

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

IN RE: PROPOSED REVISION )  
OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERMIT )  
FOR MARQUIS ENERGY, LLC, )  
IN HENNEPIN, ILLINOIS )

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of the Public Hearing  
held on the 22nd day of July, 2008, at the Putnam County  
High School, 402 East Silverspoon Avenue, Granville,  
Illinois.

PRESIDED BY: MS. DANA VETTERHOFFER,  
Hearing Officer

1  
2           THE HEARING OFFICER: Good evening,  
3 everyone. It's about 7 o'clock, so we can get  
4 started. My name is Dana Vetterhoffer, and I work  
5 for the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency,  
6 and I want to thank everyone for coming out this  
7 evening as the Illinois EPA believes that these  
8 public hearings are a crucial part of the permit  
9 review process. I have been designated to serve  
10 this evening as the hearing officer for this  
11 matter. As the hearing officer, my sole purpose  
12 tonight is to make sure this proceeding runs  
13 properly and in accordance with the rules.  
14 Therefore, it is not my job to answer questions  
15 regarding the permit process or the permit itself.

16                           This is a public hearing before  
17 the Illinois EPA in the matter of revisions to an  
18 air pollution control construction permit  
19 submitted to us by Marquis Energy, LLC, which I  
20 will refer to from this point on as Marquis.  
21 Marquis has submitted an application to the  
22 Illinois EPA to revise its air pollution control  
23 construction permit for an ethanol manufacturing

1 plant it is building in Hennepin, Illinois. The  
2 revisions will increase the permitted production  
3 capacity of the plant from 110 million gallons  
4 ethanol per year to 125 million gallons ethanol  
5 per year and also increase permitted levels of  
6 plant emissions and amounts of grain processed,  
7 feed produced, and ethanol shipped from the plant.  
8 No new equipment or facilities are being added to  
9 the construction permit, but rather the production  
10 increases will be the result of improved operating  
11 procedures at the plant. The revisions would not  
12 be a significant new source or modification under  
13 the federal rules for Prevention of Significant  
14 Deterioration at 40 CFR 52.21 or the state rules  
15 for Major Stationary Sources Construction and  
16 Modification at 35 Illinois Administrative Code  
17 Part 203.

18 The Illinois EPA has made a  
19 preliminary determination that the project is  
20 entitled to a construction permit and has prepared  
21 a draft permit for review. The Illinois EPA is  
22 holding a public comment period and a hearing to  
23 accept comments from the public on the proposed

1 issuance of a permit for this project prior to  
2 making a final decision on the application. This  
3 hearing is being held for the purpose of  
4 explaining the Illinois EPA's draft permit, to  
5 respond to questions, and to receive public  
6 comments on the draft permit.

7                   It is now approximately 7:03 on  
8 Tuesday, July 22, 2008. This public hearing is  
9 being held under the provisions of the Illinois  
10 EPA's Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan  
11 hearings which can be found at 35 Illinois  
12 Administrative Code, Part 166. Copies of these  
13 procedures can be obtained from me upon request or  
14 they can be accessed on the web site of the  
15 Illinois Pollution Control Board, and the address  
16 to that web site is [www.ipcb.state.il.us](http://www.ipcb.state.il.us).

17                   A public hearing means that  
18 this is strictly an informational hearing. It is  
19 an opportunity for the Illinois EPA to provide you  
20 with information concerning the permit and it is  
21 also an opportunity for you to provide information  
22 to the Illinois EPA concerning the permit. This  
23 is not a contested hearing. I would like to

1 explain how tonight's hearing is going to proceed.  
2 First, we'll have the Illinois EPA staff members  
3 present tonight introduce themselves and identify  
4 their responsibilities at the agency. Then we  
5 will have any representatives of Marquis introduce  
6 themselves if they wish to. Following this  
7 overview I will allow the public to ask questions  
8 or provide comments. You are not required to  
9 verbalize your comments as written comments are  
10 given the same consideration and may be submitted  
11 to the agency at any time within the public  
12 comment period which ends at midnight on August  
13 21, 2008. Any person who wishes to make oral  
14 comments may do so as long as the statements are  
15 relevant to the issues that are addressed at the  
16 hearing and such person has indicated on the  
17 registration card that he or she would like to  
18 comment. If you have lengthy comments or  
19 questions, it might be helpful to submit them to  
20 me in writing, and I will ensure that they are  
21 included in the hearing record as exhibits.  
22 Please keep your comments and questions relevant  
23 to the issue at hand. If your comments fall

