ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTR	Page 1
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS) Complainant,)	
PROFESSIONAL SWINE MANAGEMENT, LLC, HILLTOP VIEW, LLC, WILDCAT FARMS, LLC, HIGH-POWER PORK, LLC, EAGLE POINT, LLC, LONE HOLLOW, LLC, TIMBERLINE, LLC, PRAIRIE STATE GILTS, LTD., and LITTLE TIMBER, LLC, an Illinois Corporation,	PCB 10-84 (Enforcement - Water)
Respondents.)	

TRANSCRIPT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS taken before HEARING OFFICER CAROL WEBB by LISA HAHN PETERMAN, CSR, RMR, a notary public within and for the County of Macon and State of Illinois at the offices of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, 1021 North Grand Avenue East, Conference Room 1244, Springfield, Illinois, on the 13th day of December, 2016, A.D., at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

```
Page 2
1
     APPEARANCES:
2.
     ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
     1021 North Grand Avenue East
3
     P.O. Box 19274
     Springfield, Illinois 62794-9274
4
     217/524-8509
          MS. CAROL WEBB, Hearing Officer
5
6
     ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
     MS. JENNIFER BURKE, ESQ.
8
     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
     STATE OF ILLINOIS
9
     ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST FUND DIVISION
     500 South 2nd Street
10
     Springfield, Illinois 62706
     217-782-1090
     BY: MS. JANE McBRIDE, ESQ.
11
12
              Appeared on behalf of the Complainant;
13
     HEPLERBROOM, LLC
     3150 Roland Avenue
     Springfield, Illinois 62705-5776
14
     217/528-3674
15
     BY: MR. EDWARD W. DWYER, ESQ.
          MR. JOSHUA J. HOUSER, ESQ.
16
              Appeared on behalf of the Respondents,
17
              Hilltop View, Eagle Point, Timberline,
              Little Timber, and Wildcat Farms;
18
19
     BROWN, HAY & STEPHENS, LLP
     205 South 5th Street, Suite 700
     P.O. Box 2459
20
     Springfield, Illinois 62705-2459
21
     217/544-8491
          MS. CLAIRE A. MANNING, ESQ.
22
              Appeared on behalf of the Respondents,
              Prairie State Gilts, Lone Hollow, and
23
              High-Power Pork;
24
```

```
Page 3
 1
     A P P E A R A N C E S: (Continued)
 2
     PATTERSON & PRAHL, LLP
 3
     25043 Little Water Lane
     P.O. Box 767
     Custer, SD 57730-0767
 4
     605/673-5223
 5
     BY: MR. CHARLES T. PATTERSON, ESQ.
              Appeared on behalf of the Respondent,
 6
              Professional Swine Management.
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	Page 4
1	INDEX
2	PAGES
3	Hearing Officer Introductory Comments 5
4	Opening Remarks by Jane McBride 7
5	Opening Remarks by Claire Manning 10
6	Public Comment by Ramona Cook 14
7	Public Comment by Connie King 20
8	Public Comment by Cindy Arnett 24
9	Public Comment by Lindsay Keeney 27
10	Public Comment by Karen Hudson 29
11	Public Comment by Molly Hall
12	Questions and Answers of Charles Patterson 33
13	Hearing Officer Concluding Comments 34
14	
15	
16	EXHIBITS
17	MARKED ADMITTED
18	Public Hearing Exhibit No. 1 10 10
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

```
Page 5
1
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Before we start
2
     today, if everybody could please silence your phones,
3
     I would appreciate that.
                I suppose we can -- we're about two
4
5
     minutes before 10:00, but I don't see any reason that
6
     we can't get started.
7
                Good morning. My name is Carol Webb.
8
     I'm a hearing officer with the Pollution Control
9
            With me today is Board Member, Jennifer
     Board.
10
     Burke.
                This is the Public Hearing on the
11
12
     Proposed Settlement Agreement for PCB 10-84, People
13
     of the State of Illinois versus Professional Swine
14
     Management, LLC; Hilltop View, LLC; Wildcat Farms,
15
     LLC; High-Power Pork, LLC; Eagle Point, LLC; Lone
     Hollow, LLC; Timberline, LLC; Prairie State Gilts,
16
17
     LTD., and Little Timber, LLC.
18
                It is December 13th and we are beginning
19
     at 10:00 a.m.
20
                This hearing was noticed pursuant to the
     Environmental Protection Act and the Board's Rules
2.1
22
     and will conducted pursuant to Part 101, subpart (f)
23
     and Part 103, subpart (c) of the Board's Procedural
24
     Rules.
```

December 13, 2016

Page 6 1 I'll note for the record that there are 2 about a dozen members of the public present today. 3 The purpose of this hearing is to take 4 public comment on the Proposed Stipulation and 5 Settlement Agreement. The Board will make the final 6 decision in this matter. My purpose is to conduct 7 the hearing in a neutral and orderly manner so that 8 we have a clear record of the proceedings. 9 The transcript of this hearing is due by 10 December 20th and will be posted on the Board's website. 11 12 Written public comment will be accepted 13 until January 10th. Written comment may be sent by 14 mail or e-mail. Please direct any public comment to 15 the Clerk of the Board in our Chicago office. 16 by January 10th, the parties may file Post Hearing 17 Responses, if they so choose. 18 We will begin with a summary of the 19 Proposed Settlements, and please allow the parties to 20 complete their presentation without interruption, and 2.1 then we will then take public comment. 22 Public comment may address the nature of 23 the alleged violation, the impact on the environment, 24 and any views on the Proposed Settlement Agreements.

```
Page 7
1
                At this time, I will ask the parties to
2
     please make their appearances on the record.
3
                MS. MCBRIDE: Jane McBride, Attorney
     General's Office for the Complainant.
4
5
                MR. HOUSER: Josh Houser, attorney for
6
     Hilltop View, Eagle Point, Timberline, Little Timber,
7
     and Wildcat Farms.
8
                MR. DWYER: Ed Dwyer from HeplerBroom;
     also counsel for Eagle Point, Hilltop, Wildcat,
9
     Timberline and Little Timber.
10
                MS. MANNING: Claire Manning from the law
11
12
     firm of Brown, Hay & Stephens on behalf of Prairie
13
     State Gilts, Lone Hollow, and High-Power Pork.
14
                MR. PATTERSON: I'm Charles Patterson.
                                                         Ι
15
     go by Tom. I'm an attorney with the firm of
16
     Patterson & Prahl, LLP, and I represent PSM.
17
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB:
                                        Thank you.
18
                Before we begin, would any parties like
19
     to make opening remarks?
20
                MS. MCBRIDE: Right. So the Complainant
2.1
     will make a very brief statement at this time, if we
22
     may.
23
                On September 22, 2016, the Complainant
24
     filed eight Stipulations and Proposals for Settlement
```

	Page 8
1	in this matter, representing settlement with each of
2	the eight subject facilities and Professional Swine
3	Management. Professional Swine Management is a party
4	to each stipulation.
5	Each settlement represents a negotiation
6	with the respective parties; the terms and conditions
7	of the stipulation, including Section 1(d),
8	compliance to date, as well as Sections 5(a) and (d).
9	Penalty payments and future compliance represent
10	resolution of the allegation of the violation.
11	Each facility has agreed to cease and
12	desist from future violation, has undertaken
13	compliance activities to address the alleged
14	violations.
15	Further, the stipulations require
16	additional actions to ensure future compliance. Each
17	stipulation also requires a payment of a civil
18	penalty.
19	All parties have executed the
20	stipulations, indicating agreement with the terms and
21	conditions of each respective stipulation.
22	The total penalty for this matter, that
23	is the sum and the amounts identified in the
24	individual stipulations, are added together is

December 13, 2016

Page 9 1 \$116,500. And that's pretty much a summary of these 2 stipulations. 3 At this time I move to enter the eight 4 stipulations into the hearing record, as well as 5 Hearing Exhibit 1, and this exhibit is a hard copy of the electronic filing. It's an electronic filing. 6 7 It's the Notice of Filing, the eight Stipulations and 8 Proposals for Settlement, and the Motion for Relief 9 from the Hearing Requirement, and it was filed by the Complainant on September 22, 2016. 10 11 I'd also just like to note that given the 12 scope of this hearing as described by the Board's 13 Rules, which allows an opportunity for public 14 comment, the state will handle any questions directed 15 The state does not intend to the parties as follows: 16 to provide answers during the hearing but will 17 consider all questions and then respond to the extent 18 the state deems appropriate in post hearing comments. 19 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Did you want to 20 introduce that as an exhibit? 2.1 MS. MCBRIDE: Right. So as I mentioned, 22 what I've got in my hand are the stipulations as 23 filed on September 22. I've got them marked as 24 Public Hearing Exhibit. I could put a 1 on it.

