	249:22 252:13

February 26, 2014

Page 287

T				20190 201
old 19:20 25:21	214:18 215:3	246:1	238:24	outer 110:9
29:20 52:14	215:21,24	open 21:11	opinion 74:24	113:10
78:15	216:6,14 217:9	38:20	75:11,17 76:7	outfall 61:4
older 78:18	218:2,7 219:13	Opening 4:12	76:8 127:10,18	outfalls 69:23,23
oldest 78:15	219:16 220:9	operate 18:9	229:22	outreach 62:21
<b>Olson</b> 2:13 4:12	220:12,18,21	144:14 145:9	opinions 79:17	outside 56:14
41:5,8,11,11	222:18 224:12	operated 53:22	opportunity 7:8	57:6,13 58:16
43:12,15,17,22	225:6,9 226:21	53:24 86:18	7:11 10:2,4	63:13 115:16
43:23 44:13,14	228:10,13,14	95:22 103:1	13:9 20:8	115:19 116:6
44:17 45:1,4,7	228:22 229:3,4	118:17 119:5	23:23 33:6	199:16
45:18,24 46:4	231:3,9,13	144:2,10	34:13 40:14	overall 172:18
46:7,20,24	232:3 233:21	operates 65:2	99:22 142:12	overkill 189:2
47:1 53:9,12	233:24 234:1,6	operating 37:10	opposed 45:13	overlain 251:1
53:16 54:5	234:11,13	39:6 55:5	165:17 166:3	overlooked 12:8
57:9,12,16,23	236:6,11	62:13 69:14	<b>option</b> 48:14	overly 21:2
58:3,6 85:12	240:10,13,19	86:23 144:18	66:9 86:24	overnight
85:20 92:10	241:4,13,14,22	145:1,7 148:4	151:15 207:8	247:20
93:8 99:9,12	243:17,19	148:6,9 151:3	207:11	oversee 221:8
99:15,23	244:8,13 253:6	153:10,11	options 42:6	overseen 221:1
111:12 112:4	<b>Olson's</b> 44:20	210:20 211:1	101:6 167:7	221:7
112:10,13,17	45:22	216:23,24	oranges 158:7	<b>owned</b> 86:17
112:20,24	<b>omit</b> 210:8	operation 29:19	order 6:24 7:13	118:17 119:4
113:7 123:10	<b>omitted</b> 210:11	102:16 168:8	7:23 8:12,19	172:8
123:16,22	on-site 198:22	221:18,20	9:5,21 11:3,12	<b>owner</b> 42:4 57:2
134:15,21	once 9:11,18	operational	13:5 21:11	58:14 59:16,21
135:3,12,16,19	10:18,18 23:10	216:13	94:14 103:21	59:23 61:16,24
136:1,7,12	33:6 70:20	operations	148:23 157:13	62:5 69:9 71:6
140:24 141:2	128:24 132:9	70:20 71:4,7	162:20 169:19	71:8 73:17
141:13,20	182:12 188:5	71:12	181:24 200:9	83:16 87:8
142:13,23	207:2 238:13	operator 42:5	217:4,23	89:2 128:3,16
143:3 155:8,13	245:22	57:2 58:15	246:15 254:15	139:12 142:5
158:17 160:5	one-hour 100:8	59:16,21,23	orders 246:12	146:4 151:4
160:16,22	100:8	60:21 61:16	ordinance	164:8 165:17
161:2,7 162:8	one-time 75:22	62:1,5 69:9	198:18,21	166:13 172:9
163:3 164:4	one-word 59:11	71:6,9 73:17	199:1	179:15 192:8
169:6,11	ones 68:8 160:13	83:16 87:9	ordinances	238:23
183:14,17	161:21 174:23	89:2 128:3,16	93:10,12	owners 61:22
184:3 186:21	202:15 214:4	139:12 142:5	198:17,20	86:24 186:23
187:3,6,9,12 187:16 197:18	248:12,13	151:5 164:8 165:17 166:13	organics 70:23 72:8	191:24 237:10
206:14 207:21	ongoing 73:18 176:1 221:4	172:9 179:15	original 215:10	P
208:7 209:1,11	<b>Online</b> 8:17	207:3	originally 215:9	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1
211:13 212:1,8	onsite 67:13	<b>operator's</b> 146:5	originate 172:7	45:13
212:19 213:3	95:9 150:8,21	operators 61:22	osmosis 156:8	<b>p.m</b> 101:15,15
213:13 214:5	155:24 245:24	86:24 237:10	ought 83:13	258:19
1	=	=	-	-

. February 26, 2014

Page 288

<b>P.O</b> 2:12	109:3 118:4	256:21	20:17 24:15	145:17,17
package 99:12	130:20 198:11	participated	26:16 28:7,8	152:12 153:13
184:15	part 16:17 17:13	65:5	28:10,15 32:4	220:13 232:12
packet 44:23	18:7 19:17	particular 56:5	34:12	235:23
page 48:2 50:10	26:16 27:5	58:24 59:2	perchlorate 71:1	permits 62:14
54:23 64:15	36:11 45:3	66:22 136:1	81:2,3,6	62:14,15 144:2
76:19,24 94:21	50:3 51:2,6,12	138:18 143:1	179:18,20	144:6,10,21
95:17 97:12,17	51:22 53:19	174:21 214:9	perfect 90:24	145:1,19
97:23 98:15,22	54:18 55:20	214:10 219:19	perfectly 38:8	152:11 153:10
102:9,14 103:8	56:5 59:17	219:19	perform 7:11	153:11
109:16 136:19	60:9,11 61:18	particularly	181:10	permitted 153:9
144:5 162:13	63:14 67:12	52:16 63:13	performance	153:10
165:1 171:13	68:4 69:4,19	77:13	108:21 133:5	permitting
179:5,6 189:10	80:4,8,12,13	<b>parties</b> 104:1	performed	65:15,24 69:19
190:24 200:19	80:16 81:1	<b>Parts</b> 157:8	181:14	145:23
205:5 207:12	82:11,17 83:6	171:21	period 18:14	perpendicular
	· · ·		33:4 103:20	250:24
207:23 213:22 218:22 222:4	88:23 89:23	party 152:23,24 pass 163:14		
	92:16,18 93:1	184:18	165:4,10,13	person 12:23
223:3 242:1	102:2,20 103:2		<b>periodic</b> 86:2,13	101:19 118:18
249:21 250:13	110:16 116:13	passed 6:2	86:21 87:15	119:5 145:8
251:11	117:13,18	path 38:19 39:1	168:21	156:13 237:15
pages 4:2 198:8	120:1,15	pathway 77:10	periodically	personally 32:3
207:24 208:6,8	122:21,22	patience 258:17	72:20 84:10,15	221:7
208:14 246:8	123:14 128:1	pausopak	87:13,19	personnel
panel 81:9 85:14	128:24 130:22	107:10	periods 18:18	204:23
219:17,22	135:13,13,21	pay 22:21	permanent	persons 8:22
221:1,10,12	136:1,7 143:21	peak 74:20 75:9	86:11,20 87:4	11:1
237:17 248:5	143:24 146:4,9	76:1,7,9,16	87:6	pertaining 95:20
panoply 71:11	146:17 147:4,9	77:11,13,15	permeability	pesticides
paper 182:24	147:17 154:14	78:9	84:20 104:11	119:12
paragraph 77:6	154:22 155:3,5	peaking 77:12	108:11 228:15	petition 128:3
198:13 208:20	157:20 158:9	<b>Pekin</b> 28:5	228:23 231:5	128:16
parameter	158:21 159:11	33:22 34:3	245:8	<b>Petitioner</b> 2:15
133:17 174:18	161:20 171:14	35:10	permeable	petitioning
176:20 177:1,3	172:6,24 191:8	<b>people</b> 11:10	245:22	128:6
177:24 178:7	192:14 196:14	23:22 27:6,7	permit 38:7	<b>pH</b> 97:14,15,16
parameters	200:21 201:14	27:11,24 33:8	39:10,11 50:4	97:17
69:14 70:2	202:4,20,20	38:10 39:5	60:22 61:5,9	<b>phonetic</b> 107:10
71:21 72:21	230:18 241:10	85:19 101:19	61:16,20,23	photographs
83:18,19 84:16	257:12	258:15	62:4,9,16,19	251:2
132:7 174:17	part-time 206:9	people's 28:2	63:10,12 64:8	<b>photos</b> 29:24
175:1 177:8	participants	<b>Peoria</b> 13:13,21	64:13,23 65:9	physical 140:2
178:12	7:24 9:6 44:12	15:7,16,16	65:20 144:3,8	phytotoxic 99:4
paraphrase	47:13,14 98:18	16:20 17:13,24	144:14,16,18	<b>pick</b> 13:5 101:9
95:14 103:12	207:19 255:7	18:5 19:19	144:22 145:6,7	108:6

, February 26, 2014

Page 289

				5
picking 58:12	146:7 185:4,6	255:19	66:3	142:1 145:21
185:23	185:9,21 186:6	podium 11:15	polluted 28:12	149:10 160:10
pictures 27:15	187:7 198:15	13:3	pollution 1:1 2:2	188:18
pile 109:9,12	198:15	point 25:19	2:6 6:4 13:17	positive 83:8,9
148:17	<b>plant</b> 14:2,17	27:16,18 46:17	14:8,15 15:18	possibilities
piling 118:15	16:14,24 17:18	58:5 65:10	19:1,6,24 20:5	40:12
pin 185:15	20:19 24:16	67:22 71:9	20:12 26:19	possibility 25:5
pipe 28:12	25:4,24 26:1	73:9,12 80:21	29:1 37:24	183:9 194:1
135:14,16	28:5,7,8,11	110:6,8,15,16	39:21 40:12,15	244:23
pipes 135:19	31:9,12 33:4,5	112:15,17,23	72:3 109:18	possible 11:17
pits 13:11 14:3	33:23 35:19	113:1,5 116:15	120:24 124:21	47:19 71:13
14:11 31:6,13	165:6 206:11	116:24 117:5,8	143:4 145:11	112:10,12
place 63:3,6	206:16,18	117:12,19	157:12 253:5	136:12 141:9
79:3 84:19,21	216:13	123:24 125:12	257:11	161:2,8 172:23
105:3,3 157:3	plants 17:4,8,9	131:21 132:5	polyethylene	175:10,12
157:5,23	17:11 18:8	133:8,11	107:4	181:11 182:11
159:13 176:1	20:15 22:11	137:18 140:3	<b>pond</b> 16:16 23:4	186:2 195:9
181:19 201:8	25:16,20 27:1	150:20,24	28:6 82:5 87:5	216:14 258:12
218:3 224:1	27:5,23 28:10	159:9 165:21	90:7,7,12	possibly 57:20
227:11,12	30:1 34:1 40:5	173:8,17	157:14 165:19	70:11,13,19,21
247:2,11,19	93:18 98:24	178:11 191:4,8	165:22 167:14	243:14
258:4	99:2,3,6	191:12,17	167:16,17,17	post 18:4,12,18
placed 74:23	100:12,20	201:9,12 204:2	167:18,20	252:3,9
84:4,12 112:14	255:23	206:21 212:6	168:1,2,6,7,16	posted 8:15
204:8 205:13	plastic 38:15,16	218:19 221:5	203:12 233:9	potable 94:24
places 29:23	players 18:7	226:23,24	242:3,19 250:8	95:7 146:4,20
63:13	please 13:7	230:15 234:15	ponds 1:5 16:14	149:16 156:1
plainly 215:15	19:24 20:11	239:20 249:8,8	16:22 22:17,18	186:14,18
plan 32:24 59:24	22:4 24:20	250:6 254:20	22:24 28:12,17	242:9,12,21,24
61:7,7 64:9,12	30:17 41:9	258:6	28:19 29:11	244:2 251:19
66:8 101:8	46:22 49:12,14	pointed 153:6	31:10 41:18	potential 32:4
130:5,8 146:5	52:12,23 53:17	pointing 28:4	88:12 89:5	62:6 116:19
161:4,4,11,11	98:24 129:17	93:24	90:8 168:10,21	117:5 118:3,6
161:23 163:19	136:5 143:13	points 24:18,20	213:11 222:22	118:23 119:1
165:14 168:17	155:8 165:16	27:17 54:12	224:3 226:11	120:3,18 121:3
175:15 185:11	171:22 186:5	70:17 86:22	226:12 249:16	125:16 155:22
185:12,20	188:11 198:18	120:2 127:4	249:18,24	164:7 181:11
186:24 187:13	201:4 205:8	200:22 201:2,6	pool 177:17	181:24 183:8
236:14 248:19	209:19 219:2	201:8 202:2	portion 63:13	220:16 223:7
258:15	222:8 223:8	poised 46:18	pose 31:6,20	242:2,17,20
plane 123:8	226:5 227:19	policy 3:6,10	195:8 209:6	245:5 250:14
planning 168:18	228:12 232:19	4:16 8:8 64:1	posed 101:24	250:18
193:12	233:23 234:18	204:19,24	213:23 215:9	potentially
plans 16:2 63:22	237:5 240:12	218:1	227:17	51:15 52:20
66:10 136:18	251:16 255:16	pollutants 35:2	position 53:5	62:12 71:8
		-	1	
	•	•	•	•

