

1 ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

2 BUREAU OF AIR, PERMIT SECTION

3

4 IN THE MATTER OF:

5 Proposed Issuance of Construction
6 Permits/PSD Approvals to United States Steel
7 Corporation in Granite City and Gateway Energy &
8 Coke Company, LLC in Granite City

7

8

9

10 Public hearing held on Thursday, the 8th day of
11 November, 2007, at the hour of 7:00 p.m., at 4225
12 Old Alton Road, Granite City, Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 PATKES REPORTING SERVICE
23 (217)787-9314

24 REPORTER: CARLA J. BOEHL, CSR #084-002710

1 IEPA STAFF:

2 MR. JOHN KIM, Hearing Officer

3 MR. CHRISTOPHER ROMAINE
4 Manager - Construction Unit

5 MR. JASON SCHNEPP
6 Permit Engineer

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3		
4	Opening statement by Hearing Officer	4
5	Presentation by Jason Schnepf	12
6	PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	
7	Representative Tom Holbrook.	18
	Mayor Ed Hagnauer	19
8	Dr. Harry Briggs	21
	Dr. Virgil Kambarian	22
9	Jason Warner	24
	Kathy Andria	26/71
10	Dale Stewart	56
	Jason Chism	59
11	Russ Saltgaver	60
	Rosemarie Brown	63
12	Patrick McKeegan	64
	David Beard	65
13	Jonathan Ferry	66
	Edward Schmidt	68
14	Mary Richards	70
15	QUESTIONS BY:	
	Chris Duncan	33
16	Erica Gorman	40
	Leah Martin	43
17	Amy Brewster	46
18		
19		
20	EXHIBITS	
21		IDENTIFIED
	Exhibit 1	11
22	Exhibit 2	11
	Exhibit 3	11
23	Exhibit 4	11
	Exhibit 5	11
24		

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Good evening.

3 It is now 7:05 on Thursday, November 8, 2007, and we
4 would like to begin.

5 My name is John Kim and I am
6 with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.
7 I have been designated to serve as the hearing
8 officer for this matter. As the hearing officer, my
9 sole purpose is to make sure that this proceeding
10 runs properly and in accordance with our procedural
11 rules. I will not be making any final decisions on
12 the permit applications that are the subject of this
13 hearing.

14 This is a public hearing
15 before the Illinois EPA to accept public comments in
16 two related matters. The first is for construction
17 permit approval for Gateway Energy and Coke Company,
18 LLC, for a heat recovery coke plant located adjacent
19 to U.S. Steel's Granite City Works in Granite City,
20 Illinois. In conjunction with this proposed coke
21 plant, U.S. Steel Corporation is seeking approval of
22 a construction permit for a coke conveyance system
23 at Granite City Works. The proposed coke plant and

23 receive public comments on the draft permits.

24 This hearing is being held

6

1 under the provisions of the Illinois EPA's
2 Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan Hearings
3 found in Title 35 of the Illinois Administrative
4 Code Part 166, Subpart A. Copies of these
5 procedures can be obtained from me upon request or
6 they can be accessed on the website of the Illinois
7 Pollution Control Board at www.ipcb.state.il.us.

8 I would like to explain how
9 tonight's hearing is going to proceed. First,
10 Illinois EPA staff members present this evening will
11 introduce themselves and make presentations.
12 Following this overview, I will allow the public to
13 ask questions or provide comments. Representatives
14 of U.S. Steel and Gateway Energy that are present
15 have expressed their intention not to respond to any
16 questions that may be directed to them this evening,
17 though they are free to respond should they so
18 choose in the form of a public comment during the
19 public comment period.

20 You are not required to
21 verbalize your comment as written comments are given

22 the same consideration and may be submitted to the
23 Illinois EPA at any time within the public comment
24 period. The public comment period ends at midnight

7

1 on December 8, 2007.

2 Any person who wants to make
3 oral comments may do so this evening as long as the
4 statements are relevant to the issues that are
5 addressed at the hearing, and such person has
6 indicated on the registration card that he or she
7 would like to comment. These are the cards. They
8 are found at the table at the door at the back. If
9 you haven't filled out a card but you do wish to
10 speak, then please do so and I will work off these
11 cards.