```
Page 10
1
                HEARING OFFICE WEBB:
                                       Sure.
2
                MS. MCBRIDE: I don't know if we're going
3
     to have more exhibits.
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB: I don't think so.
4
5
                MS. MCBRIDE: But I'll put a 1 on it and
     we would like to enter it for the record.
6
7
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Exhibit 1 is
8
     admitted into the record. This is a copy of the
9
     Proposed Settlement Agreement for each of the
10
     Respondents.
11
                   (Public Hearing Exhibit Number 1 was
12
                   marked for identification and was
13
                   admitted into the record.)
14
                Would any of the Respondents care to make
15
     opening remarks?
16
                MS. MANNING: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
17
                Good morning, Madam Hearing Officer and
18
     Board Member Burke.
19
                I've been elected to just make a short
20
     statement on behalf of the Respondents. We are here
2.1
     this morning because we've entered into a
22
     Stipulation, a Proposal for Settlement with the State
23
     of Illinois, and particularly the Office of Attorney
     General and the Illinois EPA.
24
```

December 13, 2016

Page 11

As we have various Respondents here with separate counsel, we will plan to address any questions or public comments or statements that are made here today as necessary when we file whatever post hearing filing is required and directed by the Board.

2.1

As the Board has recognized in its decision, the Act to the Illinois Environmental Protection Act which governs these proceedings, encourages settlements.

In a case involving ADM,

Archer-Daniels-Midland, the 3rd District stated: The

public interest is better served by a procedure which

encourages Respondents to enter into settlement

discussions. By allowing the state and Respondents

to reason together, the result will conserve

resources, which would otherwise be expended in

litigation.

In a similar case involving Kmetko, the 5th District stated that the primary goal of the Act is the enhancement of the environment and settlements that do not contain a finding of violation but do yet impose a penalty and a compliance plan may more expeditiously facilitate this enhancement.

December 13, 2016

Page 12

Here, after lengthy negotiations between the parties -- that's the State of Illinois EPA, eight farms on one side, and a professional management company -- we are pleased that we were able to reach agreement on all of the issues.

2.1

In each case, there were separate incidents that were involved; each case for different reasons, none of which were intentional and all of which occurred several years ago. In fact, the earliest incident that is the subject of these stipulations occurred in the summer of 2004 and the latest occurred in the spring of 2009.

In each of these cases, violations were completely addressed to the satisfaction of the state. The issues giving rise to the incidents were corrected to the satisfaction of state, and no incidents beyond those charged in the Complaint have occurred.

In each of the cases, the farms have achieved compliance with the Act and have agreed to pay a civil penalty, ranging from \$18,000, being the largest, to \$10,055, being the lowest, as explained recently by Ms. McBride.

At each of these farms, prior to the

December 13, 2016

Page 13 1 parties reaching agreement, the state insisted on a 2 final inspection at each farm, which were conducted, 3 we believe, for two purposes: First, to assure the 4 state that the farm was designed and operated in such 5 a way that there would be no discharge to a water of the United States; and, secondly, for assuring that 6 7 the farms were in compliance with the Act and the new 8 federally driven state CAFO rules that became 9 applicable in the summer of 2014, in the middle of 10 these proceedings actually. 11 It was not until the state achieved these 12 assurances that these settlements were entered and 13 filed. 14 We appreciate the Board's attention today 15 and the public's interest in our settlement. 16 Thank you. 17 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. 18 Ms. McBride, did you have any further 19 comments you wanted to make on the proposed 20 settlement agreement, or was that addressed in your 2.1 opening statement? Did you care to expound upon 22 anything? 23 MS. MCBRIDE: No, not at this time. 24 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay.

December 13, 2016

Page 14

We are now ready to hear from members of the public.

2.1

The first person on the signup sheet is

Ms. Ramona Cook. Let me make sure the microphone is

on. If you don't mind stepping up to the podium

here, and please state your name for the court

reporter.

MS. COOK: Good morning. My name is

Ramona Cook. I live on a farm in McDonough County

within three miles of Hilltop View and Timberline hog

confinements.

We are corn and soybean farmers since the 1830s, I'm proud to say, in McDonough County, and in Schuyler County as well. So I am vitally interested in the farm industry and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the people of Illinois and how the settlement will, I believe, affect them.

I have the following concerns and questions. First of all, with regard to fines, the fines, according to the agreement and the Pollution Control Board regulations are intended to deter future violations by the Respondents and also all those similarly situated. That would mean that 2,000 or more hog farmers in the state of Illinois. I have

December 13, 2016

Page 15 1 grave concerns that the amount of the fines will, in fact, do so. 2 First of all, past fines for similar 3 4 violations have been much more. In 2010, Alan Berry 5 Livestock was fined \$75,000 for, I believe, violations based on 300 cattle. These confinements, 6 7 of course, contain many, many more hogs and probably 8 much more profit. 9 In 2009, there was a \$66,000 fine against 10 Cold Springs Farm. In 2010, there was a \$40,000 fine against Greenville Livestock; 2011, a \$40,000 fine 11 12 against Heinrich's Dairy; and, of course, in 2007, as 13 stated in the agreement, there was a \$27,000 fine against Professional Swine Management, against 14 Pinnacle Genetics, which they manage. 15 16 The violations in that case were similar, 17 except there was one additional claim of air pollution for burning carcasses. 18 19 I am concerned that current penalties 20 will not deter future violations in that they will be 2.1 viewed as minimal compared to previous penalties 22 against Professional Swine Management and others. 23 These penalties must each exceed the \$27,000 that

Pinnacle Genetics settled for in order to deter

24

2.1

December 13, 2016

Page 16

Professional Swine Management and others from future violations. Otherwise, the fines in the current case will be a signal to the industry that the claimants are no longer as interested in enforcing the laws and their prescribed fines.

The fines are also not enough to compensate the people of Illinois for the fish killed, if any, in the streams and rivers in which the discharge is spread, and in some cases, we do not know how far the spread went.

Decontamination of the Illinois River for drinking water used by small communities along its banks. And we do know that the Illinois River is contaminated. I am not here to allege that the Respondents themselves are responsible for that, but we don't, in fact, know. So somebody has to pay for decontaminating the water.

The cost of EPA employees' work on the violations, including inspections, reports, and reinspections. The fines are not enough to compensate the attorneys' fees for the Attorney General's Office, the IEPA, and the Pollution Control Board. The law provides that attorney fees are chargeable to the Respondents.

2.1

December 13, 2016

Page 17

The tax deductions given to these eight sites by the state and counties as pollution control facilities. If, in fact, the Respondents applied for and received these grants, they are not enough to compensate for any environmental protection grants. The sites were given by the EPA to improve their facilities, and they are not enough for the future inspections of the sites to be made by the Attorney General, the IEPA, and the Pollution Control Board to confirm the site's compliance with the settlement agreement.

These fines are also not enough to recognize the value of the waters of the state to those citizens who rely on them for income, drinking water, recreation, and navigation. They are not enough to recognize the damage done to the air, wildlife, fish, birds and land by pollution violations. They are not enough to compensate the damage done to neighbors of the facilities who pollute, for their loss of property values and health.

Regarding the settlement of this case, I am curious and somewhat disturbed that the decision was made to settle the cases instead of litigating

December 13, 2016

Page 18 1 There appears to be ample evidence alleged in the original Complaint and in the settlement 2 3 agreement to litigate them. Then why have the claimants decided to settle for such smaller amounts 4 5 than seems warranted in comparison to other similar 6 cases? 7 I would suggest that substantial costs 8 have been incurred so far in litigating these 9 Shouldn't the people of Illinois have matters. 10 penalties that will at least pay for part of those 11 expenses? 12 Why were the initial penalties dropped from \$50,000, plus \$10,000 a day for each count to 13 14 what they are now? 15 In some cases, the violations did occur after the Respondents were asked to make corrections 16 17 and they did not. The locations of these sites are not 18 19 suitable for avoiding pollution violations. 20 View, by its very name, is on top of a hill where 2.1 it's -- the pollution that it generates flows to a 22 body of water. 23 In every single one of these cases, the 24 pollution outflow was allowed to enter waters of the

December 13, 2016

Page 19

state and the U.S. because of the location. I am concerned that in many, many cases, hog confinements are located on the edge of watersheds, by creeks and ponds and lakes, and even by dry, unnamed tributaries, that when there is rainfall, if manure or other pollution has been laying there, will flow into our waters.

2.1

When I was growing up in Illinois, we looked forward to each spring when large numbers of carp would move upstream in our backyard creek to lay their eggs further upstream. That isn't even a possibility now. I would not drink out of any of the streams on my farm, or Sugar Creek, which has been proven to be contaminated by E.coli, even if I were dying of thirst. I would die much faster that way.

I have one final question/comment, and that is regarding paragraph two under Section D, future compliance in each of the counts. It has the Respondents agreeing not to put manure on other CAFOs, application fields, and not commingling carcasses among several sites.

I am curious, first of all, if violations were, in fact, occurring of this nature. Secondly, is such an act a violation of the Pollution Control

December 13, 2016

Page 20 1 Board regs. Third, is it a violation of these sites' 2 3 existing manure plans. 4 And fourth, if these are violations, has a fine been levied for them? I do not see one in the 5 6 settlement agreement. 7 I appreciate the time to talk with you 8 and I will reserve the right to file amended comments 9 after the hearing. 10 Thank you so much. 11 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. 12 And just to be clear, Ms. McBride, you 13 expressed a preference to responding to any questions in post hearing comments, is that correct? I mean, 14 15 does anybody care to respond to any questions now 16 versus post hearing? 17 MS. MCBRIDE: No. As I stated, we're 18 going to review these questions for the record and we 19 will respond if we feel appropriate. 2.0 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. Ms. Connie King. And please state your 2.1 22 name for the court reporter. 23 MS. KING: Good morning. My name is 24 Connie King, and I live in Fulton County, and I am a

December 13, 2016

Page 21 1 citizen of Illinois. 2 I would like to ask questions about the 3 alleged violations at Hilltop View, Wildcat Farms, 4 and High-Power Pork sites. 5 Hilltop View. I understand that this 6 site did not have the required NPDES permits when the 7 allegations regarding the storm water erosion, 8 venting, occurred in 2006, and then again in 2009 9 when there was an alleged manure spill. 10 My questions are rhetorical. Thev're as What evidence is there of social economic 11 follows: 12 benefit by Hilltop View to the public, as stated in 13 Section 3 of the stipulation? Number two, what evidence is there that 14 15 the location of Hilltop View is suitable? A, isn't 16 its name indicative that Hilltop View is situated on 17 a hilltop? B, is the location above Sugar Creek? 18 are the land application fields near Sugar Creek? D, 19 is Sugar Creek a major tributary to the Illinois 20 River? E, wasn't the location contributory to 2.1 violations, since the pollution was able to flow down 22 to Sugar Creek? 23 Question three, did PSM and Hilltop View 24 self-report these violations?

December 13, 2016

Page 22

1 Then onto Wildcat Farms. I understand 2 that this site also did not have the required NPDES 3 permit for a manure spill in September of 2008 4 entered into Wildcat Creek, and the smell and taste 5 indicated dead fish and contamination of the creek. My questions are as follows: 6 7 Wildcat Farms a social and economic benefit to the 8 Two, why is it stipulated that location of public? 9 Wildcat Farms is suitable? Wasn't the spill just 200 10 yards long into Wildcat Creek? Wasn't the CAFO located too near a water of the state? Didn't its 11 12 location contribute to the damage done by the spill? 13 And then onto High-Power Pork. Ι 14 understand that this site also did not have the 15 required NPDES permit in 2008, when 90,000 gallons of 16 manure allegedly spilled into Cedar Creek and killed 17 fish. I would like to ask, how much did this site 18 pay to the DNR for the fish kill, as stated in the 19 settlement agreement? What was the amount of the 2.0 fine based on? Isn't there evidence that this 2.1 location was not suitable, since the manure spill was 22 able to reach Cedar Creek and kill fish before it was 23 stopped?

Finally, I have these additional

24

December 13, 2016

Page 23 1 questions and comments. Why didn't PMS advise these 2 sites they had to obtain NPDES permits? They had 3 learned at least as early as 2004 at Pinnacle 4 Genetics that such a permit was required, and all of 5 these sites allegedly fail to get them. Do the fines reflect this? 6 7 Why were the fines proposed for these 8 three sites to deter operations of PMS and other hog 9 confinement operators for future violations? fact, isn't PSM's yearly revenue at least 3.9 10 million, as reported on the internet by Manta 11 12 Consultants? Won't these fines be only very small 13 percentages of PSM's annual revenue? In fact, 14 \$14,500 is only .37 percent for Hilltop View; \$10,500 15 is only .27 percent for Wildcat Farms; \$18,000 is 16 only .46 percent for High-Power Pork. 17 The fines -- will the fines be only a 18 tiny percentage of the \$900,000 average revenue for 19 2,000 hog confinements from Illinois Pork Producers. 20 The state brought in 1.8 billion dollars for 2012? 2.1 Will the fines be able to compensate the people of 22 Illinois for the cost of damage to the water in 23 Illinois and the state, the cost of investigating and 24 litigating these violations and the future costs of

	Page 24
1	enforcing these agreements? I am concerned these
2	fines are too small to do so.
3	And thank you for allowing me to speak.
4	HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you.
5	MS. KING: And I would like the option to
6	post more comments after the hearing.
7	HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Yes, yes, and I
8	will announce that again at the end of the hearing.
9	MS. KING: Thank you.
10	HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Ms. Cindy Arnett?
11	Please state your name for the court reporter.
12	MS. ARNETT: My name is Cindy Arnett.
13	I'm from Fulton County. I am a citizen of the state
14	of Illinois.
15	One thing I would like to add to what
16	Ramona had said in the costs, why aren't the people's
17	wells that are surrounding these CAFOs, why aren't
18	they added into this compensation because they have
19	to treat also.
20	Anyway, I would like to ask questions
21	that are rhetorical about the alleged violations of
22	the Prairie State Gilt and the Little Timber sites.
23	I understand the site did not have the
24	required NPDES permits in September 2008 when the

December 13, 2016

Page 25

manure alleged spilled from a lagoon into the holding pond which empties into a tributary of the homing branch.

2.0

2.1

My questions are as follows: It appears that the evidence -- or that there is what is the social and economic benefit of the Prairie State Gilts, though, and the public as stated in Section 3 of the stipulation.

Number two, what evidence is there that the location of the Prairie State Gilts is suitable?

A, isn't it located where spills can drain into a tributary or a holding branch and the waters of the state? B, doesn't the location contribute to the violations, since the pollution was able to flow down into the creek? C, shouldn't hog confinements be located where a spill cannot flow into the water of the state?

Little Timber. I understand that these three separate incidents are alleged to have occurred at the site. I also understand that the site did not have the -- the required NPDES permit in June 2004 when a leak from a mortuary structure flowed into the tributary of Middle Creek. The tributary -- and a tributary of the Illinois River.

December 13, 2016

Page 26 1 In February 2007, there was an alleged 2 manure spill in Middle Creek. In August 2007, a flow 3 from burned carcasses once again allegedly entered an unnamed creek. 4 5 My questions are as follows: How is Lone 6 Hollow a social and economic benefit to the public? 7 Number two, why is it stipulated that the 8 location of Timber -- Little Timber is suitable? 9 didn't the location contribute to the damage done by the three spills? B, isn't there evidence that the 10 site located was too close to the tributary of Middle 11 12 Creek and Illinois River to prevent pollution from 13 entering the waters of the state? 14 And finally I have these additional questions and comments. 15 16 Number one, why didn't PSM advise these 17 sites that they had to obtain the NPDES permits? 18 the fines reflect PSM's continuing failure to obtain 19 permits for the sites that it operated? 20 Number two, why will the fines proposed 2.1 for these three sites deter these operators, PSM and 22 other hog confinement operators, for future 23 violations. 24 In fact, A, isn't PSM's yearly revenue at