February 26, 2014

Page 290

				rage 200
157:20	196:10 198:8,9	24:18	107:2 183:5	227:1 230:11
potentiometric	200:19 204:20	<b>presented</b> 46:10	191:11 192:8	235:24 256:17
142:15,17,19	205:3 209:15	presenting	230:6,12	processes 70:7
142:13,17,19	232:22 234:16	18:24 212:5	230.0,12	-
				produce 21:8
250:22 251:8	237:24 240:7	presumptive	prioritization	produced 10:7
pounds 118:21	241:23 246:8	17:3	164:24 169:7	31:23
118:21 119:8,9	250:13 251:11	pretty 70:7	private 100:17	producing 14:16
power 1:7 6:8	255:21 256:20	132:4 156:19	156:2,12	46:1
14:2 24:16	257:21	159:12 182:23	191:24 192:7	production
25:4,16,20,22	precede 11:21	184:21 238:1	probably 23:11	25:22
27:1 28:10	precipitation	240:4	35:9 64:2	products 23:6
31:2 32:22	104:8 163:14	prevent 13:20	83:13 119:14	professional
40:5 41:22	precisely 101:9	85:1 98:23	123:2 137:9,12	24:1
53:20 54:6	precludes	255:22	165:18 170:11	<b>profits</b> 27:11
86:1 90:7	174:24	preventative	176:6 194:4	profound 35:8
165:6 205:8,14	predate 185:8	16:9	238:14	program 50:4
205:17 207:7	186:9	preventive 42:2	problem 38:11	51:12,14 58:17
209:23 218:23	predict 247:18	60:20 61:14	40:8 166:23	69:19 105:19
219:2	predictive 248:8	62:2 64:11	187:9 236:15	144:8 145:23
Powerton 28:5	248:16	124:7,9 185:21	problems 14:13	151:12 152:17
86:4 89:18	predicts 77:7	previous 136:18	32:1 33:5	152:17,18
91:3 93:19	249:9	136:21 137:4	105:4 188:23	153:7,13
94:3	preexisting	138:6 183:3	procedural 9:13	154:10 159:14
practicable	185:6 186:6	185:3 186:24	11:4 47:4	173:7
150:15	preparation	187:13 221:23	procedures	programs 97:3
practical 182:18	158:20	previously 116:1	29:14	105:8 136:18
<b>Prairie</b> 8:9 22:8	prepare 10:14	183:13,21	proceed 101:21	153:21 154:3
205:2	21:8 240:20	primarily 25:3	165:13 197:7	154:18,18
pre-file 7:14,24	prepared 7:21	82:19 212:20	197:12	progress 257:20
pre-filed 7:18	11:18 24:16	primary 117:5	proceeding 6:6	prohibiting
8:1,5,20 9:12	43:17 47:17	117:12,18	7:24 11:4	146:4,20
9:14,19 10:8	185:9 195:3	118:3,6 119:1	70:24 137:16	149:16
43:23,24 44:1	235:9	120:3,12,18	137:23 157:15	project 8:9
44:2,4,11 45:9	<b>preparing</b> 99:23	120.3,12,18	proceedings	30:20 230:17
45:10 50:10	215:15 255:2	126:11 256:14	1:13 204:3	230:17
54:22 68:14,15		257:2	222:20 226:22	
68:23 75:7	prerogative 207:2		252:4 259:8	projects 148:3
		principle 130:18		prompted 200:11
79:11 83:1	<b>present</b> 2:6 6:12	<b>principles</b> 152:3	<b>process</b> 14:20 20:3 65:16	
88:9 93:7	7:21 11:24	174:14		promptness
97:12,24 98:15	12:4,19,24	<b>printed</b> 8:18	66:1 75:5,23	101:17
98:22 102:10	13:24 36:20	20:5	139:19 159:6	promulgate
102:14 109:17	87:14 184:15	printing 208:2	160:19 162:21	256:8
136:20 147:13	196:14 204:20	<b>prior</b> 55:1 65:20	168:2 169:17	promulgating
162:13 165:1	221:7	79:3 88:17	176:14,24	158:2
171:13 179:6	presentation	102:18,22	198:12 214:7	pronounce 13:2
	l	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 291

properly 160:24145:20 146:642:10 45:1136:17 42:24172:11 241:7property 20:20146:12 158:2060:19 62:18136:4 150:17247:14 248:10110:9,13161:16 162:1,371:5 81:16184:18 252:17quantified113:11 114:5,9162:6 164:2,1682:7 108:12257:8,8 259:14233:1416:20 125:24164:17 165:11128:4,6 132:10published 23:22quantify 233:4191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
property 20:20146:12 158:2060:19 62:18136:4 150:17247:14 248:10110:9,13161:16 162:1,371:5 81:16184:18 252:17quantified113:11 114:5,9162:6 164:2,1682:7 108:12257:8,8 259:14233:14116:20 125:24164:17 165:11128:4,6 132:10published 23:22quantify 233:4127:14 191:4166:12 171:14180:9 181:9pull 185:24quantity 104:10191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
110:9,13161:16 162:1,371:5 81:16184:18 252:17quantified113:11 114:5,9162:6 164:2,1682:7 108:12257:8,8 259:14233:14116:20 125:24164:17 165:11128:4,6 132:10published 23:22quantify 233:4127:14 191:4166:12 171:14180:9 181:9pull 185:24quantify 104:10191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
113:11 114:5,9162:6 164:2,1682:7 108:12257:8,8 259:14233:14116:20 125:24164:17 165:11128:4,6 132:10published 23:22quantify 233:4127:14 191:4166:12 171:14180:9 181:9pull 185:24quantify 104:10191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
116:20 125:24164:17 165:11128:4,6 132:10published 23:22quantify 233:4127:14 191:4166:12 171:14180:9 181:9pull 185:24quantify 233:4191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
127:14 191:4166:12 171:14180:9 181:9pull 185:24quantity 104:10191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
191:17 244:9171:19 172:2,6188:2,11224:19234:4244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
244:11,14,18172:24 173:5193:13 222:1purchased 33:24quarterly 67:19244:24176:18 181:7222:13 227:20purpose 55:17193:1,10,15
244:24         176:18 181:7         222:13 227:20         purpose 55:17         193:1,10,15
<b>proposal</b> 6:23   181:13 182:2.3   253:13   56:21 96:21   <b>question</b> 25:23
, <b>i i</b> , , ,
41:14,20 42:4 203:8,9 247:24 130:7,10 159:6 55:13,13,16,2 72:2 06:7 propage 41:21 142:22 142:20 propage 126:7 56:17 18 57:2
72:2 96:7 <b>proposes</b> 41:21 142:23 143:20 <b>pursuant</b> 126:7 56:17,18 57:2
214:13         215:4         proposing         95:10         143:24         146:9         128:12         172:6         57:10         59:5,6           227.9         15         126         17         146         12         17         50:10         144.15
227:8,15         126:17 171:23         146:12,17         251:21         59:10,14,15           124 12         202 21 21         150 2 150 ( 15)         (2 10)         (0 2 17 (1 11))
propose 134:12         203:21,21         150:3 156:6,15         pursue 62:10         60:2,17 61:11           250:1         200:14,252,15         100:21,221,15         60:2,17 61:11
258:1         230:14 252:15         180:21 221:15         68:19         61:12,12,24
proposed 1:8         protect 16:4         233:11         push 18:11         63:24 64:18
6:8 13:18 18:3       100:11 156:10       provides 104:14       put 63:5 67:18       66:20,24 72:1
23:22 26:20         257:7,8         117:19 129:14         84:20 105:3         77:24 78:14,2
31:1         41:24         protected         14:10         181:8         193:15         112:7,11         80:3,8         81:21
42:13 50:3         protecting 14:20         228:21         161:10 182:14         81:24 83:14
51:2,5,10         31:4         providing         192:4 197:21         84:6 85:4 86:
53:14 55:20         protection 1:17         230:20         210:2 213:5         86:6,16,16
56:4,21 57:6         2:11 6:22 44:5         provision 29:10         223:24 230:6         88:7,24 89:17
59:16 60:6,21         91:15,20,24         29:12 56:21         247:2         90:20,24 91:2
62:3,5 67:5         92:3 104:14,16         62:18 64:3         putting 25:5         91:7,9,17,22
68:3,5 69:2       104:20 124:9       67:18 126:9       126:14 186:10       92:11 93:13,1
76:4,10 80:11 145:15 163:11 128:6,10,22 197:22 94:2,10,13,16
88:18,19,20 199:10,17 166:11 185:16 94:18 95:4,14
90:4 91:9,18 227:16 228:21 <b>provisions</b> 41:18 <b>Q</b> 95:15,16 96:1
91:21 92:6,16 229:14 251:22 42:1 62:14 <b>qualifications</b> 96:16,19,20
96:11 102:15         252:3         73:3,17 91:4         154:19         97:12,23 98:9
102:17,24 <b>protective</b> 29:6 95:24 146:8,22 <b>qualified</b> 219:23 98:13,21 100:
103:13,23 107:24 108:8 147:2 152:9 <b>quality</b> 42:8 100:10,15
104:12         109:20         152:8         162:9         156:13         158:21         51:3         54:3,21         101:24         102:3,
110:6 125:6,16         163:19 220:5         160:7 241:8         57:18 60:12         102:9,13
125:21,22         protocol 19:17         247:18         67:11,17,24         103:10 104:5
127:13         128:10         protocols         16:18         public         1:15         4:4         68:17         69:21         104:17         106:3
129:20,23         prove 59:1         4:5,6,7,8,9,10         80:9 82:13         106:13,14,14
130:1,16       134:4       provide       10:1,3       4:11       8:22       9:1       84:23       95:8       106:15       107:13
135:5     137:6     14:12     17:20     11:1,7     14:18     99:5     103:5     108:10,15
143:18         144:7         26:9         33:3         21:12         29:2,6         155:10,14         109:2,5,15,15