1 outside the scope of this hearing, I may ask you  
2 to proceed to another issue. All speakers will  
3 have the option of directing questions to the  
4 Illinois EPA representative or they can just make  
5 general comments or do both. Representatives of  
6 Marquis are also free to answer questions if they  
7 are willing to do so, but I am not in a position  
8 to force them to answer questions this evening.  
9 Our panel members will make every attempt to  
10 address the questions presented, but I will not  
11 permit the speakers to argue, cross-examine, or  
12 engage in a prolonged dialogue with our panel  
13 member.

14 For the purpose of allowing  
15 everyone to have a chance to comment, generally we  
16 have a time limit for comments. Since there are  
17 so few people here tonight, I don't think that is  
18 going to be a problem, but if we could keep  
19 individual comments to around 10 to 15 minutes and  
20 people representing organizations to 15 to 20  
21 minutes. I would like to ask commenters to please  
22 avoid any unnecessary repetition. So if anyone  
23 before you has already presented testimony that is

1 contained in your written or oral comments, please  
2 skip over those issues when you testify. Remember  
3 all written comments whether or not you say them  
4 out loud will become part of the official hearing  
5 record and will be considered. After everyone has  
6 had an opportunity to speak and provided that time  
7 permits, we will allow anyone who didn't have  
8 enough time the first time around to speak again,  
9 but, again, I don't see that being an issue with  
10 how few people are here tonight.

11 There are some registration  
12 cards on the table outside. If you would like to  
13 make a comment this evening, please fill out the  
14 card and then give it to me or give it to the  
15 gentleman who you saw at the table up front, Brad  
16 Frost. Those cards are what I will use to  
17 determine who has expressed an interest in  
18 speaking tonight. Anyone who fills out one of  
19 those cards will also receive a letter announcing  
20 Illinois EPA's decision. That letter will direct  
21 you to the web site where you can retrieve all the  
22 details including the Illinois EPA's  
23 Responsiveness Summary. The Illinois EPA



1 the purpose of making our administrative record.  
2 For her benefit, please keep the general  
3 background noise level in this room to a minimum  
4 so she can hear everything that's said. Also,  
5 keep in mind that any comments from those other  
6 than the person at the microphone will not be  
7 recorded by the court reporter and will only serve  
8 as a disruption to her. This rule applies not  
9 only when audience members are speaking but also  
10 when the panel from the Illinois EPA is speaking.  
11 Please remember that the court reporter can only  
12 record one person speaking at a time, so please do  
13 not speak over one another. When it's your turn  
14 to speak, please speak clearly and slowly into the  
15 microphone so that the court reporter can  
16 understand what you are saying. Also, when you  
17 speak, state your name, spell your last name, and  
18 if applicable, state any governmental body,  
19 organization, or association that you represent.  
20 People who have requested to speak will be called  
21 upon in the order they registered to make a  
22 statement.

23 Before we start with Illinois

1 EPA's presentation, I would like to record a  
2 number of preliminary documents into the official  
3 record as exhibits. I would like to record as  
4 Exhibit No. 1 a copy of the Notice of Public  
5 Hearing. Exhibit No. 2 is a copy of the Project  
6 Summary, and Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Draft  
7 Construction Permit for Marquis. A copy of all  
8 three of these exhibits are on the table out front as  
9 well. Also, we have received two sets of comments  
10 already in this matter, and I will read those into  
11 the record as well. Comments of Concerned  
12 Citizens of Putnam and Bureau Counties, that will  
13 be in the record as Exhibit 4. And comments of  
14 the Hennepin Business and Betterment Association  
15 will be in the record as Exhibit No. 5.

16 Now I will ask that the  
17 Illinois EPA staff member to my right introduce  
18 himself and make his brief presentation.

19 MR. PATEL: Thank you. Good evening,  
20 Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Minesh Patel. I  
21 am permit engineer with the Bureau of Air. I will  
22 be giving you a brief description of the proposed  
23 changes to the ethanol plant.