```
Page 27
1
     least 3.9 million as reported on the internet by
     Manta Consultants? B, won't these fines be only very
2
3
     small percentages of PSM's annual revenue? In fact,
4
     $14,000 is only .36 percent of Prairie State Gilts,
5
     and $15,000 is only .38 percent for Little Timber.
     Won't the fines be only a tiny percentage of the
6
7
     $900,000 average revenue for the 2,000 hog
8
     confinements that Illinois Pork Producers say brought
     in 1.8 billion in 2012.
9
                Will the fines be able to compensate the
10
     people of Illinois for the cost of the damage to the
11
12
     water and land of the state, the cost of
     investigating and litigating the violations, and also
13
14
     for the future costs of enforcing the agreements?
15
                I am also concerned that the fines are
16
     much too small.
17
                Thank you so much for the opportunity to
18
     be able to speak today.
19
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB:
                                        Thank you.
20
     Ms. Lindsay Keeney, K-E-E-N-E-Y. Please state your
2.1
     name for the court reporter.
22
                MS. KEENEY: Hi. I am Lindsay Keeney.
23
     I'm with the Illinois Environmental Council and I'm
24
     also a citizen of the state of Illinois.
```

December 13, 2016

Page 28

I'd like to comment on the alleged violations of the Eagle Point and Timberline sites.

2.1

IEPA is concerned that the Eagle Point site did not have the required NPDES permits in May of 2007 when it allegedly spilled the contents of a perimeter tile in a septic tank into a strip mine lake in Otter Creek.

We feel that the location of the site is not suitable because it is located where spills can drain into a strip mine lake and Otter Creek, and the location contributes to the violations because the pollution was able to flow down into Otter Creek.

Concerning the Timberline site, I understand that this site also does not have the required NPDES permit in September of 2008 when fluid from a compost structure entered a dry dam and then into the waters of the state. There is evidence that the site was not suitable, as the spill was able to reach waters of the state.

Finally, I raise additional questions and comments. Why didn't PSM advise these sites that they had to obtain NPDES permits? They had learned at least as early as 2004 that Pinnacle Genetics said such a permit was required, yet all three sites