February 26, 2014

Page 292

r				
110:3,3,5,21	209:17 210:16	47:18,22 48:9	96:18 100:15	70:24
111:16,16	210:17,17	48:10,21 49:7	236:16 241:8	raise 36:21
113:20 114:19	211:5,7,16,21	55:12 60:3,18	quickly 48:6	195:3
115:4,13	212:4,8,9	63:1 64:16	100:2 173:16	raised 194:19
116:14 117:24	213:22 214:20	66:21,23 81:7	quit 149:5	raising 31:8
119:17,17	215:8,10,12	85:10,13,15	quite 13:4 34:8	ran 96:18
120:8 123:11	218:13,18,22	86:3,8 89:17	40:2 80:6	156:23
129:9,10	219:7,14,20,23	89:20,21 90:22	187:24 257:19	Randolph 2:2
130:12,19,21	220:1,10 221:6	90:23 91:2	<b>quote</b> 50:11,15	range 97:15,17
130:24 131:8	221:13,23	93:16,21 94:17	55:18,18 97:13	<b>Rao</b> 2:9 6:20
132:1,2,11	222:3,4 223:2	95:13 96:9	97:15,16,16,16	73:1,7,15
134:3,3,14,16	223:8,19,20	97:11,22 98:12	97:17 98:1,2	74:11 81:24
135:8,12 136:5	224:2,20,21	100:3 101:10	98:23,24	82:3,15 83:3
136:17,19	225:2,13,23	101:21 102:8	102:15,19,22	83:11 124:23
137:7 138:12	227:15,19,21	103:12 107:12	102:23 103:1,2	125:5,19
138:16 139:20	228:11 229:6,7	109:4 110:2	103:3,6 109:19	219:22
139:21 141:22	229:9,17	112:4 116:16	110:8,14,15	rationale 122:23
142:13 143:10	230:22 231:15	130:22 132:3	162:14,17,19	<b>RCRA</b> 76:10
144:4 146:2,2	231:16,21,23	132:15,22	162:19,22,23	154:13
146:11 156:22	232:15,19,22	133:3 138:11	164:13,14	RD9-14(b)
157:2,16	232:22 233:22	138:14 142:14	171:14,15,18	120:16
158:18,19	234:17,17	143:17 153:18	179:7 181:10	re-submittal
160:5 162:12	235:7 236:7	160:17 170:7	181:13 233:5	182:12,14,22
163:9 164:1,5	237:7 239:13	170:18,22,24	quote-unquote	reach 141:6,9,12
164:24 165:8 166:8 169:7	240:11,18 241:5,17,23	171:4,5,7,8,12 178:18,19,23	99:2 139:22	217:15 247:14 248:9
170:2,5,6,19	241.3,17,23	178.18,19,23	<b>quotes</b> 109:17	reached 101:5
170:23 171:5,9	246:6 247:1,12	180:15,20,24	R	248:11 257:18
170:23 171:3,5	247:17 249:14	180:15,20,24	<b>R</b> 2:1 3:1	reaching 150:3
179:5,13 180:1	249:23 250:8	192:18 194:19	<b>R-A-C-E</b> 49:22	read 9:15 11:11
180:14 181:3,5	250:11 251:10	194:24 195:2	R-U-D-O-L-F	15:23 21:14
181:6 182:3,19	251:14 255:17	196:1,10,23	24:14	39:2,15 40:5
183:15 184:24	257:13 258:7	197:7,10,19,21	R14-10 6:10	50:9 53:16
186:4 187:22	question's 50:7	198:6 203:16	R2014-10 1:5	54:19 55:22
187:22,23	questioned 95:4	204:3,7,9,21	<b>R89-14</b> 251:23	58:11 66:24
188:12,12,17	questioning	205:4 210:14	R89-14(B)	67:1 77:6
189:6,10	114:23 218:16	212:11,14,15	251:23 252:11	83:14 89:22
190:23 191:2	questions 4:13	212:24 218:6	Race 49:22	102:13 129:10
191:20 192:19	4:14,16 7:6,22	219:16 235:3	radial 141:15	150:22 156:24
193:14,24	8:1,5,13,16	239:6,15	158:1	157:18 164:18
199:4 200:9	9:19,22,23	253:17,18	radiation 19:9	164:19 171:10
201:17 202:1,5	10:5,8,16,19	257:17,20,21	radio 34:17	173:5 176:17
203:7,10	10:21,23 11:3	257:22 258:8,9	radioactivity	176:21 178:3
205:16 207:22	44:10 45:9,10	258:11	19:10	181:5 187:23
209:1,10,15,16	46:9,19 47:5	<b>quick</b> 47:11 73:8	radionuclides	209:8 217:2
			l	I

, February 26, 2014

Page 293

	I	I	1	
reader 63:8	67:10 83:1	recommends	108:2 250:12	regular 139:8
reading 12:1	99:8 183:18	164:13	references 18:22	regularly 139:19
54:22 163:9	205:5 212:21	record 9:6,14	19:20 116:15	regulated 142:8
164:5 232:22	218:23 222:5	36:4,5 40:19	157:14	171:18 172:6,8
ready 13:2,7	223:3	41:6 43:18	referencing 71:2	172:9
15:13,14 21:23	reassessed 29:22	44:10,18,21	116:22 183:7	regulation 20:21
24:8 26:9	recall 93:13	45:23 46:5	referred 29:7	74:2 88:3 96:4
33:16 36:22	108:22 109:1	47:19 48:14	45:16 68:19	111:23 113:9
41:3,5 46:17	117:16 160:8	49:5,9 82:16	111:4 115:2	142:8 145:12
48:8 49:13	170:19 200:2	85:18 87:11	referring 56:9	148:16 158:24
66:17 80:3,6	237:9,16 247:4	102:12 106:1	76:6 97:15	regulations
102:2 170:18	receive 165:12	122:6 128:21	99:2 107:16	13:10 15:24
170:24 180:23	216:10	180:3,7 196:2	109:23 113:16	16:16,24 26:20
195:15 196:22	received 8:4	196:17 204:8	115:8,10	42:15,17,19
204:13 215:16	165:2,5 216:16	208:15 214:3	120:12 121:8	52:3 55:20
215:17 218:19	247:7	253:11 255:12	122:7 132:22	62:13 63:7,14
218:20	receiving 211:9	recorded 35:24	142:9 147:22	63:14 73:2
real 20:17 28:22	215:1,22	records 48:12	205:18,20	92:8,9 95:5,23
32:24 197:14	216:12 250:4	251:23	206:15 242:15	122:12,22
really 17:22	receptor 77:11	recreate 30:22	244:11	123:14 126:18
28:18 35:7,7	191:6 192:12	recreation 23:18	refers 162:23	128:1 146:10
38:1 58:19	recess 101:14	redeployed	222:10	158:3,6 171:22
73:11 79:4	170:14	17:19	reflected 19:14	220:8 240:17
113:15 122:14	recharge 104:8	redevelop 17:16	reflective 84:3	241:2 243:22
128:15 131:23	234:22 237:8	27:19	84:11 185:6	257:12
132:14,18	237:13 240:5	redeveloped	186:8	regulatory
133:10 139:15	recharging	17:12	regard 89:17	95:19 96:1
147:7 167:20	75:20 237:21	redevelopment	210:21 230:1	97:2,10
184:7 206:7	238:2	20:23	233:9 239:12	reject 126:3
216:12 217:15	recognize 62:1,7	redone 19:22	regarding 50:7	160:3,4,6
236:24 245:3	71:23 198:2,4	reduce 67:7,18	51:18 63:11	161:7
245:20	· · · · ·	,		
	recollection	69:9 73:4,18	83:10 110:3	rejected 67:10
rear 10:11	123:6	reducing 67:2	116:14 165:22 180:20 186:13	160:13 related 120:17
reason 81:22	recommend 179:21	reduction 84:16		
126:21 140:7		85:6	193:4 210:1,3	134:3 136:19
157:24 178:2	recommendati	refer 86:3	212:9	190:11 236:4
243:6 244:16	81:15 96:3	242:22	regardless 31:21	relates 64:8 80:6
247:18	108:1	reference 62:19	105:17,17	102:9 146:3
reasonable	recommended	63:8,16,20	regional 39:11	relating 93:16
71:20 254:16	62:20 64:3	64:17 102:20	240:1	97:23 109:6
reasonably 81:3	81:5 105:10	117:8 144:6	Register 76:3,9	131:2 188:13
reasoning	107:22 108:5	155:5 183:3	76:15,17,21	relation 12:5
126:19	200:4	213:21	regret 131:23	200:22
			1 - 1 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -	L L . 4" (E. 11
reasons 26:22 38:9 63:1	recommending 71:1	referenced 97:17 98:15	<b>regs</b> 63:3 117:17 123:7	relative 65:11 127:3 235:4

February 26, 2014

Page 294

Г				
239:16 246:2	51:4	225:12 226:5	required 21:8	resident 13:13
relatively 72:7	remember	227:18 229:16	29:15 56:4	22:13 24:14
release 124:13	122:11,23	231:15 232:18	62:16 64:21,23	26:23 33:22
124:16 139:1	125:7 197:16	repeated 69:11	65:9 67:3,8	34:4,6
148:5,7,8	200:17	repetition 11:22	104:12,13	<b>residents</b> 33:8
155:19 181:15	removal 32:15		104.12,13	33:13
		rephrase 215:8		
181:19,21,22	86:2 87:2,15	replaced 90:3	137:2 159:22	residual 125:21
190:9,12	103:18 118:8	106:11	162:16 165:13	residues 82:23
released 191:15	164:13 165:10	report 18:21	166:23 179:11	<b>Resource</b> 242:9
releases 147:1	192:7 221:1	72:19 249:12	179:15,22	242:12,21,24
relevance	remove 55:19	reported 98:17	181:20 188:3	244:2 251:19
157:19 214:12	56:2,8 70:23	98:17 259:7	189:18,19,22	resources 23:15
226:21	71:1 87:1,20	reporter 24:11	193:5,8,11,12	23:15 42:19
relevancy	87:22,23 104:8	46:22 197:12	200:24 217:23	80:19 95:12
218:16	156:4,9 164:9	221:22 259:5	220:7 225:24	96:7 235:12,12
relevant 109:20	168:20 192:2	reporter's 49:18	227:24 237:10	235:21
158:16,22	218:24 219:3,5	reports 42:2	238:23	respect 62:19
214:6 222:20	removed 52:9,19	represent 15:16	requirement	68:2 72:16
226:22 232:7	70:23 84:10,15	26:11 30:17	17:23 63:6,10	80:7 91:1,4
relied 116:23	86:13,21 88:13	33:18 37:3	103:18 118:19	94:3 102:7
120:1	88:15,17,22	80:20	138:3 145:12	130:23,24
relief 129:5	89:3,6 90:9	representative	147:15 164:15	134:4 149:13
relined 106:11	104:22 148:22	172:19	172:14 236:3	158:2 170:22
106:18,24	149:8 155:24	Representatives	requirements	171:3,9 211:6
167:16 226:1,3	162:14,17,18	6:20	18:16 59:22	215:11 225:23
226:8,9,12	162:20 219:8	representing	62:12,20 74:19	226:6 227:22
227:24	220:3	15:6 22:6,8	88:19 103:16	229:10,11,20
rely 92:18 146:7	removing 62:22	24:12	111:10 137:5	237:6 238:11
183:21	81:6 87:9,13	represents 82:16	137:10,22	238:20 257:14
<b>relying</b> 153:15	105:21 156:5,7	reproduced	138:7 157:20	respectively
remain 70:7	167:24	193:17	158:10 159:11	198:16
81:23 257:21	rendering 19:2	request 7:10	159:15 160:10	respond 46:19
remaining 90:2	renovation	94:13 165:12	160:11 161:8,9	responded 50:5
258:8	165:9 166:17	requests 164:16	161:10,21	61:21 62:17
remarkable	repackaged	214:11	182:16 184:11	88:21 95:21
198:1,1	138:1	require 14:12	184:14 192:21	104:13 128:9
remedial 118:8	repair 165:9	60:21 61:15	231:2 246:23	131:6 251:18
119:1	166:17 168:4	67:6 71:8	requires 115:23	responding
remediate 42:11	168:15	120:6 137:24	130:4,8 151:1	45:10
234:8	repeat 27:20	156:8,19	requiring 32:12	responds 126:5
remediation	52:11 76:23	183:18 188:23	32:18 189:14	129:21
51:14 58:17	91:22 115:3	189:3 202:24	189:14 202:3	response 41:16
148:24 151:12	136:4 158:17	208:22 230:13		42:2 50:9
234:8			rerouting 61:2 research 82:23	
	186:3 211:4	248:16,17		60:11,20 61:14
<b>remedy</b> 50:14,16	219:24 221:23	257:23	252:15	62:2 64:11,18
	I	I	I	I