12 If you have lengthy comments,
13 it might be helpful to submit them to me in writing
14 before the close of the comment period, and I will
15 insure that they are included in the hearing record
16 as exhibits. Please keep your comments and
17 questions relevant to the issue at hand. If your
18 comments fall outside the scope of this hearing, I
19 may ask you to proceed to another issue.

20 All speakers have the option

21 of directing questions to the Illinois EPA panel or
22 they can make general comments or do both. I am not
23 in a position to ask the permit applicants to
24 respond to any questions during this hearing. Our

8

1 panel members will make every attempt to answer the
2 questions presented, but I will not permit the
3 speakers to argue, cross-examine, or engage in a
4 prolonged dialog with our panel.

5 For the purposes of allowing
6 everyone to have a chance to comment, I am asking
7 that groups, organizations, and associations keep
8 their questions and comments limited to
9 approximately 15 minutes of time, and that
10 individuals keep their comments to approximately ten
11 minutes in time to allow everyone who desires to
12 speak an opportunity. In addition, I would like to
13 avoid unnecessary repetition. So if anyone before
14 you has presented testimony that is contained in
15 your written or oral comments, I would appreciate it
16 if you could skip over those issues when you
17 testify. After everyone has had an opportunity to
18 speak, and provided the time permits, we will allow
19 those who either ran out of time during their

20 initial comments or who have additional comments to
21 speak.

22 Please remember all written
23 comments, whether or not you say them out loud, will
24 become part of the official hearing record and will

9

1 be considered.

2 If you do fill out a
3 registration card, you will be receiving a letter
4 which announces the Illinois EPA's final decision.
5 The letter will also direct you to our website where
6 you can retrieve all details including the Illinois
7 EPA's responsiveness summary. The responsiveness
8 summary will attempt to answer all the relevant and
9 significant questions raised at this hearing or
10 submitted to me prior to the close of the comment
11 period. Again, the written record in this matter
12 will close on December 8, 2007. Therefore, I will
13 accept all written comments as long as they are
14 postmarked by midnight December 8, 2007.

15 During the comment period all
16 relevant comments, documents, or data will also be
17 placed into the hearing record as exhibits. Please
18 send all written documents or data to my attention

19 at the following address: John Kim, that's K-I-M,
20 Hearing Officer, Illinois Environmental Protection
21 Agency, 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box
22 19276, Springfield, Illinois 62794. That address is
23 also the address that is listed on the public notice
24 for the hearing tonight. To date I have received

10

1 several pieces of correspondence, and those will all
2 be placed into the record as public comments.

3 For anyone who wishes to make
4 comments or ask questions, I would like to inform
5 you that we have a court reporter here who is taking
6 a verbatim record of the proceedings for the purpose
7 of making our administrative record. For her
8 benefit, I would ask that everyone please keep the
9 general background noise level in this room to a
10 minimum so she can hear everything that is said.
11 When you are speaking, you will speak at the podium
12 here and it would be helpful if you could face the
13 court reporter to allow her to get a better handle
14 on everything that you are saying.

15 Also, please keep in mind that
16 any comments from those other than the person at the
17 microphone will not be recorded by the court

18 reporter and will only act as a disruption. This
19 rule applies not only when audience members are
20 speaking but also when the panel from the Illinois
21 EPA is speaking. When it is your turn, please spoke
22 clearly and slowly into the microphone so she can
23 understand what you are saying.

24 Also, when you begin to speak,

11

1 please state your name and if applicable any
2 governmental body, organization, or association that
3 you represent. For the benefit of our court
4 reporter we will ask that you spell your last name.
5 People who have requested to speak will be called
6 upon in the order they registered to make a
7 statement.

8 Before we start with our
9 presentation, I would like to note that certain
10 documents have been marked into the official record
11 as exhibits. Exhibit Number 1 is a copy of the
12 Notice of Comment Period and Public Hearing.
13 Exhibit Number 2 is a copy of the Gateway Energy
14 Coke Plant Project Summary. Exhibit Number 3 is a
15 copy of the U.S. Steel Coke Conveyance System
16 Project Summary. Exhibit Number 4 is a copy of the

17 Draft Construction Permit as would be issued to
18 Gateway Energy. And Exhibit Number 5 is a copy of
19 the Draft Construction Permit as would be issued to
20 U.S. Steel.

21 I will now ask the Illinois
22 EPA staff who are present here to introduce
23 themselves. They can make a short presentation.
24 After that we will begin with taking comments.