```
Page 29
1
     allegedly failed to get them. Do the fines reflect
2
     this?
3
                Why do these fines proposed for the three
4
     sites deter these operators, PSM, and other hog
5
     confinement operators, for future violations?
     these fines be only very small percentages of PSM's
6
     annual revenue?
8
                The fines seem to be only a tiny
9
     percentage of the $900,000 average revenue for 2,000
10
     hog confinements of the Illinois Pork Producers.
     Will these fines be able to compensate the people of
11
12
     the Illinois for the costs of the damage to the
     waters and the lands of the state, the cost of
13
     investigation and litigating the violations, and the
14
15
     future costs of enforcing the agreement.
     concerned that the fines are too small to do so.
16
17
                Thank you for this opportunity to speak.
18
                HEARING OFFICER WEBB:
                                        Thank you.
19
     Ms. Karen Hudson. Please state your name for the
20
     court reporter.
2.1
                MS. HUDSON:
                             My name is Karen Hudson,
22
     H-U-D-S-O-N. I'm a citizen of the state of Illinois,
23
     a farmer in Peoria County, cofounder of Illinois
24
     Citizens for Clean Air and Water, and a regional
```

December 13, 2016

Page 30 1 representative for the Socially Responsible 2 Agricultural Project. 3 I am making a general comment today. 4 experience in our rural community of Illinois is a 5 \$50,000 fine on a CAFO operator near our farm for 6 violations, and I'm here to just make a statement 7 about the alleged positive social and economic 8 benefits of these facilities, as stated in Section 3 9 of the stipulation. I'd like to inform you that there is a 10 recent study, as recent as 2008, that looked over 11 12 seven decades of research from the 1930s until 2008 13 that examined the impact of industrialization to They looked at the economic 14 rural communities. 15 situation and the socioeconomic situation, the communities' social fabric effects and the effects to 16 17 the environment. They concluded that there were few 18 positive effects for the community. 19 I feel that the public concern is 20 warranted in this case, due to the continued construction of these and other CAFO sites in the 2.1 22 state of Illinois. 23 Thank you. 24 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you.

December 13, 2016

Page 31

Ms. Molly Hall.

2.1

MS. HALL: My name is Molly Hall, and I am from Menard County and have served as chairperson of the Menard Citizens for Clean Air and Water.

We were aware of the experience of the rest of the state when the latest CAFO project in Menard County was proposed. We already had a USEPA designation of both the Clary Creek, which flows through the property where the CAFO was eventually allowed to develop, and the Sangamon River are impaired, impaired due to agricultural contamination. And let's be honest; it is sewage. This is not like the manure from Grandpa's farm. This contains chemicals and compounds, all of these unnatural substances that would never be found in a traditional farm setting, and that's what's necessary to keep these animals alive in these settings.

So we know about the settlements and the fines, but there's no cleanup, so how does one determine the monetary value of environmental damage? And I would agree that these fines are not going to deter anyone from doing anything untoward, because the fines don't compare to the profits of these factory farms.

December 13, 2016

Page 32 1 The reason why they want to keep siting 2 is because they are so profitable. 3 When we had our informational meeting, we were told about how great these farms are and how 4 5 well run they are. We have self-monitoring. We have 6 self-reporting if there's a problem. 7 Well, you know, that doesn't happen. 8 Let's face it. EPA doesn't get involved until 9 citizens inform them that there's been a problem, 10 and, you know, by then the damage is done and it's too late. 11 12 No traditional business would be allowed to put millions of gallons of untreated sewage onto 13 14 land that flows downhill into waterways of this 15 state, but the Act has ensured that factory farms can 16 do that, and the EPA coming in after the fact isn't 17 helping. The state of Illinois does have severe 18 19 financial constraints. We all know that. So why not 20 start proactive monitoring of these facilities to 2.1 spot problems before they create environmental havoc? 22 You've got all of these attorneys getting 23 involved. You've got all of these different 24 investigators doing their thing. Why not get out

December 13, 2016

Page 33 1 there and just look at the operations and see if 2 they're -- you know, there are problems that can be 3 detected early enough to prevent the pollution. 4 But in the case of our CAFO, the most 5 recent one in Menard County, which, by the way, is just a few miles from Lincoln's New Salem State 6 7 Historic Site, the most visited historic site in the 8 state of Illinois, it's on a hill. The land that the 9 sewage is applied on is sloping. It runs off into 10 Clary Creek, which flows into the Sangamon River, which is a Lincoln Heritage Water Trail that gets a 11 12 lot of recreation every year. 13 If you're going to keep citing these 14 CAFOs, at least do something proactive to prevent the 15 damage and recognize that the reason why there are 16 more of them coming into Illinois is because other 17 states have seen the devastation and have said 18 enough. 19 Thank you. 20 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Thank you. 2.1 Those are all the names I have on my 22 Is there anybody else here who would like to 23 make a comment? 24 MR. PATTERSON: Just as a point of

December 13, 2016

Page 34 1 clarification, the last commenter, is my 2 understanding correct that her concerns in Menard 3 County did not involve any of these farms or PSM? 4 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Ms. Hall, did you 5 hear Mr. Patterson's --6 MS. HALL: My comments spoke to the 7 totality of industry statewide, which includes those 8 operations. 9 MR. PATTERSON: Yeah, but my question is, 10 your complaints about a facility in Menard County did not involve any of these Respondents, is that 11 12 correct? 13 MS. HALL: My comments were directed at the totality of the industry in Illinois and the 14 15 impacts we have seen statewide from CAFO operations throughout the state. 16 17 MR. PATTERSON: All right. I think my 18 question is made clear for the record. Thank you. 19 HEARING OFFICER WEBB: Okay. Thank you. 20 Nobody else? No more public comment? 2.1 Okay. Do the parties have any closing 22 remarks they would care to make? No? Okay. 23 Again, the transcript will be received at 24 the Board by December 20th and will be posted on the

```
Page 35
 1
     Board's website.
 2
                January 10th is the deadline for public
 3
     comment, as well as post hearing responses from the
     parties, if they so choose. Public comment must be
 4
 5
     postmarked or e-mailed by the deadline and must be
 6
     directed to the Clerk of the Board in our Chicago
 7
     office. Street and e-mail addresses, as well as
 8
     phone numbers, are available on our website,
 9
     ipcb.state.il.us.
10
                If you do not have internet access,
11
     please see me after the hearing and I will get you
12
     any information you need.
13
                I thank you all for your participation
     and we are adjourned.
14
15
                   (Hearing adjourned 10:42 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
```

```
Page 36
 1
     STATE OF ILLINOIS
                                 SS
                            )
 2
     COUNTY OF MACON
 3
 4
 5
                 I, LISA HAHN PETERMAN, do hereby certify
 6
     that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary
 7
     Public in the State of Illinois and that I reported in
     shorthand the foregoing, taken on the 13th day of
 8
 9
     December, 2016, and that the foregoing is a true and
     correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.
10
11
12
13
14
                       Notary Public -- CSR, RMR
                       CSR #084.2149
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