. February 26, 2014

Page 295

				Page 295
81:6,8 82:20	150:1 155:7	38:6,10 39:7	167:4 169:2,23	193:8,11,15
86:7 90:6	restored 20:22	47:15 60:1	173:9 177:22	<b>Route</b> 28:18,19
91:13 95:8,11	246:16	61:13 63:22	178:3,6,13	routine 168:9
97:5,19 98:6,9	restricted 93:10	66:8 72:19	184:13 185:1	rows 170:3
98:19 99:4	198:17	75:14 81:18	189:3,11,16	<b>Rudolf</b> 4:7
100:13 103:7	restrictions	99:22 137:8,14	197:7 202:22	12:15 24:13
103:15 104:5	110:11	138:3,8 158:9	206:17 213:14	<b>Rudy</b> 12:14
107:15,16	resubmit 138:8	158:16 161:12	213:16 217:7	rule 32:21 41:15
109:8,22	183:18	182:15 187:7	225:14 237:15	51:10 76:4,10
110:14 116:13	resubmitted	251:14 255:18	243:15 244:15	104:12 118:24
134:9 137:3	138:1 183:10	reviewed 136:21	244:22 248:12	130:1 134:13
139:4 140:17	186:7	137:4 256:5	risk 28:3 31:21	134:19 135:5
143:15,22	resubmitting	reviewing 10:16	99:20 104:7	135:20 137:6
146:16 157:10	183:5	75:11 96:17	107:14	137:10 160:18
162:22 164:11	result 60:19	<b>revise</b> 60:22	<b>risk-based</b> 191:2	160:22 162:1,3
172:2,21	61:1,17 75:19	61:16 62:16	<b>risks</b> 76:16 77:8	162:6 164:2
178:19 179:19	111:5 182:23	revision 39:11	77:15 191:14	172:24 173:5
181:4,6,17	resulted 77:15	revisit 40:24	227:16 251:15	176:18,21,23
185:21 187:23	246:11	Richard 7:19	255:18	176:23 181:8
191:7 192:8,9	resulting 75:21	44:3 49:23	<b>river</b> 13:23 14:6	182:16 184:11
192:11,15	124:15	<b>Rick</b> 42:23 67:9	16:15,20 23:4	184:12 200:3
193:7 197:21	results 72:19	123:12 153:19	23:6,7,8 25:8	200:11 214:17
198:24 200:8	73:5,19 82:4	155:8 197:18	25:10,18 26:17	214:21 216:22
200:12 201:11	83:3 93:17	198:8	28:6,9,11,12	217:5,11,11,14
205:10 208:10	94:3 130:6,9	rid 89:6	28:13,15 31:9	217:17,19,20
209:12 212:14	130:23 131:18	ridiculous 18:10	33:23 34:19,22	218:3 227:1
214:18 215:12	131:19 172:23	<b>right</b> 6:13,16	39:24 140:4,4	233:10 236:3
222:3 223:12	resume 100:3	23:5 33:23	246:13,18,22	rule's 217:15
225:1 227:5	101:8 166:2	35:12 38:6	247:2 248:7	rulemaking 6:10
231:7 232:23	170:13,18	49:22 52:4	rivers 8:10 22:9	6:14,23 7:3
235:2 236:9	258:6	59:4 65:17	23:16 24:2	41:16,17 65:5
239:14 241:4,5	retired 40:10	66:14,19 67:14	30:20 139:7	95:11 96:7
242:6 247:8	retroactive	67:15 69:6,7	205:2 213:9	122:7 157:13
responses 44:10	51:18	72:22 77:4	<b>RMR</b> 1:15 259:4	203:12 212:7
45:9 46:9	retrospectively	80:21 85:17	259:13	213:2 214:6,6
64:15 171:7	120:21	87:12 89:11	<b>Robin</b> 4:10	232:4 235:15
178:24 180:13	return 257:17	90:15 101:21	12:23 33:19	239:18,20
180:21 197:23	returned 150:17	102:5 114:8	<b>robust</b> 174:7	252:10
204:5 219:18	returning	117:23 121:17	<b>Roman</b> 99:5	Rulemaking
responsible	101:17 170:16	124:5 128:18	room 1:18 10:11	1:7
61:22	revealed 237:12	129:7,8 132:13	13:18 23:14	rulemakings
rest 180:13	revealing 238:11	135:23 145:3	122:17	222:21
197:19	revenue 20:21	148:2 152:22	round 10:12	<b>rules</b> 9:13 13:19
restate 215:8	reverse 156:8	160:9 161:17	19:16,16	14:9 15:22
restoration	review 20:7 29:4	162:7 163:8	rounds 192:22	23:22 27:17

February 26, 2014

Page 296

1				5
29:4 30:4 31:1	172:3 181:13	saying 21:11	secondary 117:5	110:17 122:8
31:4,22 33:13	182:13,13	41:1 71:23	117:13,18	137:10 155:16
41:24 42:14	183:8 189:2	87:8 122:24	118:23 120:4	164:5 177:4,7
50:4,18,21	199:18,19	126:8 130:12	120:12,19	177:11 180:18
51:17,20,24	216:24 235:8	131:9 132:13	122:9 125:16	188:11 201:24
52:17,21 53:7	<b>rulings</b> 137:15	140:22 150:19	126:11 256:15	207:4 212:13
53:14,23,24	<b>run</b> 37:9 38:5	176:22 189:4	section 9:13	213:2 217:20
54:4,9,22 55:1	39:6 78:3,3,5	230:9 231:9	27:4 43:1,4,10	227:7 248:5,18
56:3,9,11,15	78:10 133:17	243:13,14	50:12,15,22	251:6 253:18
56:22 57:6,13	running 78:6	246:4	53:12,13,19	255:6 258:14
58:1,9,10,11	109:23	says 54:19 113:9	54:18,23 57:14	258:16
58:15,16,23	runoff 109:8,12	121:7	57:17 62:6,11	seeing 9:3 11:6
59:16 60:6,21	109:21	scary 39:1	62:22 68:11	41:1 49:11
62:3 63:18	rural 15:15	scenario 151:4	91:14 92:17	75:9,18,21,22
64:10,12 67:5		174:13 245:13	93:6 102:24	94:12 143:12
68:4 71:5	S	scenarios 175:12	103:14 110:6	179:2 180:22
73:16 74:13	<b>s</b> 2:1 3:1 5:1	scheduled	110:17 116:22	194:21 196:15
80:17,17 88:18	91:10	204:11 258:2	119:20 120:4	255:10
88:20,23 89:8	saddled 29:8	schedules 9:8	120:16 126:7,8	seek 59:24 62:8
91:10,18,21	safe 219:9 220:4	scheme 174:18	126:15 128:2	63:11 128:11
92:6,16,19,21	safety 42:18	Schiff 3:2	128:12 129:12	199:22
93:1 95:10,18	sake 253:10	195:17	130:2,4,8,14	seeking 88:11
96:11,21,24	sample 69:14,22	scientists 19:7	134:13 137:2	89:19
97:6,9 102:15	72:9,11 111:5	scope 55:19	142:7 149:24	seen 37:22 82:24
102:17,19,23	samples 203:13	56:15 96:10,20	150:11 152:9	83:2 120:23
103:2,6,13,23	sampling 67:18	96:24 97:6,9	155:9,11,12	121:24 122:1,3
110:7 117:2	70:1 193:1,8,9	182:8 214:15	164:15 169:8	122:4 126:24
122:20 124:24	193:10,11,16	217:5	179:14,16	127:19 140:3
125:21 128:8	193:20 202:3,9	seasonal 104:7	181:7 185:2,17	212:13 240:16
128:10,12,15	203:6,9	193:15,17,22	187:1 188:14	seepage 129:15
128:24 129:13	San 34:11	seasons 194:6	203:8,9 230:10	sell 87:23
129:20,23	Sangamo 1:17	seats 195:7	251:21,22	semiannual
130:16 135:10	satellite 29:24	second 8:6 12:4	Sections 130:2	67:19 69:15,24
135:23 137:23	satisfactorily 142:5	25:14 48:17	198:14	72:5
137:24 138:5,7		72:14 94:16	see 12:6,19	sense 16:7,17
142:4 143:19	satisfactory 37:16	106:13,14	13:23 19:19	65:7,20 90:24
144:7 145:20	satisfied 103:21	107:6 108:19	26:22 27:3	118:1 120:21
146:6,12 147:9	105:1	117:20 138:13	28:14,18 29:23	127:4
152:1 154:6,10	satisfy 137:22	178:22 194:14	34:23 36:3	sensitive 98:24
154:14,17	saturated	194:24 198:13	59:10 71:14	99:3,6 184:21
157:6,7 158:20	142:21	200:18 207:21	77:19 78:1	255:23
159:18 161:5	<b>saturation</b> 35:18	209:11,15	81:7,12 89:9 08:0 00:7	sent 68:18 83:24
161:16 164:16	saw 170:1 187:9	224:20 228:19	98:9 99:7	237:22
165:11 166:4 166:12 171:19	197:20	234:21 245:17 247:22	100:7 101:12 105:5 107:15	sentence 209:9
100.12 1/1.19	197.20	241.22	103.3 107.13	separate 39:10
	l	I	l	1