12

1 MR. ROMAINE: Good evening. My
2 name is Christopher Romaine. I am manager of the
3 construction unit for the Air Permit Section.

4 MR. SCHNEPP: Good evening. My
5 name is Jason Schnepf. I am a permit engineer with
6 the Bureau of Air. I will be giving you a brief
7 description of the air pollution control aspects of
8 the proposed project.

9 Gateway Energy and Coke
10 Company has submitted an application for a permit to
11 construct a heat recovery coke plant adjacent to
12 United States Steel's Granite City Works. The coke
13 plant would be designed to process 1.1 million tons
14 of coal per year, yielding approximately 740,000
15 tons of coke per year. The coke from the plant will

16 be used for the production of iron in the two
17 existing blast furnaces at the Granite City Works or
18 sold for use elsewhere. The proposed coke plant
19 would also recover the waste heat from the coke
20 manufacturing process to produce steam that would be
21 sent to the Granite City Works.

22 In conjunction with this
23 proposed coke plant, U.S. Steel is proposing to
24 construct a coke conveyance system. This system

13

1 would handle coke from the proposed Gateway coke
2 plant and transfer it to the Granite City Works.
3 Although this proposed coke conveyance system is the
4 subject of a separate application submitted by U.S.
5 Steel, a combination of the proposed heat recovery
6 coke plant and the proposed coke conveyance system
7 are considered to constitute a single project.

8 The proposed coke plant would
9 have heat recovery coke ovens. The design and
10 operation of heat recovery coke ovens which are wide
11 and relatively shallow are different than that of
12 traditional byproduct coke ovens which are tall and
13 narrow. A byproduct coke oven is designed and
14 operated so that the volatiles and combustion

15 products driven off the coal are collected
16 downstream of the oven and processed in a byproduct
17 plant to recover chemicals such as benzene, toluene,
18 zylene, coal tar and ammonia. The coke oven gas
19 remaining after the byproduct plant is then used as
20 fuel in the heating system of the coke oven and in
21 other combustion units at its source.

22 Byproduct coke ovens must be
23 kept at a positive pressure to prevent air from
24 entering the ovens, which would oxidize recoverable

14

1 products and overheat the ovens. In contrast, in a
2 heat recovery coke oven, coal volatiles are oxidized
3 or burned inside the oven. The ovens are operated
4 under negative pressure, adding air from the outside
5 to oxidize the volatile material and enable
6 combustion to occur in the oven system. As a
7 consequence, byproduct coke ovens and heat recovery
8 coke ovens have substantially different
9 characteristics with respect to their emissions and
10 the requirements for control of emissions.

11 The largest emission point at
12 the coke plant would be the main stack. Emissions
13 of sulphur dioxide and particulate from the main

13 contemporaneous and credible emission decreases that
14 have occurred or will occur at the Granite City
15 Works.

16 The proposed changes at the
17 source would result in increases in emissions of
18 particulate matter that exceed the thresholds
19 established for a major modification under both the
20 federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration
21 Rules and the state rules for Major Stationary
22 Sources Construction and Modification. The rules
23 for Major Stationary Sources Construction and
24 Modification require implementation of lowest

16

1 achievable emission rate, emission offsets,
2 compliance by existing sources and an analysis of
3 alternatives. The PSD rules require a Best
4 Available Control Technology determination and an
5 ambient air quality analysis related to emissions of
6 particulate matter and other analyses of the
7 projects' potential impacts. The air quality
8 analysis submitted by the source for this project
9 shows that it will not cause a violation of the
10 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for
11 particulate matter. The Illinois EPA's initial

12 review concludes that the proposed control measures
13 will provide BACT and LAER for the project.

14 Under nonattainment New Source
15 Review rules, the source must also obtain emission
16 offsets of PM10 emission increases from the project.
17 As a result the source must obtain and maintain
18 approximately 268 tons of PM10 emission offsets from
19 sources in the St. Louis, Missouri, Metro-East,
20 Illinois, nonattainment area. Emission offsets
21 achieved by vacuum sweeping of certain roads and
22 roadways are currently planned that will be adequate
23 to offset the majority of the PM10 emissions of the
24 proposed project. The remainder of the required

17

1 emission offsets will be provided from the
2 installation and operation of a system by U.S. Steel
3 to remove sulphur compounds or desulphurize coke
4 oven gas. This system will also act to reduce the
5 PM emissions that occur when this coke oven gas is
6 burned as fuel in the Granite City Works.
7 Construction of this system will occur such that it
8 is complete prior to startup of the proposed coke
9 plant.