				Tage 37
A	agricultural 30:2	20:19	11:6,7 14:21	charged 12:17
$\frac{A}{A.D 1:19}$	31:11	Archer-Daniels	16:23 17:9 20:1	Charles 3:5 4:12
	air 15:17 17:16	11:12	34:24 35:6	7:14
a.m 1:20 5:19 35:15	29:24 31:4	Arnett 4:8 24:10,12	Board's 5:21,23	chemicals 31:14
able 12:5 21:21	Alan 15:4	24:12	6:10 9:12 13:14	Chicago 6:15 35:6
22:22 23:21 25:14	alive 31:17	asked 18:16	35:1	choose 6:17 35:4
27:10,18 28:12,18	allegation 8:10	assurances 13:12	body 18:22	Cindy 4:8 24:10,12
29:11	allegations 21:7	assure 13:3	Box 2:3,20 3:3	citing 33:13
accepted 6:12	allege 16:14	assuring 13:6	branch 25:3,12	citizen 21:1 24:13
access 35:10	alleged 6:23 8:13	attention 13:14	brief 7:21	27:24 29:22
achieved 12:20	18:1 21:3,9 24:21	attorney 2:8 7:3,5	brought 23:20 27:8	citizens 17:14
13:11	25:1,19 26:1 28:1	7:15 10:23 16:21	Brown 2:19 7:12	29:24 31:4 32:9
act 5:21 11:8,9,20	30:7	16:23 17:8	Burke 2:7 5:10	civil 8:17 12:21
12:20 13:7 19:24	allegedly 22:16	attorneys 32:22	10:18	claim 15:17
32:15	23:5 26:3 28:5	attorneys' 16:21	burned 26:3	claim 13.17 claimants 16:3 18:4
actions 8:16	29:1	August 26:2		Claire 2:21 4:5
activities 8:13	allow 6:19	available 35:8	burning 15:18 business 32:12	7:11
add 24:15	allow 6:19 allowed 18:24	Avenue 1:18 2:2,13	Dusiness 32.12	clarification 34:1
added 8:24 24:18	31:10 32:12		C	
additional 8:16		average 23:18 27:7 29:9	c 2:1 3:1 5:23 21:17	Clary 31:8 33:10 Clean 29:24 31:4
15:17 22:24 26:14	allowing 11:15 24:3		25:15	
28:20	allows 9:13	avoiding 18:19 aware 31:5	CAFO 13:8 22:10	cleanup 31:19 clear 6:8 20:12
address 6:22 8:13		aware 31.3	30:5,21 31:6,9	
11:2	amended 20:8	B	33:4 34:15	34:18
addressed 12:14	amount 15:1 22:19	B 4:16 21:17 25:13	CAFOs 19:20	Clerk 6:15 35:6
13:20	amounts 8:23 18:4	26:10 27:2	24:17 33:14	close 26:11
addresses 35:7	ample 18:1	backyard 19:10	carcasses 15:18	closing 34:21
adjourned 35:14	animals 31:17	banks 16:13	19:21 26:3	cofounder 29:23
35:15	announce 24:8	based 15:6 22:20	care 10:14 13:21	Cold 15:10
ADM 11:11	annual 23:13 27:3	beginning 5:18	20:15 34:22	coming 32:16 33:16
admitted 4:17 10:8	29:7	behalf 2:12,16,22	Carol 1:14 2:4 5:7	comment 4:6,7,8,9
10:13	answers 4:12 9:16	3:6 7:12 10:20	carp 19:10	4:10,11 6:4,12,13
advise 23:1 26:16	anybody 20:15	14:16	case 11:11,19 12:6	6:14,21,22 9:14
28:21	33:22	believe 13:3 14:17	12:7 15:16 16:2	28:1 30:3 33:23
affect 14:17	Anyway 24:20	15:5	17:22 30:20 33:4	34:20 35:3,4
ago 12:9	appearances 7:2	benefit 21:12 22:7		commenter 34:1
agree 31:21	Appeared 2:12,16		cases 12:13,19 16:9	comments 4:3,13
agreed 8:11 12:20	2:22 3:6	25:6 26:6	17:24 18:6,15,23	9:18 11:3 13:19
agreeing 19:19	appears 18:1 25:4	benefits 30:8	19:2	20:8,14 23:1 24:6
agreement 5:12 6:5	applicable 13:9	Berry 15:4	cattle 15:6	26:15 28:21 34:6
8:20 10:9 12:5	application 19:20	better 11:13	cease 8:11	34:13
13:1,20 14:20	21:18	beyond 12:17	Cedar 22:16,22	commingling 19:20
15:13 17:11 18:3	applied 17:3 33:9	billion 23:20 27:9	Certified 36:6	communities 16:12
20:6 22:19 29:15	appreciate 5:3	birds 17:17	certify 36:5	30:14
agreements 6:24	13:14 14:15 20:7	Board 1:1,17 2:2,6	chairperson 31:3	communities'
24:1 27:14	appropriate 9:18	5:9,9 6:5,15 10:18	chargeable 16:24	30:16
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	ı
community 30:4,18	Connie 4:7 20:21	24:13 29:23 31:3	deems 9:18	Eagle 1:7 2:17 5:15
company 12:4	20:24	31:7 33:5 34:3,10	described 9:12	7:6,9 28:2,3
compare 31:23	conserve 11:16	36:2	designation 31:8	earliest 12:10
compared 15:21	consider 9:17	course 15:7,12	designed 13:4	early 23:3 28:23
comparison 18:5	constraints 32:19	court 14:6 20:22	desist 8:12	33:3
compensate 16:7	construction 30:21	24:11 27:21 29:20	detected 33:3	East 1:18 2:2
16:21 17:5,18	Consultants 23:12	create 32:21	deter 14:21 15:20	economic 21:11
23:21 27:10 29:11	27:2	creek 19:10,13	15:24 23:8 26:21	22:7 25:6 26:6
compensation	contain 11:22 15:7	21:17,18,19,22	29:4 31:22	30:7,14
24:18	contains 31:13	22:4,5,10,16,22	determine 31:20	Ed 7:8
Complainant 1:4	contaminated	25:15,23 26:2,4	devastation 33:17	edge 19:3
2:12 7:4,20,23	16:14 19:14	26:12 28:7,10,12	develop 31:10	EDWARD 2:15
9:10	contamination	31:8 33:10	die 19:15	effects 30:16,16,18
Complaint 12:17	22:5 31:11	creeks 19:3	different 12:7	eggs 19:11
18:2	contents 28:5	CSR 1:15 36:14,15	32:23	eight 7:24 8:2 9:3,7
complaints 34:10	continued 3:1	curious 17:23	direct 6:14	12:3 17:1
complete 6:20	30:20	19:22	directed 9:14 11:5	elected 10:19
completely 12:14	continuing 26:18	current 15:19 16:2	34:13 35:6	electronic 9:6,6
compliance 8:8,9	contribute 22:12	Custer 3:4	discharge 13:5 16:9	employees' 16:18
8:13,16 11:23	25:13 26:9	D	discussions 11:15	empties 25:2
12:20 13:7 17:10	contributes 28:11		District 11:12,20	encourages 11:10
19:18	contributory 21:20	d 4:1 8:8 19:17	disturbed 17:23	11:14
compost 28:16	control 1:1,17 2:2,6	21:18	DIVISION 2:9	Enforcement 1:5
compounds 31:14	5:8 14:21 16:22	Dairy 15:12	DNR 22:18	enforcing 16:4 24:1
concern 30:19	17:2,9 19:24	dam 28:16	doing 31:22 32:24	27:14 29:15
concerned 15:19	Cook 4:6 14:4,8,9	damage 17:16,19 22:12 23:22 26:9	dollars 23:20	enhancement 11:21
19:2 24:1 27:15	copy 9:5 10:8	27:11 29:12 31:20	downhill 32:14	11:24
28:3 29:16	corn 14:12	32:10 33:15	dozen 6:2	ensure 8:16
Concerning 28:13	Corporation 1:9	date 8:8	drain 25:11 28:10	ensured 32:15
concerns 14:18	correct 20:14 34:2		drink 19:12	enter 9:3 10:6
15:1 34:2	34:12 36:10	day 1:19 18:13 36:8	drinking 16:12	11:14 18:24
concluded 30:17	corrected 12:16	dead 22:5 deadline 35:2,5	17:14	entered 10:21
Concluding 4:13	corrections 18:16	decades 30:12	driven 13:8	13:12 22:4 26:3
conditions 8:6,21	cost 16:18 23:22,23	December 1:19	dropped 18:12	28:16
conduct 6:6	27:11,12 29:13	5:18 6:10 34:24	dry 19:4 28:16	entering 26:13
conducted 5:22	costs 18:7 23:24	36:9	due 6:9 30:20 31:11	environment 6:23
13:2	24:16 27:14 29:12	decided 18:4	Dwyer 2:15 7:8,8	11:21 30:17
Conference 1:18	29:15 Council 27:22	decision 6:6 11:8	dying 19:15	environmental 2:9
confinement 23:9	Council 27:23	17:23		5:21 11:8 17:5
26:22 29:5 confinements	counsel 7:9 11:2 count 18:13	decontaminating	E 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,2	27:23 31:20 32:21 EPA 10:24 12:2
14:11 15:6 19:2		16:17	4:16 21:20	
23:19 25:15 27:8	counties 17:2 counts 19:18	Decontamination	e-mail 6:14 35:7	16:18 17:6 32:8 32:16
29:10		16:11	e-mailed 35:5	erosion 21:7
confirm 17:10	County 1:15 14:9 14:13,14 20:24	deductions 17:1	E.coli 19:14	ESQ 2:7,11,15,15
Commun 17.10	14.13,14 20.24		2.00117.11	E3Q 2.7,11,13,13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	ı
2:21 3:5	farmers 14:12,24	following 14:18	growing 19:8	hog 14:10,24 19:2
eventually 31:9	farms 1:7 2:17 5:14	follows 9:15 21:11		23:8,19 25:15
everybody 5:2	7:7 12:3,19,24	22:6 25:4 26:5	H	26:22 27:7 29:4
evidence 18:1	13:7 21:3 22:1,7,9	foregoing 36:8,9	H 4:16	29:10
21:11,14 22:20	23:15 31:24 32:4	forward 19:9	H-U-D-S-O-N	hogs 15:7
25:5,9 26:10	32:15 34:3	found 31:15	29:22	holding 25:1,12
28:17	faster 19:15	fourth 20:4	HAHN 1:14 36:5	Hollow 1:8 2:23
examined 30:13	February 26:1	Fulton 20:24 24:13	Hall 4:11 31:1,2,2	5:16 7:13 26:6
exceed 15:23	federally 13:8	FUND 2:9	34:4,6,13	homing 25:2
executed 8:19	feel 20:19 28:8	further 8:15 13:18	hand 9:22	honest 31:12
exhibit 4:18 9:5,5	30:19	19:11	handle 9:14	Houser 2:15 7:5,5
9:20,24 10:7,11	fees 16:21,23	future 8:9,12,16	happen 32:7	Hudson 4:10 29:19
exhibits 10:3	fields 19:20 21:18	14:22 15:20 16:1	hard 9:5	29:21,21
existing 20:3	file 6:16 11:4 20:8	17:7 19:18 23:9	havoc 32:21	
expeditiously 11:24	filed 7:24 9:9,23	23:24 26:22 27:14	Hay 2:19 7:12	I
expended 11:17	13:13	29:5,15	health 17:21	identification
expenses 18:11	filing 9:6,6,7 11:5		hear 14:1 34:5	10:12
experience 30:4	final 6:5 13:2 19:16	G	hearing 1:14 2:4	identified 8:23
31:5	finally 22:24 26:14	G 4:2	4:3,13,18 5:1,8,11	IEPA 16:22 17:9
explained 12:22	28:20	gallons 22:15 32:13	5:20 6:3,7,9,16	28:3
expound 13:21	financial 32:19	general 2:8 10:24	7:17 9:4,5,9,12,16	Illinois 1:1,3,9,16
expressed 20:13	finding 11:22	17:9 30:3	9:18,19,24 10:1,4	1:17,19 2:2,3,6,8
extent 9:17	fine 15:9,10,11,13	General's 7:4 16:22	10:7,11,16,17	2:10,14,20 5:13
	20:5 22:20 30:5	generates 18:21	11:5 13:17,24	10:23,24 11:8
F	fined 15:5	Genetics 15:15,24	20:9,11,14,16,20	12:2 14:16,24
f 5:22	fines 14:19,20 15:1	23:4 28:23	24:4,6,7,8,10	16:7,11,13 18:9
fabric 30:16	15:3 16:2,5,6,20	getting 32:22	27:19 29:18 30:24	19:8 21:1,19
face 32:8	17:12 23:5,7,12	Gilt 24:22	33:20 34:4,19	23:19,22,23 24:14
facilitate 11:24	23:17,17,21 24:2	Gilts 1:8 2:23 5:16	35:3,11,15	25:24 26:12 27:8
facilities 8:2 17:3,7	26:18,20 27:2,6	7:13 25:7,10 27:4	Heinrich's 15:12	27:11,23,24 29:10
17:19 30:8 32:20	27:10,15 29:1,3,6	given 9:11 17:1,6	helping 32:17	29:12,22,23 30:4
facility 8:11 34:10	29:8,11,16 31:19	giving 12:15	HeplerBroom 2:13	30:22 32:18 33:8
fact 12:9 15:2	31:21,23	go 7:15	7:8	33:16 34:14 36:1
16:16 17:3 19:23	firm 7:12,15	goal 11:20	Heritage 33:11	36:7
23:10,13 26:24	first 13:3 14:3,19	going 10:2 20:18	Hi 27:22	impact 6:23 30:13
27:3 32:16	15:3 19:22	31:21 33:13	High-Power 1:7	impacts 34:15
factory 31:24 32:15	fish 16:7 17:17 22:5	Good 5:7 10:17	2:23 5:15 7:13	impaired 31:11,11
fail 23:5	22:17,18,22	14:8 20:23	21:4 22:13 23:16	impose 11:23
failed 29:1	flow 19:6 21:21	governs 11:9	hill 18:20 33:8	improve 17:6
failure 26:18	25:14,16 26:2	Grand 1:17 2:2	hilltop 1:6 2:17	incident 12:10
far 16:10 18:8	28:12	Grandpa's 31:13	5:14 7:6,9 14:10	incidents 12:7,15
farm 13:2,4 14:9,15	flowed 25:22	grants 17:4,5	18:19 21:3,5,12	12:17 25:19
15:10 19:13 30:5	flows 18:21 31:8	grave 15:1	21:15,16,17,23	includes 34:7
31:13,16	32:14 33:10	great 32:4	23:14	including 8:7 16:19
farmer 29:23	fluid 28:15	Greenville 15:11	historic 33:7,7	income 17:14