1                   Marquis Energy, LLC, was issued  
2 a construction permit for an ethanol plant in  
3 Hennepin in September 2006. The principal  
4 products produced at the ethanol plant are fuel  
5 ethanol and distiller grains. The original  
6 permit allowed Marquis Energy to produce up to 110  
7 million gallons of denatured ethanol per year.

8                   Marquis Energy has requested an  
9 increase in the permitted capacity of its new  
10 ethanol plant to 125 million gallons per year. The  
11 increase will not require construction of new  
12 equipment and/or facilities but rather be achieved  
13 through improved operating procedures for the  
14 plant as achieved at other similar plants. These  
15 improvements are reflected in a higher guarantee  
16 for plant capacity from the firm that designed  
17 this plant.

18                   This increase in plant  
19 production would be accompanied by increases in  
20 the amount of corn processed, feed produced, and  
21 ethanol shipped and associated increases in  
22 permitted emissions of certain units at the plant.  
23 The requested increases in emissions from the

1 plant are not proportional to the increase in  
2 production.

3                   First, emissions from some  
4 units need not be increased as emissions from  
5 these units were originally permitted at levels  
6 that accommodate operation at the higher level of  
7 throughput. For example, the boilers and the  
8 grain milling operations are already permitted for  
9 levels of emissions consistent with operation at  
10 the requested level of production.

11                   Second, the requested increase  
12 in VOM emissions for loadout of ethanol would  
13 address both increases in permitted capacity and a  
14 change in the manner in which VOM emissions from  
15 loadout are determined.

16                   Finally, the emissions from  
17 certain other units would be increased  
18 proportional to the increase in production. These  
19 units include grain handling operation, feed  
20 dryers, feed coolers, fermentation operation,  
21 storage tanks, and the cooling tower.

22                   This plant is not considered a  
23 new major stationary source under the federal

1 rules for Prevention of Significant Deterioration  
2 of Air Quality, 40 CFR 52.21. In particular,  
3 ethanol plants are not in one of the 28 listed  
4 categories of sources for which the major source  
5 threshold is the potential to emit 100 tons per  
6 year or more. This is a consequence of recent  
7 changes to the PSD rules by USEPA in which the  
8 ethanol plants are reclassified as not being  
9 chemical process plants.

10 With the requested increase in  
11 permitted capacity, the permitted emissions of the  
12 plant for CO, carbon monoxide, VOM, and  
13 particulate matter would be more than 100 tons per  
14 year. However, due to the changes in the PSD  
15 rules as discussed, the plant still would not be  
16 considered a major PSD source because the  
17 potential emissions after the proposed changes as  
18 limited by the permit would be less than the  
19 applicable major source thresholds for PSD rules,  
20 which is now 250 tons per year. It should be  
21 noted that Marquis Energy has not requested to  
22 remove any control devices because of this change  
23 in PSD rules. However, requested increase in

1 emissions due to increase in production is  
2 facilitated by changes in the PSD rule.

3           After the proposed changes, the  
4 plant would be classified as a major source under  
5 Illinois' Clean Air Act Permit Program pursuant to  
6 Title V of the Clean Air Act. This is because the  
7 increase in the permitted emissions has resulted  
8 in at least one pollutant in excess of 100 tons  
9 per year. Accordingly, Marquis Energy would be  
10 required to obtain a CAAPP permit for the  
11 operation of the plant rather than a state  
12 operating permit.

13           As was required in the original  
14 permit, the revised permit also requires Marquis  
15 Energy to use appropriate equipment for effective  
16 control of emissions from the various operations  
17 at the plant. This includes fabric filters to  
18 control particulate matter emissions from the  
19 principal grain handling operations, milling of  
20 grain, and handling and loadout of dried feed and  
21 also a scrubber to control organic material  
22 emissions from the fermentation units and  
23 combustion control with natural gas fired thermal

1 oxidizers for emissions of organic material,  
2 carbon monoxide, and particulate matter from the  
3 feed dryers. The oxidizers also control organic  
4 material emissions from certain units in mash  
5 preparation area, distillation operation, and  
6 solid separation and evaporation units.

7                   The Illinois EPA has reviewed  
8 the materials submitted by Marquis Energy and has  
9 determined that the application for the increased  
10 production shows that it will comply with the  
11 applicable state and federal regulations. The  
12 conditions for the proposed draft permit contains  
13 limitations and requirements on the activities of  
14 the facility. The permit also establishes  
15 appropriate testing, monitoring, recordkeeping,  
16 and reporting requirements.