10 In closing, the Illinois EPA

11 has reviewed materials submitted by U.S. Steel and
12 Gateway and has determined that the application for
13 this project applies with applicable state and
14 federal standards. The Illinois EPA is proposing to
15 grant construction permits for installation of U.S.
16 Steel's coke conveyance system and Gateway's heat
17 recovery coke plant. We welcome any comments or
18 questions on our proposed action. Thank you.

19 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Does anyone
20 have any questions as to how the hearing will
21 proceed tonight before we begin to take public
22 comments? Okay.

23 The first speaker will be
24 Representative Tom Holbrook.

18

1 REPRESENTATIVE HOLBROOK: Thank
2 you. I don't know if the podium works in this
3 situation.

4 I was here last night. This
5 is a project, I think, for multiple public hearings.
6 I have already filed comments in a letter dated
7 October 25, and those stand on record also. There
8 is one for this hearing also. But I wanted to come
9 and add additional public comments at this time,

10 both last night and tonight.

11 I support this project and I
12 thank the IEPA for issuing the initial permits in
13 this case. I can tell you that this facility is
14 entirely located within my district. I have been in
15 over seven terms and I have yet to see a project
16 receive so much support as this one has. And why do
17 they feel that way? They think that it is a viable
18 project and it is both environmentally and
19 economically sound and positive for this community.

20 I can also tell you that we
21 are on a very weak grid here in southern Illinois.
22 Any additional power for that grid, whether taking
23 out of it or putting in, would be positive for our
24 area, and that I believe that two years ago that we

19

1 consumed a record use of power south of Springfield,
2 and that would do nothing but help our grid when you
3 look at the supply and demand situation. Even if
4 they are supplying their own power and not buying it
5 off the grid, I think that's something positive for
6 our area.

7 I think the antiquated
8 equipment is probably an Achilles Heel of this

9 facility. Many of these things go back to the 1920s
10 when they were created, and I think to make this
11 facility viable for the next couple of decades we
12 absolutely have to have these upgrades to this
13 facility. I am in full support of it. I would ask
14 you to be in support of it, and I would also ask
15 that you folks survey all who are speaking tonight.
16 Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you.
19 And if I mispronounce anyone's name, I apologize.
20 Mayor Ed Hagnauer.

21 MAYOR HAGNAUER: Thank you,
22 Mr. Kim. My name is Ed Hagnauer, H-A-G-N-A-U-E-R.
23 I am the mayor of Granite City. As mayor of Granite
24 City I am committed to doing everything I can to

20

1 help our community grow and prosper so this
2 generation and future generations can live and raise
3 their families in a safe and vibrant area they are
4 proud to call home. I recognize this is not
5 something that I or any one person can accomplish
6 alone. It takes dedication and vision from all
7 corners of our roots, including elected officials,

8 the business community, our churches, our schools
9 and other important stakeholders.

10 That is why I, like many other
11 citizens, are strongly supporting doing the Works
12 projects, one proposed by U.S. Steel and the other
13 by Gateway Energy and Coke, LLC, a subsidiary of
14 Gateway Coal and Coke Company. These projects
15 include a coke conveyance system and also a
16 cogeneration boiler project and also a heat recovery
17 coke plant located adjacent to U.S. Steel Granite
18 City Works. These related projects will both
19 provide a significant economic boost to our region.

20 U.S. Steel's coke conveyance
21 system and Gateway Energy and Coke's heat recovery
22 plant project will translate into approximately 1100
23 good paying and skilled construction jobs at peak
24 development using local building and construction

21

1 trade workers. It will also mean approximately 70
2 new full time manufacturing jobs. Importantly, the
3 project will also improve the market competitiveness
4 of Granite City Works and employee stability of the
5 current 2,200 employees.

6 Additionally, the projects

7 will not only produce extensive economic benefits,
8 but they will do so in an environmentally
9 responsible manner using the latest technology.
10 Both projects will meet strict state and federal
11 guidelines to build and operate the facility.