December 13, 2016

incurred 18:8	Jennifer 2:7 5:9	Lincoln's 33:6	manage 15:15	10:21 14:8 20:23
indicated 22:5	Josh 7:5	Lindsay 4:9 27:20	manage 13.13	mortuary 25:22
indicating 8:20	JOSHUA 2:15	27:22	3:6 5:14 8:3,3	Motion 9:8
indicative 21:16	June 25:21	LISA 1:14 36:5	12:4 15:14,22	move 9:3 19:10
	June 23.21	list 33:22	· ·	move 9.5 19.10
individual 8:24	K		16:1	N
industrialization	K-E-E-N-E-Y	litigate 18:3	manner 6:7	$\overline{N2:13:14:1}$
30:13	27:20	litigating 17:24	Manning 2:21 4:5	name 5:7 14:6,8
industry 14:15 16:3	Karen 4:10 29:19	18:8 23:24 27:13	7:11,11 10:16	18:20 20:22,23
34:7,14	29:21	29:14	Manta 23:11 27:2	21:16 24:11,12
inform 30:10 32:9	Keeney 4:9 27:20	litigation 11:18	manure 19:5,19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
information 35:12	•	Little 1:9 2:17 3:3	20:3 21:9 22:3,16	27:21 29:19,21 31:2
informational 32:3	27:22,22	5:17 7:6,10 24:22	22:21 25:1 26:2	
initial 18:12	keep 31:16 32:1	25:18 26:8 27:5	31:13	names 33:21
insisted 13:1	33:13	live 14:9 20:24	marked 4:17 9:23	nature 6:22 19:23
inspection 13:2	kill 22:18,22	Livestock 15:5,11	10:12	navigation 17:15
inspections 16:19	killed 16:8 22:16	LLC 1:6,6,7,7,7,8,8	matter 6:6 8:1,22	near 21:18 22:11
17:8	King 4:7 20:21,23	1:9 2:13 5:14,14	matters 18:9	30:5
intend 9:15	20:24 24:5,9	5:15,15,15,16,16	McBRIDE 2:11 4:4	necessary 11:4
intended 14:21	Kmetko 11:19	5:17	7:3,3,20 9:21 10:2	31:16
intentional 12:8	know 10:2 16:10,13	LLP 2:19 3:2 7:16	10:5 12:23 13:18	need 35:12
interest 11:13	16:16 31:18 32:7	located 19:3 22:11	13:23 20:12,17	negotiation 8:5
13:15	32:10,19 33:2	25:11,16 26:11	McDonough 14:9	negotiations 12:1
interested 14:14	т	28:9	14:13	neighbors 17:19
16:4	<u>L</u>	location 19:1 21:15	mean 14:23 20:14	neutral 6:7
internet 23:11 27:1	lagoon 25:1	21:17,20 22:8,12	meeting 32:3	never 31:15
35:10	lake 28:7,10	22:21 25:10,13	Member 5:9 10:18	new 13:7 33:6
interruption 6:20	lakes 19:4	26:8,9 28:8,11	members 2:6 6:2	North 1:17 2:2
introduce 9:20	land 17:17 21:18	locations 18:18	14:1	notary 1:15 36:6,14
Introductory 4:3	27:12 32:14 33:8	Lone 1:7 2:23 5:15	Menard 31:3,4,7	note 6:1 9:11
investigating 23:23	lands 29:13	7:13 26:5	33:5 34:2,10	notes 36:10
27:13	Lane 3:3	long 22:10	mentioned 9:21	Notice 9:7
investigation 29:14	large 19:9	longer 16:4	microphone 14:4	noticed 5:20
investigators 32:24	largest 12:22	look 33:1	middle 13:9 25:23	NPDES 21:6 22:2
involve 34:3,11	late 32:11	looked 19:9 30:11	26:2,11	22:15 23:2 24:24
involved 12:7 32:8	latest 12:12 31:6	30:14	miles 14:10 33:6	25:21 26:17 28:4
32:23	law 7:11 16:23	loss 17:20	million 23:11 27:1	28:15,22
involving 11:11,19	laws 16:4	lot 33:12	millions 32:13	Number 10:11
ipcb.state.il.us 35:9	lay 19:10	lowest 12:22	mind 14:5	21:14 25:9 26:7
issues 12:5,15	laying 19:6		mine 28:6,10	26:16,20
	leak 25:22	M	minimal 15:21	numbers 19:9 35:8
J	learned 23:3 28:22	Macon 1:16 36:2	minutes 5:5	
$\overline{\mathbf{J}2:15}$	lengthy 12:1	Madam 10:16,17	Molly 4:11 31:1,2	0
Jane 2:11 4:4 7:3	let's 31:12 32:8	mail 6:14	monetary 31:20	o'clock 1:20
January 6:13,16	levied 20:5	major 21:19	monitoring 32:20	obtain 23:2 26:17
35:2	Lincoln 33:11	making 30:3	morning 5:7 10:17	26:18 28:22
			morning 5./ 10.1/	
	<u> </u>	I	l .	ı