17                   In closing, the Illinois EPA is  
18 proposing to grant a revised construction permit.  
19 We welcome any comments or questions from the  
20 public on our proposed action. Thank you.

21                   THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We also  
22 have another representative of the Illinois EPA  
23 tonight sitting at the back of the room, Chris

1 Romaine. Did any representative of Marquis wish  
2 to introduce themselves or make a statement?

3 MR. MARQUIS: I'll just introduce myself.  
4 I'm Mark Marquis, president and general manager of  
5 Marquis Energy, LLC.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We can proceed  
7 to the public comment and question period. I only  
8 have two cards from people who actually indicated  
9 that they wanted to make verbal statements here  
10 tonight. If anyone else actually wanted to speak,  
11 anyone who filled out a different registration  
12 card, please -- you can either let me know or let  
13 the gentleman outside know.

14 Okay. The first name I have is  
15 David Raikes representing Laborers Local Union  
16 393, and if Mr. Raikes could come to this podium  
17 right here and make your statement.

18 MR. RAIKES: Can I speak a little bit  
19 later?

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Sure. We only have  
21 one other card. The next card is Alex Sagady  
22 representing Concerned Citizens of Putnam and  
23 Bureau Counties.

1           MR. SAGADY: Thank you, Mrs. Vetterhoffer,  
2 was it?

3           THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.

4           MR. SAGADY: My name is Alex Sagady. I'm  
5 an environmental consultant for Concerned Citizens  
6 of Putnam and Bureau Counties. Let the record  
7 show that I provided a copy of -- paper copy of  
8 our statement to Engineer Patel just before the  
9 hearing started.

10                           It's noted in the staff report  
11 and admitted by the company that there's been no  
12 change in the process equipment or the emission  
13 controls for the proposed facility, but there is a  
14 change in the admitted process rates for some of  
15 the equipment, and there are changes in some of  
16 the emission factors for some of the equipment.  
17 And the proper question that should be before Ohio  
18 -- or, excuse me, Illinois EPA is during which  
19 permit proceeding, the 2006 proceeding or the  
20 present proceeding, did the applicant tell the  
21 truth about its actual process -- maximum process  
22 rates on all of its equipment and maximum  
23 potential to emit on all of its equipment. In

1 our view the issuance of this modification permit  
2 essentially rewards the applicant for submitting  
3 understated process and potential to emit  
4 information during the 2006 proceeding, and one  
5 really must question which sets of data are  
6 actually correct when there's been no changes in  
7 process equipment or emission controls.

8 So the essence of the current  
9 proceeding is to reward the past erroneous  
10 characterizations of the Marquis Energy process  
11 parameters, maximum process parameters, and  
12 maximum control permit to -- to emit. Now, under  
13 the circumstances, when there's some doubt about  
14 what the actual emissions are going to be, it's  
15 certainly justifiable for Illinois EPA not to  
16 issue this modification permit and instead to wait  
17 until the first compliant stack emission test  
18 studies are due so that this facility can actually  
19 say what its emissions are, and we would urge  
20 that to be the case, that this permit not be  
21 granted until an actual first set of stack test  
22 compliant studies are submitted by the company.

23 Now, one of the statements was

1 that the -- there's no applicability between the  
2 Federal Resource Review Rules and this facility.  
3 That's not correct. This facility does contain  
4 one of the listed source categories, and that is  
5 the fossil fuel boilers greater than 250 million  
6 BTU per hour and -- heat input. And that is  
7 actually a statutory requirement of the Clean Air  
8 Act, and it's also a requirement of the  
9 regulations that facilities that have that  
10 emission at the hundred ton level are major  
11 stationary sources under both the Act and the  
12 Regulations.

13 In addition to being a fossil fuel  
14 combustion boiler, this facility is also a fuel  
15 transfer facility or an energy conversion facility  
16 that converts biomass corn fuel to ethanol liquid  
17 fuel, and such fuel conversion facilities are also  
18 covered by the current and in place existing PSD  
19 rule. USEPA may have had the intention of trying  
20 to exempt ethanol process plants from the  
21 definition of chemical process unit when they  
22 enacted their rule, but they did not alter in any  
23 way the requirements for considering that fossil

1 fuel combustion facilities over 250 million BTU per  
2 hour and fuel conversion facilities are  
3 nevertheless covered, and under the circumstances  
4 this permit should not be issued because it has  
5 not undergone -- the facility has not undergone  
6 major stationary source review, and such review is  
7 required, in fact, contrary to the statement  
8 by Illinois EPA.