12 I am also proud that the
13 Granite City council has unanimously endorsed these
14 projects and passed resolutions allowing them to
15 move forward. So I am here to ask that these
16 permits be allowed. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
19 speaker is Harry Briggs.

20 MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. Good
21 evening. My name is Dr. Harry A. Briggs. I am
22 superintendent of schools of the Granite City School
23 District. Previously on behalf of the school
24 district I submitted a letter of support for the

22

1 U.S. Steel projects. I am here this evening in this
2 public forum to reiterate the fact that the Granite
3 City School District and the Board of Education is
4 unilaterally supportive of this project and the
5 other project which was, I believe, talked about

4 MR. WARNER: My name is Jason
5 Warner, W-A-R-N-E-R. Good evening, Mr. Kim. Thank
6 you for allowing us to make comments tonight.

7 This project will release 286
8 million tons of particulate matter into a
9 nonattainment area, and this is a nonattainment area
10 so I am not exactly sure why we are here to begin
11 with. But the project also states that they will
12 offset this with other pollution controls. But I
13 imagine if we took all the permits in the past that
14 we took off -- sorry. I always get nervous at these
15 things.

16 So if we took them, if we
17 had -- if we hadn't approved all the permits that we
18 had in the past, we wouldn't be in this
19 nonattainment zone.

20 But be that as it may, I can
21 tell you why I am here. I am 35 years old and I
22 have a son who is six years old and we ride the bike
23 trails regularly and I also commute to work at least
24 two or three times a week on my bike. And I also

25

1 have an eight-month old daughter who soon will be
2 making those trips with us on the bike trails.

1 that are called precursors, meaning they can turn
2 into fine particulate. The new coke plant will add
3 268 tons of particulate to our air. I cannot even
4 begin to visualize the size of a ton of matter that
5 is 1/32 the size of a human hair. And yet U.S.
6 Steel and Gateway Coke are using the bigger size
7 particulate, and you are letting them, as a
8 surrogate for PM2.5. And you are letting them get
9 away with street sweeping to offset this when --

10 I have lots of notes that are
11 from last night that are jumbling together, so I
12 apologize if I repeat something.

13 U.S. Steel is not operating
14 within its legal limits. The Illinois Attorney
15 General has filed suit against the company for
16 violations of the Clean Air Act, and the company has
17 been in violation for many years. According to U.S.
18 EPA thousands of Americans are dying prematurely,
19 even when breathing levels of pollution that are
20 considered legal.

21 We hope with the new coke
22 plant things will be better, but we have deep
23 concerns about the ways that you are proposing to
24 handle the particulates and the offsets. U.S. Steel

1 In fact, last night Chris
2 Romaine said they didn't have to regulate carbon.
3 Well, I have got -- there is a partnership, for
4 those of you who don't know it, between Sierra Club
5 and the steel workers called the Blue-Green
6 Alliance. The president of the steel workers called
7 for regulation of emissions. This is a May 7, 2007,
8 press release, asserting that global warnings has
9 transformed the issue of pollution into the ultimate
10 health and safety issue. U.S. Steel workers
11 president Leo Gerard said today, told the North
12 American Labor Conference, that regulating both
13 carbon emissions in trade more stringently are
14 essential for addressing the global climate process.
15 We need to use regulation of global warming and we
16 will need to use this regulation as a powerful tool
17 to improve workers' lives both here in America and
18 across the globe. The U.S. steel workers have long
19 been a leading advocate in the labor movement with
20 environmental reforms.

21 He is saying this because when
22 you take care of the environment and you take care
23 of a plant so that it is in attainment and so it
24 makes it in compliance, then the plant is not going

1 to have to close. Because there are new particulate
2 standards coming and we need to address them now.
3 With a new modern facility operating in compliance
4 with environmental protection laws and the new
5 standards that are being developed, our children and
6 families should be healthier, and the company and
7 its workers and the city should prosper, and that's
8 what we all want.

9 I have one more thing to add
10 and then I will have a couple of questions at the
11 end. I am wondering if you could answer if there
12 was any effort to reach out to -- a special effort
13 for environmental justice, to reach out to the
14 community.

15 MR. ROMAINE: That's a question
16 that Brad needs to answer. Brad?

17 MR. FROST: My name is Brad Frost.
18 I am coordinator of community relations. Cathy, we
19 basically in our outreach, in our notification, we
20 reached out to groups that we were aware of which
21 include minority groups and groups from essentially
22 every other hearing that we have held in the
23 Metro-East area for about the past five or six
24 years. So it is certainly groups that attended

1 hearings in Alton, Granite City, the East St. Louis
2 area, we notified those groups.