December 13, 2016

10.15	7 10 0 6 10 0 15	04 11 07 00 00 10	1 , , , , , , ,	25.24.26.7.14
occur 18:15	7:18 8:6,19 9:15	24:11 27:20 29:19	probably 15:7	35:2,4 36:7,14
occurred 12:9,11	12:2 13:1 34:21	35:11	problem 32:6,9	public's 13:15
12:12,18 21:8	35:4	pleased 12:4	problems 32:21	purpose 6:3,6
25:19	party 8:3	plus 18:13	33:2	purposes 13:3
occurring 19:23	Patterson 3:2,5	PMS 23:1,8	Procedural 5:23	pursuant 5:20,22
office 2:8 6:15 7:4	4:12 7:14,14,16	podium 14:5	procedure 11:13	put 9:24 10:5 19:19
10:1,23 16:22	33:24 34:9,17	point 1:7 2:17 5:15	proceedings 1:13	32:13
35:7	Patterson's 34:5	7:6,9 28:2,3 33:24	6:8 11:9 13:10	0
officer 1:14 2:4 4:3	pay 12:21 16:16	pollute 17:20	Producers 23:19	question 21:23 34:9
4:13 5:1,8 7:17	18:10 22:18	pollution 1:1,17 2:2	27:8 29:10	34:18
9:19 10:4,7,16,17	payment 8:17	2:6 5:8 14:20	professional 1:6	question/comment
13:17,24 20:11,20	payments 8:9	15:18 16:22 17:2	3:6 5:13 8:2,3	19:16
24:4,7,10 27:19	PCB 1:5 5:12	17:9,17 18:19,21	12:3 15:14,22	questions 4:12 9:14
29:18 30:24 33:20	penalties 15:19,21	18:24 19:6,24	16:1	9:17 11:3 14:19
34:4,19	15:23 18:10,12	21:21 25:14 26:12	profit 15:8	20:13,15,18 21:2
offices 1:16	penalty 8:9,18,22	28:12 33:3	profitable 32:2	21:10 22:6 23:1
Okay 13:24 20:20	11:23 12:21	pond 25:2	profits 31:23	24:20 25:4 26:5
34:19,21,22	people 1:3 5:12	ponds 19:4	project 30:2 31:6	26:15 28:20
once 26:3	14:16 16:7 18:9	Pork 1:7 2:23 5:15	property 17:20	20.13 26.20
opening 4:4,5 7:19	23:21 27:11 29:11	7:13 21:4 22:13	31:9	R
10:15 13:21	people's 24:16	23:16,19 27:8	Proposal 10:22	R 2:1 3:1
operated 13:4	Peoria 29:23	29:10	Proposals 7:24 9:8	rainfall 19:5
26:19	percent 23:14,15	positive 30:7,18	proposed 5:12 6:4	raise 28:20
operations 23:8	23:16 27:4,5	possibility 19:12	6:19,24 10:9	Ramona 4:6 14:4,9
33:1 34:8,15	percentage 23:18	post 6:16 9:18 11:5	13:19 23:7 26:20	24:16
operator 30:5	27:6 29:9	20:14,16 24:6	29:3 31:7	ranging 12:21
operators 23:9	percentages 23:13	35:3	protection 5:21	reach 12:5 22:22
26:21,22 29:4,5	27:3 29:6	posted 6:10 34:24	11:9 17:5	28:19
opportunity 9:13	perimeter 28:6	postmarked 35:5	proud 14:13	reaching 13:1
14:15 27:17 29:17	permit 22:3,15 23:4	Prahl 3:2 7:16	proven 19:14	ready 14:1
option 24:5	25:21 28:15,24	Prairie 1:8 2:23	provide 9:16	reason 5:5 11:16
order 15:24	permits 21:6 23:2	5:16 7:12 24:22	provides 16:23	32:1 33:15
orderly 6:7	24:24 26:17,19	25:6,10 27:4	PSM 7:16 21:23	reasons 12:8
original 18:2	28:4,22	preference 20:13	26:16,21 28:21	received 17:4 34:23
Otter 28:7,10,12	person 14:3 PETERMAN 1:14	prescribed 16:5	29:4 34:3	recognize 17:13,16
outflow 18:24	36:5	present 2:6 6:2	PSM's 23:10,13	33:15
P		presentation 6:20	26:18,24 27:3	recognized 11:7
P 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:2	phone 35:8	pretty 9:1	29:6	record 6:1,8 7:2 9:4
P.O 2:3,20 3:3	phones 5:2	prevent 26:12 33:3	public 1:15 4:6,7,8	10:6,8,13 20:18
paragraph 19:17	Pinnacle 15:15,24 23:3 28:23	33:14 previous 15:21	4:9,10,11,18 5:11	34:18
part 5:22,23 18:10		-	6:2,4,12,14,21,22	recreation 17:15
participation 35:13	plan 11:2,23	primary 11:20	9:13,24 10:11	33:12
particularly 10:23	plans 20:3	prior 12:24	11:3,13 14:2	reflect 23:6 26:18
parties 6:16,19 7:1	please 5:2 6:14,19	proactive 32:20	21:12 22:8 25:7	29:1
Par eres 0.10,17 /.1	7:2 14:6 20:21	33:14	26:6 30:19 34:20	
	l	l	<u> </u>	I