9 I would also have to say that in order  
10 to make this fit into some kind of regulatory  
11 exception, you would have to consider this plant as two  
12 sources under the Clean Air Act, under some kind of  
13 nested major and a minor approach where the boilers are  
14 not the entire facility, but we don't think that  
15 complies with Clean Air Act. In fact, aspects of that  
16 approach that EPA has applied with so-called nested  
17 minor theories just aren't supported by past  
18 litigation that's taking place under the Clean Air  
19 Act addressing the definition of the source.

20 So, as far as individual equipment,  
21 the fermentation scrubber exhaust was not calculated at  
22 the same emission factor in 2008 as it was in 2006.  
23 The applicant in 2006 said that the emission factor

1 of the fermentation scrubber acetaldehyde emissions was  
2 110 pounds of acetaldehyde per million gallons of  
3 ethanol production. In 2008, on the same  
4 equipment, the rate was lowered to 107 pounds  
5 of acetaldehyde per million gallons of equipment  
6 -- or million gallons of production, and there is  
7 absolutely no basis or statement or justification  
8 for this reduction from 110 to 107 in the fermentation  
9 acetaldehyde emission factor. If there is no  
10 justification for for such a factor, the permit should  
11 be denied for failure to provide sufficient  
12 justification, sufficient basis. Failure to provide  
13 adequate information about the basis of 107 pounds per  
14 million gallon production rate factor denies  
15 commenters due process of rights and law by  
16 failing to make a complete agency record in  
17 justification of this permit.

18 Marquis Energy never submitted any  
19 documentation that justified the controlled  
20 acetaldehyde factors with respect to its submittal of  
21 data on glacial lakes energy stack tests. Marquis  
22 Energy submitted information, a complete description of  
23 glacial energy compliance stack test studies, but if

1 you look at the acetaldehyde emission rate from the  
2 glacial lake study submitted by Marquis in 2006, you'll  
3 see that the calculated factor based on the  
4 glacial lake study for acetaldehyde is 245 pounds of  
5 acetaldehyde per million gallons of ethanol production,  
6 which is considerably higher than the 107 and  
7 the 110 pounds of acetaldehyde per million  
8 gallons of production that was used in the -- in the  
9 original application. And so they never justified  
10 -- they said this is relevant to their  
11 application, but they never justified why 245 pounds of  
12 acetaldehyde per million gallons of ethanol production  
13 is not an appropriate factor. Never said anything  
14 about that either in 2006 or 2008

15 Marquis Energy's fermentation  
16 scrubber acetaldehyde mass rate emissions, when you  
17 compare it to the work that was done by the Minnesota  
18 Pollution Control Agency on acetaldehyde, a review of  
19 all the stack tests that they did there in that state,  
20 you find that the -- that the planned acetaldehyde  
21 emission rate is much too low considering the  
22 Minnesota experience on all the test reflected  
23 plants that were 50 million gallons per

1 year ethanol production or less. Similarly,  
2 experience in Nebraska with acetaldehyde emissions for  
3 fermentation scrubbers were that plants smaller than  
4 this one had mass rate emissions higher than what you  
5 are proposing here, and there just isn't any kind of  
6 reconciliation between these kind of records and  
7 industry performance on what's being proposed in  
8 the permit

9                   Now, finally, on the thermal  
10 oxydizer, the original -- the original thermal  
11 oxydizer emission factor that was used was  
12 0.0084 pounds of acetaldehyde from the thermal oxydizer  
13 per ton of DDGS process rate. So it's 0.0084, and  
14 that was what was used in the -- in the 2006 permit,  
15 but in the 2008 permit the rate is improperly  
16 rounded off to 0.008 pounds of acetaldehyde per million  
17 BTU, and 0.08 -- this emission factor you should be  
18 able to calculate this out to five significant figures,  
19 and they have calculated it only to one significant  
20 figure, and they used two significant figures in the  
21 2006 proceeding. The use of the proper number of  
22 significant figures in engineering calculations is a  
23 matter of -- of professional acceptance, and to round

1 off such a number in this manner means that the  
2 emission calculation was improperly carried out. And,  
3 further, this is just enough to put them over the ten  
4 ton acetaldehyde major half source limit. So, again,  
5 there are higher rates predicted from the glacial  
6 lakes stack test study submitted by the company,  
7 but the company never reconciled their planned  
8 emission rates with the glacial lake  
9 experience that they themselves put in their  
10 application. And, again, the Minnesota experience  
11 on acetaldehyde from thermal oxidizers, dryer thermal  
12 oxidizer process train shows that the emission rate is  
13 too low that was being considered.