. February 26, 2014

Page 297

1				2
63:17 64:14,24	shorten 83:18	significantly	175:21 176:5	84:9,14 136:13
74:4 174:11	<b>shorter</b> 18:19	19:2 127:23	176:11 181:18	140:14 151:9
178:6 218:5	67:4 124:6	silent 16:6	181:23 182:5,9	152:4 153:1
separately 132:8	shorthand 259:7	<b>similar</b> 18:10	181.25 182.3,9	156:15 157:3
series 93:21	259:10		<i>,</i>	
		123:2,24	188:1,10,10,19	165:18,19
160:16	<b>shortly</b> 36:18	130:18 142:17	190:6,17 206:4	166:19 168:14
serious 13:22	shot 75:22	146:24 152:4	206:5 214:9	174:12 175:24
27:13 31:5,24	show 57:20,24	159:12	222:16 224:17	191:13 194:3
seriously 24:1	68:6 70:15	Similarly 18:5	234:24 240:22	situations 18:17
serve 30:22	89:5 125:2	60:17 94:15	242:12 243:4	22:19 28:2
250:10	133:19 140:13	148:7	243:19,21	172:17 173:2
service 31:18	148:21 251:5	simple 66:6	244:5,7	173:21 245:23
88:13,15,17	257:4	141:5 173:22	site-by-site 16:2	252:21
89:6 90:9	showed 42:7	174:5 175:10	161:3	six 37:13 168:5
123:12,18	125:9	236:19	site-specific	168:14 208:6,8
168:16,19,19	shower 100:24	simplifying	41:16 73:23	208:14 216:1
set 11:15 50:12	showing 25:12	139:20	74:2 77:20	size 119:7
82:10 100:11	55:24 73:13	simply 73:21	80:17 87:24	121:20 122:2
103:13,16	89:9 128:17	138:7 157:7	95:11 96:4,7	<b>ski</b> 34:16
152:10 160:18	186:16 190:13	183:3,6 209:8	127:1 136:13	skiing 34:24
172:18,19	190:13 238:14	210:8 215:11	139:15,16	<b>skip</b> 85:10
173:24 174:11	<b>shown</b> 58:13	231:17 236:16	157:13 198:23	143:15 170:7
175:22 183:20	70:1,16 83:19	simultaneously	200:3 203:11	171:5 181:3
193:13 194:24	136:24 251:4,8	201:2	214:11 222:21	Skipping 198:13
195:1 236:17	shows 57:3 74:7	single 63:2	233:10 239:23	slash 93:10
237:2	75:15 142:18	69:23 72:21	sites 27:10 29:9	sleep 39:2
sets 8:5 173:23	142:20 194:2	133:14 174:21	30:2 67:17,24	slightly 82:20
174:2 176:7	shuttered 17:14	174:22 176:20	74:7 75:8	189:6
227:1	<b>sic</b> 165:1	177:23 178:5,7	77:23 86:11,20	slurry 134:6,17
setting 175:15	<b>side</b> 65:11	222:22	87:4,6,19	134:23
214:7	114:14 197:16	sinking 236:22	94:23 95:6	small 61:12
settled 47:10	236:20 244:14	<b>SIP</b> 154:10	96:8 118:17	91:10 105:18
seven 38:2	Sierra 8:9 12:10	sir 24:10,21 26:3	119:4 144:1,2	179:23 180:4
108:24 205:15	22:9 26:15	<b>sit</b> 176:2	146:18 153:9	smaller 120:2,5
215:11 249:16	30:20 31:3	site 20:5 27:20	154:2,2 191:14	120:10,22
shallow 234:23	32:10 205:1	29:22 32:6	225:24 226:2	121:8,12,19,21
238:22,24	sign 11:10	51:14 58:17	233:13 235:22	smell 98:17
239:4 240:5	sign-in 101:18	73:24 79:2,2,5	244:17,23	smelled 256:24
shared 235:20	signal 94:12	118:7,11,12,16	246:22 248:3	snapshot 217:6
Shaw 12:6,7	signed 9:1 40:23	118:24 119:4	sitting 23:5	217:10
21:23,24 40:24	101:20	124:15 140:20	197:18,19	snow 36:4
sheet 101:18	significant	141:3,22 143:1	248:12 249:2	social 27:9
sheets 94:5,9	39:11 67:16,23	146:21 149:16	situation 20:14	solar 25:23
<b>short</b> 24:18 31:4	109:19 110:22	151:12 155:10	38:1 57:4	<b>solid</b> 129:12,16
47:14 133:20	248:2,21	173:7 175:19	65:22,24 74:9	157:4,8,21
т/.1т 133.20	270.2,21	1/3./ 1/3.1/	03.22,27 / 7.9	1,0,21
	l	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 298

r				2
171:20	121:4 124:13	131:14 160:6	68:17 73:22,23	<b>start</b> 37:2 85:18
solids 251:13	125:16 126:11	172:12 214:4	74:1 81:2	87:9 123:17
soluble 97:14	133:6 140:11	250:8	98:11 108:11	131:15 173:10
solution 16:17	141:8,18 142:6	specifications	108:21 110:24	174:10,10
141:9	143:4,5 152:5	90:5	111:9,9,13,14	196:24 198:7
solutions 16:8	190:14 232:10	specifics 79:4	116:4 124:17	started 82:12
Something's	sources 96:22	specified 53:18	128:11,18	230:20 235:18
40:13	97:4 117:13	92:8 104:21	129:5 133:12	236:22
somewhat	120:4,12,19	specifies 111:23	140:10 150:10	Starting 205:3
104:10 140:10	122:10 156:10	222:11	150:13,14,19	state 1:16 16:3
181:2	south 2:16 3:2	specify 62:15	152:24 167:5	17:11,19 18:9
soon 258:12	35:10 88:13	147:10 202:14	168:9 224:16	20:22 29:6
sophisticated	Southern 33:7	speculate 217:16	246:3 248:10	34:21 35:13
156:4,20	spacial 174:3	217:23	256:2,14,15	41:23 62:13
sorry 12:7 55:10	spatial 172:17	speculation	257:2	68:14 70:7
60:7 61:11,12	speak 13:9	217:24 226:20	standards 18:10	75:17 78:4
74:22 80:5	24:23 25:1	spell 14:24 22:4	32:14 42:8	85:12 94:2
92:12 94:16,18	206:18 230:7	24:11 30:16	54:3,21 57:19	97:3,13,24
112:2 115:13	speaking 24:15	33:17	59:18 60:7,8,9	98:22 102:15
121:5 158:17	224:15 229:24	spelled 22:7	60:12 67:12	144:18 145:1,7
186:4 189:5	230:2	37:7	68:4 69:5,20	162:14 165:2
202:23 206:12	speaks 231:3,11	spelling 26:10	69:21 80:9,13	171:14 172:23
227:4 233:16	special 118:10	37:2	80:14,16 82:11	179:7 202:6
234:20 238:8	118:16	spent 197:17	82:12,13 95:9	205:17,24
247:8 249:19	specific 91:2	spills 38:24 40:1	98:4 103:5	220:8 246:9
252:7 253:1	93:16 94:19	<b>spoil</b> 23:20	114:2,14,23,24	257:9 259:1,4
254:3	120:8,16	spring 34:22	115:6,21 116:2	259:6
sort 18:4 61:1	126:17 127:12	Springfield 1:18	120:15 124:12	stated 94:3 97:9
169:17 187:13	132:7 140:19	2:12 37:14	124:19 125:3,8	139:21 140:16
216:22 217:20	148:5 153:13	209:24 236:19	138:18 150:1	240:2 242:17
232:13 240:1	154:23 155:2	<b>SS</b> 259:1	152:13,15	250:1 255:21
sorts 40:9	157:6 174:12	<b>St</b> 34:12	154:20,23	statement 77:21
sought 73:23	177:1,1 182:9	stabilization	155:3,5,7,10	83:1 94:21
sounding 99:20	185:11,11,15	19:18	155:14 175:21	95:2,17 97:19
<b>sounds</b> 213:7	190:8 201:12	stack 182:24	192:13,16	99:1,8 102:21
254:16	222:14,17	staff 6:20 19:24	223:14,17	109:16 110:21
source 57:21,24	223:13 236:2	78:24 81:19	224:6 230:13	112:3 120:9
59:1 70:12	245:23 247:4	stage 212:2	230:18 241:8	148:10 149:14
78:7 100:19	248:6 253:18	stakeholder	246:17,18,21	180:10 181:8
105:19 108:10	specifically	62:21	247:15 249:10	197:1 198:10
108:12 109:13	16:11 32:10	stakeholders	251:20 252:15	198:11 205:5
109:14,18	80:14 86:4	64:3	252:20 253:14	218:22 222:5
116:20 117:6	89:12 95:19	stand 36:7	256:3,9,17	223:3 241:24
117:18 118:3,6	101:24 107:19	standard 50:12	standing 55:2	242:6 243:24
118:23 119:2	110:17 130:4	51:3 60:15	stands 90:1	245:4,20
	l	l	l	l

, February 26, 2014

Page 299

r				5
256:20	118:9,20	98:14,18	146:9 187:22	253:24 254:23
states 40:4 50:11	119:11 154:1,6	235:16 256:21	238:21	255:19 256:19
102:24 200:19	155:17 208:24	stuff 192:6	<b>Subparts</b> 234:20	256:22 257:2
201:10 205:6	stored 208:23	<b>Stukarich</b> 205:1	234:20	sulfates 19:11
207:13 208:20	stores 119:7	subbase 162:24	subquestion	156:16 192:2
218:23 222:5	storm 61:5,9	subclass 153:20	241:6	sulphate 257:5
223:4 243:24	stormwater	subclasses	<b>subsection</b> 53:16	suprate 257.5 summarize 50:2
252:3		153:24	53:19 54:5	59:10 60:4
	109:6,7,11,17			
station 88:10	109:20,23,24	subdivision	116:18 120:16	summarized
89:24 224:3	straightforward	236:20,21,22	Subsection(b)	47:23
238:23 246:15	141:5	subject 18:18	104:4	summarizing
247:10 248:14	strategy 32:16	25:6 45:22	subsequently	47:18 86:6
249:15,19,20	82:5 227:9	51:2,23 52:2	68:18	88:8
stations 86:2,4,5	235:19 250:12	53:7 56:10	subset 178:12,12	summary 9:17
86:10 89:18	stream 61:3	58:1,8,9,22	substance 48:20	summer 34:22
91:4 94:20	streams 23:17	59:24 62:6	119:10 208:13	superiors 198:3
95:2 136:24	37:11,15,18	88:19 89:8	substances	supplies 31:7
223:16	Street 2:2,16	90:4 118:8,24	118:20	42:24 150:7
statistical 72:20	strengthen	135:10 145:22	substantially	252:18 257:9
130:23 131:1,4	13:18 14:9	154:3,5,9,13	138:21	supply 10:15
131:7,11,13,16	30:4	214:21 227:15	Subtitle 42:15	25:7 94:8,24
132:4,12 173:7	strengthened	243:22	42:17 95:23,23	95:7 156:2
174:7,14 175:1	26:22 31:22	submit 15:11	96:5 144:14,15	support 55:11
175:5,18	stricter 152:24	24:21 25:2	144:18,22	68:11,22 103:9
177:10,18	strictly 206:5	26:4 60:22	successful 169:2	104:18 242:1
178:2 179:10	strike 165:23	165:14 196:9	successfully	supporting
192:24 193:4	stringent 18:16	207:13 211:23	57:3,23 59:1	130:6,9
193:18 194:11	strong 13:10	213:17 241:21	sudden 236:21	supports 180:10
statistics 68:12	26:20 33:13	252:1 254:6	sufficient 47:20	supposed 163:5
73:10,11	structural	submittals 183:4	104:6 138:24	sure 12:12 32:22
131:23 132:6	235:10,13,16	submitted 15:24	187:13 223:1	33:12 48:8
133:12,17,21	236:3 239:5	30:13 101:22	suggest 161:22	53:11 54:17
173:15,21	structure 136:14	183:13 185:4,6	174:2	56:16 58:5
status 89:19	162:16,19,23	193:6 208:15	suggested 101:6	64:17 72:10
steady 70:7 78:4	163:2,4 164:9	249:12 258:10	102:1 105:20	77:1 85:20
stems 173:4	structures	submitting	116:17	92:12,17
step 36:23 135:7	134:17 235:22	99:23 182:23	suggesting 74:1	100:10 107:21
215:5	struggle 17:15	subparagraph	suggestion 104:2	117:3,21 120:9
stipulation	struggling	103:17	suggests 176:18	124:17 130:17
250:4	214:11	subparagraphs	suitable 157:22	132:21 141:1
stop 78:9 101:4	studies 19:8,10	103:16	suite 2:3,17 3:2	175:20 178:22
110:19	25:11 252:4	Subpart 50:23	3:6 72:11	182:15 183:19
stopped 52:8	256:23 257:4	50:24 91:7	sulfate 98:7,13	184:14 189:9
96:17	study 7:11 20:11	115:2 138:12	98:14,16	206:17 214:5
storage 109:9,12	31:19 35:23	144:18,19	251:14,16	216:7 217:9,18
		, . , . ,	,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
	•	•	•	•