T				
regard 14:19	30:1	self-report 21:24	19:21 21:4 23:2,5	9:14,15,18 10:22
regarding 17:22	rest 31:6	self-reporting 32:6	23:8 24:22 26:17	11:15 12:2,15,16
19:17 21:7	result 11:16	sent 6:13	26:19,21 28:2,21	13:1,4,8,11 14:6
regional 29:24	revenue 23:10,13	separate 11:2 12:6	28:24 29:4 30:21	14:24 17:2,13
regs 20:1	23:18 26:24 27:3	25:19	sites' 20:2	19:1 20:21 22:11
regulations 14:21	27:7 29:7,9	September 7:23	siting 32:1	23:20,23 24:11,13
reinspections 16:20	review 20:18	9:10,23 22:3	situated 14:23	24:22 25:6,10,13
Relief 9:8	rhetorical 21:10	24:24 28:15	21:16	25:17 26:13 27:4
rely 17:14	24:21	septic 28:6	situation 30:15,15	27:12,20,24 28:17
remarks 4:4,5 7:19	right 7:20 9:21	served 11:13 31:3	-	28:19 29:13,19,22
10:15 34:22	20:8 34:17		sloping 33:9 small 16:12 23:12	30:22 31:6 32:15
	rise 12:15	setting 31:16 settings 31:17		
reported 23:11			24:2 27:3,16 29:6	32:18 33:6,8
27:1 36:7	River 16:11,13	settle 17:24 18:4	29:16	34:16 36:1,7
reporter 14:7 20:22	21:20 25:24 26:12	settled 15:24	smaller 18:4	stated 11:12,20
24:11 27:21 29:20	31:10 33:10	settlement 5:12 6:5	smell 22:4	15:13 20:17 21:12
36:6	rivers 16:8	6:24 7:24 8:1,5	social 21:11 22:7	22:18 25:7 30:8
reports 16:19	RMR 1:15 36:14	9:8 10:9,22 11:14	25:6 26:6 30:7,16	statement 7:21
represent 7:16 8:9	Roland 2:13	13:15,20 14:17	Socially 30:1	10:20 13:21 30:6
representative 30:1	Room 1:18	17:10,22 18:2	socioeconomic	statements 11:3
representing 8:1	rules 5:21,24 9:13	20:6 22:19	30:15	states 13:6 33:17
represents 8:5	13:8	settlements 6:19	somebody 16:16	statewide 34:7,15
require 8:15	run 32:5	11:10,21 13:12	somewhat 17:23	Stephens 2:19 7:12
required 11:5 21:6	runs 33:9	31:18	South 2:9,19	stepping 14:5
22:2,15 23:4	rural 30:4,14	seven 30:12	soybean 14:12	stipulated 22:8
24:24 25:21 28:4	<u> </u>	severe 32:18	speak 14:16 24:3	26:7
28:15,24		sewage 31:12 32:13	27:18 29:17	stipulation 6:4 8:4
Requirement 9:9	S 2:1 3:1 4:2,16	33:9	spill 21:9 22:3,9,12	8:7,17,21 10:22
requires 8:17	Salem 33:6	sheet 14:3	22:21 25:16 26:2	21:13 25:8 30:9
research 30:12	Sangamon 31:10	short 10:19	28:18	stipulations 7:24
reserve 20:8	33:10	shorthand 36:6,8	spilled 22:16 25:1	8:15,20,24 9:2,4,7
resolution 8:10	satisfaction 12:14	36:10	28:5	9:22 12:11
resources 11:17	12:16	side 12:3	spills 25:11 26:10	stopped 22:23
respective 8:6,21	Schuyler 14:14	signal 16:3	28:9	storm 21:7
respond 9:17 20:15	scope 9:12	signup 14:3	spoke 34:6	streams 16:8 19:13
20:19	SD 3:4	silence 5:2	spot 32:21	Street 2:9,19 35:7
Respondent 3:6	secondly 13:6	similar 11:19 15:3	spread 16:9,10	strip 28:6,10
Respondents 1:10	19:23	15:16 18:5	spring 12:12 19:9	structure 25:22
2:16,22 10:10,14	Section 8:7 19:17	similarly 14:23	Springfield 1:18	28:16
10:20 11:1,14,15	21:13 25:7 30:8	single 18:23	2:3,10,14,20	study 30:11
14:22 16:15,24	Sections 8:8	site 21:6 22:2,14,17	Springs 15:10	subject 8:2 12:10
17:3 18:16 19:19	see 5:5 20:5 33:1	24:23 25:20,20	SS 36:1	subpart 5:22,23
34:11	35:11	26:11 28:4,8,13	start 5:1 32:20	substances 31:15
responding 20:13	seen 33:17 34:15	28:14,18 33:7,7	started 5:6	substantial 18:7
responses 6:17 35:3	self-monitoring	site's 17:10	state 1:3,8,16 2:8	Sugar 19:13 21:17
responsible 16:15	32:5	sites 17:2,6,8 18:18	2:23 5:13,16 7:13	21:18,19,22
L				

				1 agc 43
suggest 18:7	time 7:1,21 9:3	value 17:13 31:20	waterways 32:14	10,000 18:13
suitable 18:19	13:23 20:7	values 17:20	way 13:5 19:15	10,055 12:22
21:15 22:9,21	tiny 23:18 27:6	various 11:1	33:5	10,500 23:14
25:10 26:8 28:9	29:8	venting 21:8	we're 5:4 10:2	10:00 1:20 5:5,19
28:18	today 5:2,9 6:2	versus 5:13 20:16	20:17	10:42 35:15
Suite 2:19	11:4 13:14 27:18	View 1:6 2:17 5:14	we've 10:21	10.42 55.15 101 5:22
sum 8:23	30:3	7:6 14:10 18:20	Webb 1:14 2:4 5:1	101 3.22 1021 1:17 2:2
sum 8.23 summary 6:18 9:1	told 32:4	21:3,5,12,15,16	5:7 7:17 9:19	1021 1.17 2.2 103 5:23
summar y 0.18 3.1 summer 12:11 13:9	Tom 7:15	21:23 23:14	10:1,4,7 13:17,24	10th 6:13,16 35:2
summer 12.11 13.9 suppose 5:4	top 18:20	viewed 15:21	20:11,20 24:4,7	116,500 9:1
suppose 3.4 sure 10:1 14:4	top 18.20 total 8:22	views 6:24	24:10 27:19 29:18	1244 1:18
surrounding 24:17	total 8.22 totality 34:7,14	violation 6:23 8:10	30:24 33:20 34:4	13th 1:19 5:18 36:8
Swine 1:6 3:6 5:13	traditional 31:15	8:12 11:22 19:24	34:19	14 4:6
	32:12	20:2		
8:2,3 15:14,22 16:1	32:12 Trail 33:11	violations 8:14	website 6:11 35:1,8 wells 24:17	14,000 27:4 14,500 23:14
10.1	transcript 1:13 6:9	12:13 14:22 15:4	wens 24:17 went 16:10	14,500 23:14 15,000 27:5
T	34:23 36:10		Wildcat 1:6 2:17	/
T 3:5 4:16	treat 24:19	15:6,16,20 16:2 16:19 17:18 18:15	5:14 7:7,9 21:3	18,000 12:21 23:15 1830s 14:13
take 6:3,21	tributaries 19:5	18:19 19:22 20:4	,	19274 2:3
taken 1:13 36:8,10			22:1,4,7,9,10 23:15	19274 2.3 1930s 30:12
talk 20:7	tributary 21:19	21:3,21,24 23:9 23:24 24:21 25:14	wildlife 17:17	19308 30.12
tank 28:6	25:2,12,23,23,24 26:11	26:23 27:13 28:2	with 17.17 work 16:18	2
taste 22:4				2,000 14:23 23:19
taste 22.4 tax 17:1	true 36:9	28:11 29:5,14	Written 6:12,13	27:7 29:9
terms 8:6,20	TRUST 2:9	30:6	X	20 4:7
thank 7:17 13:16	two 5:4 13:3 19:17	visited 33:7	X4:1,16	200 22:9
13:17 20:10,11	21:14 22:8 25:9	vitally 14:14	74 7.1,10	2004 12:11 23:3
24:3,4,9 27:17,19	26:7,20	vs 1:5	Y	25:21 28:23
29:17,18 30:23,24	U	W	yards 22:10	2006 21:8
33:19,20 34:18,19	U.S 19:1	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$ 2:15	Yeah 34:9	2007 15:12 26:1,2
35:13	understand 21:5	want 9:19 32:1	year 33:12	28:5
thing 24:15 32:24	22:1,14 24:23	wanted 13:19	yearly 23:10 26:24	2008 22:3,15 24:24
think 10:4 34:17	25:18,20 28:14	warranted 18:5	years 12:9	28:15 30:11,12
Third 20:2	understanding	30:20		2009 12:12 15:9
thirst 19:15	34:2	wasn't 21:20 22:9	Z	21:8
three 14:10 21:23	undertaken 8:12	22:10		2010 15:4,10
23:8 25:19 26:10	United 13:6	water 1:6 3:3 13:5	0	2011 15:11
26:21 28:24 29:3	unnamed 19:4 26:4	16:12,17 17:15	084.2149 36:15	2012 23:20 27:9
tile 28:6	unnatural 31:14	18:22 21:7 22:11	1	2014 13:9
Timber 1:9 2:17	untoward 31:22	23:22 25:16 27:12	1 4.10 0.5 24 10.5 7	2016 1:19 7:23 9:10
5:17 7:6,10 24:22	untreated 32:13	29:24 31:4 33:11	14:18 9:5,24 10:5,7 10:11	36:9
25:18 26:8,8 27:5	upstream 19:10,11	waters 17:13 18:24		205 2:19
Timberline 1:8	USEPA 31:7	19:7 25:12 26:13	1(d) 8:7 1.8 23:20 27:9	20th 6:10 34:24
2:17 5:16 7:6,10		28:17,19 29:13		217-782-1090 2:10
14:10 28:2,13	V	watersheds 19:3	10 4:5,18,18 10-84 1:5 5:12	217/524-8509 2:4
			1 0-04 1.3 3.12	
	ı	ı	I	<u> </u>

December 13, 2016

•			Page 44
217/528-3674 2:14 217/544-8491 2:21 22 7:23 9:10,23 24 4:8 2459 2:20 25043 3:3 27 4:9 23:15 27,000 15:13,23 29 4:10 2nd 2:9	700 2:19 75,000 15:5 767 3:3 8 9 90,000 22:15 900,000 23:18 27:7 29:9		
3 3 21:13 25:7 30:8 3.9 23:10 27:1 300 15:6 31 4:11 3150 2:13 33 4:12 34 4:13 36 27:4 37 23:14 38 27:5 3rd 11:12			
4 40,000 15:10,11 46 23:16 5 54:3 5(a) 8:8 50,000 18:13 30:5 500 2:9 57730-0767 3:4			
5th 2:19 11:20 6 605/673-5223 3:4 62705-2459 2:20 62705-5776 2:14 62706 2:10 62794-9274 2:3 66,000 15:9 7 7 4:4			