14 So, all in all, this plant is a  
15 major source for criteria pollutants subject  
16 to the PSD rule, and it is a major source for  
17 hazardous air pollutants for acetaldehyde. This plant  
18 has not been subjected to required control technology  
19 and air quality impact reviews. It has not been  
20 subjected to hazardous air pollutant  
21 required control technology review and  
22 evaluation, and does not, in fact, require  
23 conformance with the federal MACT standards.

1 All in all, there is good reason to, number one,  
2 not issue this permit, and number two, to enforce  
3 -- initiate enforcement action against Marquis under  
4 the Clean Air Act enforcement provisions for violation  
5 of new source review, state of implementation plan  
6 requirements and hazardous air pollutant control  
7 requirements.

8 Thank you very much.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. The other  
10 card I have is for Mr. Raikes. Do you wish to  
11 make a comment at this time?

12 MR. RAIKES: Not at this time.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Is there anyone else  
14 in the audience tonight who wishes to make a verbal  
15 comment or has a question?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you read the  
17 fourth and five examples, or were you only going to  
18 put them into Patel's exhibit?

19 THE HEARING OFFICER: There was only one other  
20 comment, and the comment was the Concerned Citizens  
21 of Putnam and Bureau Counties, and the only other  
22 comment I received was from I believe the Hennepin  
23 association.

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: And you're not going to read them  
2 aloud? They're just going to be in the transcript?

3           THE HEARING OFFICER: That's correct, and you can  
4 request a copy of all of the exhibits from me, and if  
5 you -- even after the hearing tonight, if you want to  
6 give me your name and your address, I can make sure you  
7 get a copy of them.

8           AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can read it on the web.

9           THE HEARING OFFICER: The exhibits will not  
10 actually be posted on the web, but you can receive  
11 a copy of them from me.

12                               Okay. Any other questions or  
13 comments? As I don't see anyone else  
14 indicating that they wish to make a question or  
15 comment, we'll conclude the hearing. Again, I'll  
16 remind you that if you decide after this hearing  
17 to give some comment you would like to make that  
18 you didn't think of tonight, you can send that in  
19 as a written comment. Written comments will be  
20 considered as part of the record when Illinois EPA  
21 performs its permit review process and issues its  
22 final decision. I would also like to again remind  
23 everyone that the comment period for the record in

1       this matter closes on August 21, 2008. Therefore,  
2       any written comments must be postmarked before  
3       midnight on that date and sent to me to be  
4       accepted as part of the record. As I just  
5       indicated, copies of the transcript of the hearing  
6       tonight will be made available on the Illinois  
7       EPA's web site as soon as we obtain a copy from  
8       the court reporter and we're able to put it on the  
9       internet. The Illinois EPA's web site is  
10      www.epa.state.il.us. Any copies of the exhibits  
11      that I identified tonight are available upon  
12      request. You can direct your request to my  
13      attention.

14                               The time is now approximately 7:34.  
15      Again, seeing that there's no other members of the  
16      public who wish to make a comment or ask a  
17      question, that would conclude our hearing tonight.  
18      Thank you.

19   (Which were all the  
20   proceedings held in this  
21   matter.)

22  
23

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 ) SS:  
2 COUNTY OF GRUNDY )

3 I, BELINDA A. HARR, being first duly sworn on  
4 oath, say that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter doing  
5 business in the City of Morris, County of Grundy,  
6 Illinois; that I reported in shorthand the proceedings of  
7 the Public Hearing on the 22nd day of July, 2008, and  
8 that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my  
9 shorthand notes so taken aforesaid and contains all the  
10 proceedings given in said hearing.

11 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto set my  
12 hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2008.

13

14

\_\_\_\_\_  
BELINDA A. HARR  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
Ill. License No. 084-003215

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