February 26, 2014

Page 300

				rage 500
244:9 249:5	surrounded	167:8 213:5	148:11 158:6	248:12 249:8
253:12	28:9	250:23	185:10,13,14	telling 116:23
Surely 102:6	Susan 2:18 4:13	<b>TACO</b> 143:20	202:13,14,15	tells 66:2
surface 1:6 6:7	49:19	143:23 144:9	218:6 224:13	temperature
16:10 29:18	suspect 226:8	145:21 146:9	227:1 232:7	13:14
31:1,6,20	228:3	146:17,22	244:10 245:4	temporal 51:19
32:11,12,19	suspected	147:14,23	245:23	ten 8:22 21:17
41:22 42:5,9	223:10,14	148:3,14,21,23	talks 198:11	35:10,19
42:12,14 50:21	224:4,23 225:4	150:24 151:1,7	tanks 154:2,6	108:24 170:13
51:1 53:20	225:17,20	151:7,12,17,23	155:17	228:18,23
54:7 61:2 67:6	suspicion 228:8	152:3,10,14	taste 98:1,7,17	ten-minute
69:20 70:4,8,9	swear 46:18	153:12,20	tasted 256:24	170:8,14
74:5,6 76:15	197:6,8	154:17	tax 17:20 20:20	ten-year 18:14
77:9,13,17	swearing 197:12	take 25:1 26:4	taxpayer 23:1	tended 199:6
95:20,21 96:5	swimming 34:23	37:4 46:15	taxpayers 32:23	Tennessee 22:20
96:12,15,23	100:24	48:9 52:22	TCLP 19:21	term 27:13
97:1,7 103:22	sworn 7:21 41:7	56:4 59:2	<b>TDS</b> 97:23,24	70:11 93:6
109:7,11,24	46:23 48:8	63:21 100:5	98:2,6 156:7	106:15 171:14
118:15 119:3	196:22 197:10	137:20 155:16	156:16 192:2	171:19,24
120:20 122:2	197:13 231:8	158:11 159:10	251:15 255:18	198:18,21,24
127:20 129:19	synthetic 90:3	164:3 167:18	teacher 40:11	termed 56:22
129:23 134:8	106:6,16	168:4 170:13	team 197:19	87:5
135:16 136:3,8	222:12,14	178:21 181:18	technical 2:9,9	terminated
142:15,17,19	228:20 229:12	187:6 189:20	6:20 21:13	59:19
142:20,21,24	229:21 230:1	197:3 204:10	55:10 68:10,22	terms 16:8,9
154:5,9,13	231:18	207:21 217:6	74:24 81:19	19:15,21 25:6
157:11,17	system 65:8,13	217:14 231:17	103:9 130:14	25:14,15,16,18
158:23 159:22	66:4 90:10	239:21 247:13	160:23 242:1	25:22 73:9
163:13 171:24	93:18 112:7	247:20 248:2,9	technically	74:18 86:7
172:11 208:24	134:7,19 135:4	256:3 258:7	206:11,15	203:19
214:10 218:4	135:10,13,22	taken 1:13 24:1	209:4	Terrific 43:20
218:24 219:5,9	136:2,8 147:17	69:18 73:1	technique	test 19:21 72:18
221:2 222:6	156:12 162:15	101:14 117:6	131:14,17	217:20
223:4 232:2,4	162:23 173:11	164:12 170:14	techniques	tested 35:24
232:17 233:1,3	185:12,19	227:11,12	256:5	testified 37:14
233:6,17 234:5	205:9 241:10	243:11 259:10	technologies	testify 39:7
234:9 235:5	systematic	takes 25:23 53:4	192:1	testimony 7:4,7
236:12 238:14	129:14	248:21	technology 19:1	7:9,15,18 8:2
239:5,17	systems 164:14	talk 17:1 71:22	29:12 125:10	8:14,16,21
240:20,21	T	149:2	156:9 207:9,12	9:12,14 10:16
246:10 247:22	$\frac{\mathbf{I}}{\mathbf{T} 5:1}$	talked 216:21	208:21 256:4	10:23 43:24
250:15,19,22		talking 72:8,10	tell 23:14 139:10	44:1,2,3 50:11
251:3,5,7,7,8	<b>table</b> 6:17,19,21 10:12 99:5	93:8 111:13	155:8 189:4	54:23 68:14,15
surprise 139:23	10:12 99:5	120:11 121:18	210:18 213:14	68:23 75:7
surprised 19:19	101.10 104.23	131:13,16,20	215:17 228:14	79:11 83:2,10
1			1	

February 26, 2014

Page 301

1				
99.0 02.7 21	204.1.17	106.12 100.5	104.12 10 10	111.0.12
88:9 93:7,21	204:1,17	186:12 189:5	104:13,19,19	111:9,13
94:21 95:18	234:12 238:7	189:12 191:10	111:9,13	124:17 228:18
97:13,18,24	239:9 241:22	192:8 194:7,10	124:17 177:17	228:23 252:19
98:16,22	252:24 258:17	194:12,14	184:16 185:14	timing 65:7
102:10,11,14	thanks 10:13	199:6,11,18	197:22 204:23	100:1
109:17,22	15:18,19 21:1	200:1 203:19	213:9 222:11	<b>TIMOTHY</b> 1:14
136:19,20	21:1,2,22	209:9 212:13	234:19 253:20	2:4
137:1 147:13	83:11 117:21	215:7 216:21	255:8	today 6:11 7:2
150:4 156:6	179:3 241:15	217:18 218:14	three-dimensi	7:21 8:20,21
162:13 165:1	thing 17:2,3,22	222:19 223:1	188:3	9:9 10:7 12:7
171:13 173:6	19:9 23:8 35:7	226:13 227:6,9	threshold	13:9 15:6 20:6
179:6 197:6	73:6 90:11	231:3,6,10	107:14	26:11 33:18
198:8,10	122:16 139:17	232:21 234:14	Thursday	40:19 41:14
199:11,21	174:8 175:14	236:2 238:10	204:12	42:20 43:12
200:19 201:1	184:5 240:2	239:11 244:8	<b>Tiered</b> 143:19	47:13 48:13
237:24 240:8	244:10 246:5	244:20 253:8	143:23	49:20 99:24
246:9 250:13	things 23:8	thinking 81:22	tight 245:7,14	108:14,16
251:11 255:21	35:12 65:11	162:3 186:14	tighter 127:9	196:3 198:7
256:20	67:19 70:8	203:19	Tim 6:5	204:19 215:24
testing 19:15,16	73:13 120:19	thinks 161:21	time 18:2 21:1,9	217:10,21
72:5,16,18	125:15 184:4	third 8:7 12:6,9	22:1 30:3	217:10,21 218:11 258:2
		25:19 234:22		
tests 72:7,10	186:11 190:11		35:17 37:16	<b>told</b> 39:17
<b>thank</b> 12:16	217:12 240:1	thought 82:8	38:10 41:2	tomorrow 258:3
13:8,9 14:22	think 16:1 17:17	135:6 160:14	43:19 44:17	258:6,13,16
15:9 21:20	20:24 23:9,23	170:1 189:7	46:7 47:1,14	tons 31:23
24:5,7 26:3,6	25:20 29:3,4	197:24	52:22 65:20	tool 132:14,20
30:3,9,11,14	29:13 34:4,5	thousands 77:12	70:13 83:8	top 30:8 35:20
30:24 33:6,14	35:17,22,23	77:16	86:24 87:8	76:13 142:21
34:12 36:10,15	39:20 40:4	threat 13:22	96:18 100:8	153:23 179:5
36:16 40:14,17	48:18 50:2,8	150:17 248:23	101:8 103:19	194:23 250:10
40:19 41:8,13	55:10 58:10	threaten 95:6	105:5 122:21	255:24
45:24 54:11	63:10 66:9,17	156:13 246:3	137:8 150:6	topic 203:15
55:15 58:3	70:7,24 74:6	threatened	156:23 164:22	topographic
59:4 66:14	83:13 85:9,21	94:23	168:11 170:11	142:18 238:16
74:15 79:21,22	90:23 93:4	threatening	174:9 178:12	251:3
101:12,16	102:2,12	249:1	182:10 206:21	total 84:3,11
102:6 106:5	105:10,14,20	threatens	221:5 225:8,10	147:15 249:16
107:11 113:7	121:18 124:12	245:11	228:1 230:15	251:13
113:18 116:8	139:14 143:15	threats 32:12	230:20 231:22	totality 28:16
134:1 164:20	147:6 151:11	96:11,13,21	239:22 244:4	totally 29:1
170:15 178:16	158:5,6 160:1	three 8:4 11:19	248:2,9,22	56:16 147:19
184:22 186:20	164:1 166:19	21:15 24:17	257:18	147:23 169:18
187:19 190:22	169:8 170:11	30:20 37:4	timeframe 78:10	189:9
194:16,17,22	176:4 177:5	38:2 42:6	105:4	tour 121:22
200:15,16	184:5 185:24	67:15 103:15	times 77:11	158:1
1				

. February 26, 2014

Page 302

	1	1	1	
town 258:5	triple 122:2	Twenty-four	unacceptable	87:15 128:19
townships 20:18	trouble 12:12	79:10	18:13	138:5 142:1
toxic 13:24 15:8	202:12	<b>two</b> 6:16 21:15	unaware 40:3	144:23 145:2,4
15:17 17:24	truckload	31:13 63:12	uncertainties	148:1 149:1
40:1	105:12 107:24	67:14 88:12,14	240:3	151:1 152:2
toxics 18:17	truckloads	88:16 89:5	unclear 121:6	153:20 154:17
Traci 205:2	107:22 108:3,5	90:2 99:20	unclosed 87:10	163:20 173:20
213:8	trucks 105:12	104:15 107:22	unconfined	202:1,13
track 174:6	<b>true</b> 19:9 54:6	108:2 170:12	237:20	206:19 216:10
235:4 239:16	141:13 259:9	177:16 184:16	undergoing	248:1
tractors 37:21	truly 29:6	193:3,10 195:1	165:9	undertaken
Tracy 4:5 12:5	try 60:3 65:6	197:3 198:6	underground	234:3
15:15	70:14 93:21	216:22 218:5	154:1,6 155:17	undertook 10:14
training 22:15	245:13	222:1 228:18	236:23	Unified 192:21
transcript 1:13	trying 52:15	242:1,17 243:6	underlying	<b>Uniform</b> 199:13
40:18 259:9	54:12 55:10	244:16 245:23	122:6	199:20 200:10
transferring	56:20 58:6,18	type 34:20 36:6	underneath	unique 84:7
32:20	58:19,20 65:18	89:1,8 131:10	122:15	159:15 191:13
transport 75:13	65:23 87:11	165:9 166:17	understand	<b>unit</b> 2:9,9 43:7
78:3,6,7	92:13,20	175:5 185:8	11:18 18:17	50:13,17 52:5
129:17 134:8	107:18 108:7	192:6 200:1	21:10 25:9	52:8,10,14
164:9	125:14 135:9	205:23 222:9	34:2 35:13	55:1,4 56:1,10
trashed 25:24	140:12 145:19	222:14,24	47:16 56:17,19	83:15,20
treat 159:4	148:21 149:22	229:13,21	56:20 58:7,18	102:18 103:19
treating 118:15	152:6 153:7	types 19:16	58:20 65:18,23	103:22 104:11
119:3	158:2 161:15	68:12 70:17	70:3 81:20	104:21 105:16
treatment 118:9	164:21 177:13	82:19 92:22	87:7,11 92:14	105:23 109:6
147:17 156:5,8	185:14 214:14	98:3,10 99:1	107:18 113:20	109:10 110:9
156:14,14,20	214:23	125:18 148:6	113:21 120:9	111:8 112:8
192:1 232:9	<b>TSD</b> 55:9	160:14 222:11	132:21 135:9	113:11,17,23
256:4,5	<b>turn</b> 9:9,12,18	222:12 235:13	137:13 140:1,6	114:4 115:9
trees 100:20	9:22 10:20	238:13,15	140:13,22	118:7,23 121:2
tremendous	41:4 46:12	typical 127:20	148:13,20	121:21 122:15
127:5	48:20 50:1	165:18 188:5	149:9 151:18	125:23 129:16
trench 16:16	53:13 66:17	typically 68:7	151:22 152:6	129:24,24
trend 25:21	102:4 131:24	75:12 76:16	153:7 157:16	134:8,9 138:20
trends 79:7	171:11 204:3,6	115:2 179:17	158:18 161:15	139:2 140:14
trichloroethyl	248:5 258:11	179:20 251:1	187:24 206:14	141:8,18 142:3
192:6	turned 10:18	U	214:23 217:4	143:5 148:11
trick 58:19	<b>turning</b> 179:4	U.S 31:18 35:15	understandable	148:15,16
tried 75:6,17	208:19	36:2	143:16	149:3,4,5,12
82:24	turns 195:2	<b>Uh-huh</b> 57:11	<b>understanding</b>	151:1,9,24
trigger 62:3	<b>TVA</b> 246:11	139:24 203:22	9:15 13:4 64:8	153:13 155:18
<b>triggers</b> 61:19	<b>twelve</b> 167:19	unable 33:9	69:8 76:1 79:7	157:22 159:9
trip 33:10	167:24		79:12 86:14	161:18 165:2
	I	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 303

1				10000
165:15 169:9	unnecessarily	198:23 199:20	variability 75:9	152:10,17,17
169:12,19	16:5 62:12	200:1 204:15	172:11,18,21	153:6
172:6,10	unnecessary	208:22 223:7	174:3 193:15	<b>volunteer</b> 26:15
172:0,10	128:15	238:5	varies 79:2	volunteel 20.15
181:19 192:5	unquote 171:15	<b>useable</b> 20:22	206:4	W
201:3,13	unquote 171.15 unused 53:2	<b>USEPA</b> 67:17	various 38:9	Wacker 3:2,6
,				wait 131:15
202:15,18	165:19	67:24 77:20	44:11 83:5	137:10 211:15
210:4 238:12	unusual 63:2	127:1 252:18	172:22 173:16	254:4
243:20,21	166:5	256:1,8,13,16	174:14 179:24	waited 38:8
<b>unit's</b> 69:13	updated 252:19	257:1	208:3	
United 252:2	upgraded	USEPA's 67:14	Venice 31:12,17	waiting 11:16
<b>units</b> 51:18	133:11 177:17	76:1 127:13	87:5 233:11	walked 35:3
102:16,21	upgradient	uses 100:14,16	ventures 33:1	want 6:2,11 10:6
103:1 109:21	138:19,24	100:22 131:14	verify 11:13,23	13:23 24:22
119:22 120:5	139:22 140:7	192:15 244:6	Vermilion 23:4	29:16 30:24
120:10,11	140:11,12	<b>USGS</b> 238:15	version 211:23	40:24 41:13
121:7,9,13,19	141:7,17	251:2	versus 119:22	55:3 58:4
123:1 125:8,18	171:18 172:16	usually 78:3	133:12 147:20	67:21 70:14
126:7,10,16,18	172:19 173:8	151:12 178:10	152:1 155:18	71:23 81:18
127:7,12 135:2	173:12,12,23	205:22	161:4 172:1	84:13 85:17,19
144:10,14	174:1,3,13,16	<b>utilize</b> 147:1	173:8,13 174:4	90:11 105:24
145:18,22	174:23 175:2	148:23 205:9	174:13,16,23	128:21 129:3
147:16 148:12	177:15,24	210:7	178:1	137:10 150:23
152:21 153:11	178:4 250:24	utilized 29:19	vertically	165:20 183:18
153:12 159:14	upriver 28:6	118:9,11,14	122:18	183:19 196:2
160:15 171:18	upwards 28:7	119:2	vessel 145:10	197:2 199:21
172:1,8 176:8	<b>urge</b> 14:8 30:3	utilizes 210:4	<b>view</b> 27:18 76:1	211:15 212:10
176:10 190:15	33:3	utilizing 165:7	128:14	212:21,22
191:13,18	use 24:20 25:1		viewing 31:18	213:6 243:5
210:8,19 212:5	25:17 57:19	V	violate 145:9	244:9 249:5
212:16 214:7	83:17 87:1	<b>V-14</b> 99:5	violated 152:11	254:12
215:19,20	92:5 93:10	<b>vague</b> 16:5	152:12,14	wanted 48:2,15
217:11,14,16	106:15 116:24	valid 166:5	violation 68:18	82:6 84:6
237:11 242:8	119:23 121:11	validate 72:19	228:7 238:6	94:19 107:23
244:1,4,7	124:6 126:3	Valley 3:5 4:14	Virginia 39:24	161:9 199:5,22
246:2	129:16 131:10	8:6 10:2 28:15	<b>vivid</b> 39:3	218:15
universe 218:12	133:13 143:19	114:21 195:1	<b>VN</b> 238:5	wanting 168:16
<b>unlined</b> 17:10	143:22 146:3,4	195:18,23	<b>VNs</b> 237:22	wants 20:24
18:17 31:14	146:16,21	196:10	<b>void</b> 234:21	warning 34:21
75:20 76:2,15	147:5,7,7,8,10	value 24:2	236:13	warnings 34:17
77:10,13	148:14 149:16	111:19 173:18	voids 236:18	34:18
158:22 159:1,5	149:18 150:16	177:19	<b>volume</b> 103:20	warrant 105:19
213:12 214:4	168:1 169:16	values 93:22	voluntarily	wasn't 12:17
214:16,24	174:3,4 195:8	171:6,16	153:1	57:20,24 104:6
224:3 242:5	198:9,16,17,19	172:15	voluntary	123:6 160:12
	, -, ·,		J	
	•	•	•	•

February 26, 2014

Page 304

				1490 001
245.2 12 20	77.10.04.24	206.20 211.22	224.14 220.24	240.9
245:3,12,20 waste 6:7 15:8	77:10 94:24	206:20 211:23	234:14 239:24	240:8 west 2:2 39:24
15:17 17:24	95:7 97:14	239:6 254:4	240:24 244:10 254:4	236:20
	98:15 99:5 100:18,19	257:11,19		wet 36:3 205:12
18:2 19:18	,	ways 21:15	we've 36:13,14	
25:13 29:18	105:8 139:9	we'll 47:9 78:6	37:22 38:7	206:21 208:23
31:2 32:1,15	142:21 145:11	94:8 101:12	39:15,24 75:3	wetland 234:23
32:16 38:13,21	146:4,21	102:4 132:3	77:3 82:24	238:12
39:4,8,13 40:6	149:16 150:7	149:21 180:18	101:5 126:24	wetted 207:1
41:22 42:5,9	151:16 156:1,3	186:1,18	132:10 133:4	whichever
53:21,22 54:1	156:11,12	203:20 253:13	167:14,16	110:10 113:6
54:2,8,9 70:13	192:15 208:22	we're 15:13,22	168:3 170:11	113:11,12,15
73:2 80:15	209:23 232:5	16:13 17:17	203:19 216:21	113:16 116:20
81:4 82:22,23	232:17 233:3,7	21:23 23:18	218:14 234:3	125:24 133:9
104:22 105:13	233:17 234:5	24:8 33:12,16	239:23 248:3	<b>wildlife</b> 25:16,17
118:10,11,12	234:10 235:12	36:5,22 37:11	252:19,19	William 7:19
118:16 119:3	238:15 242:3	38:13 40:3	<b>web</b> 213:22	<b>willing</b> 21:16
119:13 120:20	242:18 247:14	41:3 46:13	website 213:10	71:17,19,22
129:12,16	247:22 250:23	56:20 58:6,18	Wednesday 7:16	83:17 85:5
157:4,5,8,21	251:3,5,7,7	58:19 65:22	8:2	147:1 163:21
165:3,4 171:20	252:2,16,18	66:17 70:11,24	weekly 42:1	166:12 195:11
205:6 211:3,10	253:3,21,23	71:1,16 72:10	weeks 197:22	203:18
215:2,23	254:1,18,20,22	75:7,9,11,12	welcome 6:3	wind's 28:20
216:16 218:4	256:2,3,7,9,14	75:13,14,15,18	well's 112:21	winds 165:22
218:10 224:15	256:17,22,23	75:21,22 80:5	wells 28:1 29:22	wings 11:16
236:12 240:21	257:2,7,9	83:8,8 84:21	31:15,17 69:11	winter 36:5
wastes 32:20	watering 98:23	85:23 90:17	70:16 75:19	wish 6:2 8:18,22
wastewater	255:23	92:13 107:18	94:24 95:7	9:1 11:10
134:7,18,24	waters 13:24	119:14 121:18	112:7 127:3	21:24 22:23
147:17	16:4 31:6	132:5,9,13,17	131:5 132:6	23:1 46:5
watch 105:5	232:2 250:15	133:5,10 135:9	138:20 171:17	101:19,20
258:15	250:19	138:2,11	171:17 172:15	197:7
watched 35:18	waterway 66:3	140:12 148:11	174:18,19	wished 36:20
37:12	Waukegan 86:4	149:19 150:11	176:7 177:17	wishes 9:4,16
watching 249:2	91:3 93:19	158:1,1,6	177:22 178:12	40:22
water 16:10	way 11:5 34:8	161:15 167:15	186:11,14	wishing 8:24
23:15,17,19	38:21 39:4	167:17,21,24	193:2 202:3,14	11:1 40:23
25:7,10 28:1,8	46:15 47:8	168:15,18	202:17 245:10	41:2
31:7,15 32:11	105:24 122:16	171:4 178:14	246:2,21	withdraw
32:12 34:16,24	132:4,10	180:23 182:11	248:11,20	209:14
35:20 37:24	133:19,24	194:8,14,15	249:13	witness 53:13
39:20 40:1,11	173:5 176:3,17	202:19 211:13	went 9:6 16:23	66:22 197:13
42:14,24 43:2	176:20,21	212:19 214:9,9	17:21 19:15	209:7 219:19
43:5,10 61:2,6	177:7 178:3	212:19 214:9,9	39:2 82:21	207:19
61:9 65:11	186:1 197:23	222:21 226:24	weren't 81:22	witnesses 7:5,20
69:21 70:5,8,9	199:19 203:22	230:14 232:7	92:21 184:7	9:20 41:7
07.21 70.3,0,7	177.17 203.22	2JU.17 2J2./	<i>72.2</i> 1 10 <b>7</b> ./	J.20 TI./
	I	I	I	I

February 26, 2014

Page 305

1				- )
42:20 46:18,23	25:2 26:5	77:16,17 79:9	142:21 149:21	<b>10(a)</b> 179:13
48:8 49:7	30:13 47:20	79:18 84:2	151:15 155:6	<b>10(b)</b> 180:14
195:4 196:21	48:10 99:24	125:3,10,12	185:20 200:21	<b>10:00</b> 1:20
219:18 232:20	176:21 178:9	147:3 184:16	201:15 249:3	<b>100</b> 2:2 40:6
woefully 18:15	178:24 180:21	193:3,10 216:2	zones 123:16,18	76:16
wonderful 13:14	199:19 204:5	247:11 248:4	127:6 151:20	<b>1021</b> 1:18 2:11
wondering 38:2	232:15	yesterday 20:4	246:13 257:14	<b>104.424(f)</b> 9:13
<b>Wood</b> 31:9	wrong 35:16,22	215:24		11 5:7 97:23
246:13,18,22	123:7 212:21	young 23:12	0	109:16 180:15
247:2 248:7	wrote 200:17	· · · ·	<b>09-01</b> 157:15	254:10,24
word 148:11		Z	<b>09-1</b> 96:4	255:4,9,13
words 248:24	X	Zalewski 2:8		11-500 2:3
work 21:17	<b>x</b> 4:1 5:1 107:5	6:18	1	<b>12</b> 94:4 98:9,13
30:19 31:8	108:11,18	Zeman 209:17	<b>1</b> 5:3 43:24 44:7	152:9 177:21
33:10 43:5,8	174:18	209:22,22	44:18 46:2	180:15 246:7
71:19 89:23		210:12,14,15	68:15 80:8	<b>12:10</b> 101:14
94:8 122:17	Y	Zimmer 7:20	85:19 86:1,3	<b>12:55</b> 101:15
123:3 124:10	yard 100:18,21	43:3,3 44:1	86:10,18 88:9	<b>122</b> 199:14
124:20 137:20	<b>yards</b> 103:21	55:24 56:7,12	88:12,13 93:20	<b>13</b> 98:21 180:15
137:22 138:1	104:11 105:10	56:16,24 57:8	93:23 95:3	<b>13-15</b> 4:4
165:21 174:14	105:16,22	57:15,22 58:2	102:16 107:5	14 68:15 79:9
182:22 183:5	107:14,19,23	58:21 181:1	108:11,18	100:5,10
217:21 218:1	108:2	182:9,18,20	136:24 138:12	101:24 180:15
worked 18:1	yeah 68:10	183:1,6,23	145:5 171:5,8	237:24 240:7
120:24	71:22 73:7,7	184:5,21	187:22 209:18	250:12
working 20:10	73:15 77:3	185:10,22	210:2,17,22	<b>15</b> 50:10 102:3,7
33:11 47:8	99:12,17 121:5	186:3,12 187:2	211:7 215:12	177:21 180:15
works 77:23	122:11 125:4	187:5,8,11,15	237:23 247:9	<b>15-21</b> 4:5
174:16	148:14 211:18	187:21 189:9	249:16,24	<b>150</b> 125:23
world 38:3	220:20	189:13,17,22	<b>1(a)</b> 181:3	126:1,4,19,23
206:16,19	year 31:24 35:8	190:3,22	<b>1(b)</b> 138:15	127:13
worse 191:14	36:4 69:24,24	191:19 193:23	181:5 188:12	<b>15th</b> 7:16 94:6
wouldn't 18:18	69:24 71:20,20	194:13,16	<b>1(c)</b> 143:9,12	<b>16</b> 41:18 103:10
39:1 81:18	71:21,21	200:19 201:24	<b>1,200</b> 98:4	198:8
159:24 203:1	103:19 193:13	202:12,19,23	<b>1:00</b> 101:8	<b>16-year-old</b> 34:9
217:22,22	221:17,20	203:5	<b>10</b> 2:16 6:1	<b>16(a)</b> 104:5
238:22 249:2	yearly 104:23	Zimmer's 201:1	54:23 97:12	107:16
wrap 257:23	105:21	<b>zone</b> 28:22,24	102:9,14 107:5	<b>16(b)</b> 103:11
258:12	years 14:7 15:21	119:18,20	108:11,18	107:13
wrapped 10:24	17:15 18:1	120:17 122:13	170:13 177:21	1600 3:6
41:3	19:22 22:14	122:13 123:24	178:20 179:5	<b>17</b> 109:3 198:8
write 24:23	25:21 29:20	124:3,21 125:1	241:24 242:1	207:24
written 7:24	37:13 38:7,12	125:1,11 128:4	242:16 245:17	<b>18</b> 103:8 109:15
10:7,10 21:8	51:20 55:5	128:6 133:5,8	254:7,9,21	136:20 165:4,6
21:19 24:21	76:17 77:12,14	133:9,17	255:4,9,13	165:10,20,23
				2 - 2 -
	•	•	•	

February 26, 2014

Page 306

r				2
166:1,18 167:2	257:14 258:7	<b>26-30</b> 4:8	<b>39</b> 64:15	<b>5/58.17</b> 91:16
168:11 169:19	<b>2003</b> 254:1	<b>26th</b> 1:19	<b>399</b> 38:7	<b>5:02</b> 258:19
216:1,6,9,16	<b>2004</b> 253:22	<b>27</b> 251:22	<b>3D</b> 188:4,6,21	<b>50</b> 16:3 25:20
247:11 251:11	<b>2008</b> 254:2	<b>28.1</b> 128:13	189:15,18	29:20 105:10
18-month	<b>2009</b> 19:21 32:4	<b>28th</b> 6:24	190:1	105:16,22
165:12	<b>2010</b> 76:4 94:6	<b>29</b> 86:5 89:18	<b>3S</b> 90:7	107:22 108:1,6
<b>19</b> 110:3 116:14	<b>2010</b> 70:13 1.0 <b>2011</b> 207:8	<b>25</b> 90:7,12	00 90.7	258:9
<b>19</b> (a) 119:17	<b>2012</b> 6:24 91:16	20 90.7,12	4	<b>50s</b> 27:23
<b>19(b)</b> 125:20	<b>2012</b> 0:21 91:10 <b>2013</b> 7:1 41:17	3	<b>4</b> 44:3 59:5	<b>58.17</b> 91:14
<b>19(c)</b> 127:24	96:6	<b>3</b> 44:2 55:16	61:11 90:20,24	92:18
<b>19(0)</b> 127.21 <b>19276</b> 2:12	<b>2014</b> 1:19 7:16	64:15 67:22	91:2 94:21	<b>5th</b> 8:3,11 44:11
<b>192/02</b> .12 <b>195-203</b> 4:14	<b>204-258</b> 4:16	89:17 143:18	95:17 104:22	<b>5th</b> 0.5,11 11.11
<b>1951</b> 78:18	<b>208</b> 5:6,6	171:5,9,10	146:2,2 178:19	6
<b>196</b> 5:5,5	<b>21</b> 116:16	179:1 192:18	192:18 200:19	<b>6</b> 5:4 49:2,5,13
<b>1972</b> 99:6	130:19	221:13 222:4	210:4,9,11	49:15 60:17
<b>1976</b> 19:20	<b>21(c)</b> 130:21	223:3 246:8	245:17 249:17	61:12 94:14,16
<b>1970</b> 19:20 <b>1981</b> 252:12	217-782-5544	250:13	250:1	94:18 162:12
<b>1983</b> 19:1	2:13	<b>3(a)</b> 89:20,21,22	<b>4.4</b> 31:23	162:13 178:19
<b>1989</b> 252:4,6,8	<b>22</b> 116:16 134:3	171:10 172:14	4.5 97:17,20	179:6 207:23
<b>1990</b> 79:4,9	175:1	<b>3(b)</b> 90:22	<b>400</b> 122:1,4	223:2
<b>1991</b> 120:23	<b>22-24</b> 4:6	<b>3:00</b> 170:13	127:22	<b>6-13</b> 4:3
230:19 231:1	<b>23</b> 112:11,14,16	<b>30</b> 14:6 22:14	<b>401.405</b> 169:8	<b>6(a)</b> 64:18 95:4
252:20	113:22 114:3,9	51:20 190:24	<b>41-46</b> 4:12	163:10 223:8
<b>1996</b> 247:10	136:17	<b>30-33</b> 4:9	<b>410(a)</b> 130:3	<b>6(b)</b> 164:6,22
<b>1998</b> 34:11	<b>233</b> 3:2	<b>300</b> 72:8	<b>410(a)(7)</b> 130:8	<b>6(d)</b> 231:24
<b>1999</b> 98:14	<b>24</b> 28:18,19	<b>309</b> 144:17,19	<b>415</b> 91:15	<b>60</b> 29:20 33:4
1N 90:8	79:18 179:5	145:1,7,17	418.402(b)(3)	257:22
<b>1S</b> 90:8	<b>24-26</b> 4:7	<b>310(e)</b> 130:2,4	128:2	<b>60601</b> 2:3
15 70.0	<b>25</b> 103:20	312-251-5250	44 5:3	<b>60601-2110</b> 3:7
2	104:10 105:11	2:18	<b>45</b> 101:12	<b>60603</b> 2:17
<b>2</b> 44:1 50:6	107:14,19	312-258-5550	<b>45-minute</b> 101:7	<b>60606</b> 3:3
54:23 88:7	110:8,12,13,17	3:3	<b>46</b> 5:3 200:9	<b>60s</b> 27:23
102:17,20	110:22 111:7	312-795-3747	<b>47-194</b> 4:13	<b>611</b> 257:12
143:10,15	111:11,20,24	3:7	<b>49</b> 5:4,4	<b>620</b> 51:12 59:17
171:5,8,13	112:1 113:1,1	312-814-6983	·	60:9,12 67:12
205:5 207:12	113:10 115:9	2:4	5	68:4 69:4,20
209:18 218:19	115:11,16,18	<b>33-36</b> 4:10	<b>5</b> 5:3 44:4,7,18	80:10,12,14,16
218:21,22,22	115:20,23	<b>35</b> 1:8 3:6 6:8	44:23 45:8,16	81:1 82:12,17
240:7 246:8	116:6,19 117:1	50:14 123:19	46:2,9 60:2	110:16 115:2
249:21 250:9	119:23 126:2	143:21,24	93:15 94:10	117:6,9,13,18
<b>2(b)</b> 88:16	127:12	146:17 257:12	101:8 156:22	120:1 122:22
<b>2(e)</b> 190:23	<b>25,000</b> 119:7	<b>35.145</b> 76:17,22	157:2 165:1	122:22 155:5
2,500 119:9	<b>250</b> 98:8,19	76:24	178:19 222:4	155:11 192:14
<b>20</b> 129:9 215:18	<b>255</b> 5:7,7	<b>3600</b> 2:17	257:18	230:18 241:11
215:19 248:4	<b>26</b> 112:18	<b>37-40</b> 4:11	<b>5(c)</b> 94:2 192:19	<b>620.240</b> 110:17
	,			
	•	•	•	•

, February 26, 2014

Page 307

r			2
191:9	8	841.200(b)(3)	
620.240(e) 120:5	<b>8</b> 5:6 96:10	181:7 188:15	
620.240(e)(1)(A)		<b>841.215</b> 179:16	
116:18,22	170:5,6,20,23	<b>841.230</b> 203:9	
	178:20 207:14		
126:7,9,15	207:20 208:12	841.310(e)(9)	
<b>620.250</b> 50:15	208:16,19	198:14	
191:9	251:21 254:7,9	841.400(b)	
620.250(a)	<b>810</b> 123:14	164:15	
120:17	<b>810.103</b> 119:21	841.410(k)	
<b>620.410</b> 50:12	<b>811</b> 123:19	198:14	
620.410(a)	157:8,20 158:9	<b>89-14</b> 252:10	
179:14	158:14,21	9	
<b>620.424</b> 149:24	159:11,17	9	
<b>620.430</b> 50:12	160:3,7,11		
<b>620.450</b> 155:12	161:8,20		
620.454(b)	171:21		
150:11	<b>811.317</b> 129:12		
<b>62794-9276</b> 2:12	130:14		
<b>6600</b> 3:2	<b>814</b> 123:20		
<b>6th</b> 7:13	128:1,22 157:9		
	157:20 158:9		
7	158:14,21		
7 5:5 66:20 80:8	159:11,17		
95:14 97:12	160:3,7,11		
107:5 108:12	161:8,20		
108:19 165:1	171:21		
178:19 196:7	<b>84-2149</b> 259:14		
196:11,13,17	<b>840</b> 233:10		
196:18 207:24	<b>841</b> 1:9 6:9 50:3		
228:23	51:6,10 55:20		
7(a) 80:3 83:13	56:5 92:16		
165:8	93:1 103:3		
<b>7(b)</b> 85:10	93:1 103:3 128:24 144:7		
166:11	128:24 144:7		
7,500 118:21			
119:9	155:3		
<b>700</b> 30:22	<b>841.105</b> 50:23		
<b>742</b> 143:21,24	53:13,14 54:19		
146:9,17 147:4	57:14,17		
<b>75</b> 76:17,21	102:24		
<b>75,000</b> 118:21	841.105(b)(4)(		
119:8	103:14		
<b>765</b> 199:14	<b>841.110</b> 110:6		
7th 7:1 228:19	<b>841.145</b> 185:2		
/ III / .1 220.17	185:17		
	<b>841.150</b> 62:6,11		
		I	