3 MS. ANDRIA: Well, I would like
4 to -- and I will enter this into the record. But
5 within three miles there are 5700 people below
6 poverty level. There are almost 10,000 children
7 under 17, almost 3,000 of those are eight years and
8 less. I don't see any of them here. I think this
9 is a really big concern because there is a housing,
10 a low income housing unit within, I think,
11 three-tenths of a mile from the new coke plant,
12 four-tenths of a mile from the old coke plant.
13 There is a lot of asthma among those children.
14 There is bronchitis, emphysema. There is a lot of
15 heart disease and diabetes. And according to the
16 lung association those things are affected.

17 So what we really, really
18 want, we do want the coke plant. We do want the
19 workers protected and the families, and we want you
20 to do a really honest job of looking at it and not
21 let some sort of slight of hand have offsets that
22 aren't real. Thank you.

23 (Applause)

24 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next

1 speaker is Chris Duncan.

2 MR. DUNCAN: Hi, my name is Chris
3 Duncan, D-U-N-C-A-N. I am a third year law student
4 at Washington University and I am with the
5 Environmental Clinic there, and I am here on behalf
6 of the American Bottoms Conservancy.

7 My first question is, when
8 evaluating nonattainment PM2.5 offsets, did IEPA
9 consider the impact of the project on 24-hour PM2.5
10 levels?

11 MR. ROMAINE: No, we did not. The
12 issue of attainment of the air quality standard for
13 PM2.5 is something that the Illinois EPA, in fact
14 Illinois EPA and the state of Missouri, are
15 addressing as a separate matter as part of preparing
16 an attainment demonstration to bring the area into
17 compliance with the current air quality standard.

18 MR. DUNCAN: Okay. My second
19 question is in the draft coke plant permit, IEPA
20 states that for purposes of nonattainment PM source
21 review, PM10 serves as a surrogate for PM2.5 under
22 the U.S. EPA guidance. To what guidance is IEPA
23 referring?

24

MR. ROMAINE: I don't have a

34

1 specific document to identify, but it is a U.S. EPA
2 document that indicates that until U.S. EPA
3 completes its rulemaking to explain how New Source
4 Review regulations shall be implemented for PM2.5 as
5 PM2.5, that permitting shall continue to be
6 conducted using PM10 as a surrogate in place of
7 PM2.5.

8 MR. DUNCAN: Would it be possible
9 for you to send me this document at a later time, as
10 you don't know off the top of your head?

11 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, it is and if you
12 make that request in writing, a handwritten note is
13 fine, we can supply that document to you.

14 MR. DUNCAN: Thank you. My next
15 question is, IEPA states that it has found the
16 permit application has utilized BACT for emissions
17 of PM and PM10 and LAER for PM2.5. Did IEPA conduct
18 independent BACT and LAER analyses to determine
19 this?

20 MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

21 MR. DUNCAN: Is there any
22 documentation of your analysis?

23 MR. ROMAINE: The results of that
24 evaluation are contained in the project summary.

35

1 MR. DUNCAN: Well, in the project
2 summary, from what I have read, essentially it says
3 what is BACT and what is LAER. But I guess I am
4 really asking for any sort of findings as to the
5 effectiveness, like details of, you know, searches
6 of other states or data bases or other facts, those
7 are the sort of things that would lead to basically
8 supporting the argument for the final determination
9 that you made.

10 MR. ROMAINE: As explained, the key
11 piece of information that we are relying upon is the
12 U.S. EPA's standards that were adopted for national
13 maximum achievable control technology for coke ovens
14 which set standards that address the use of heat
15 recovery coke oven technology.

16 MR. DUNCAN: These EPA guidelines
17 address this type of coke oven?

18 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, they do.

19 MR. DUNCAN: Could I also get a
20 copy of those?

21 MR. ROMAINE: Those are available

22 on the internet at any copy of federal regulations.
23 You don't need me to provide those regulations to
24 you.

36

1 MR. DUNCAN: Well, could you at
2 least point me to the specific regulation filed or
3 where I can find a copy of the regs?

4 MR. ROMAINE: Certainly, 40 CFR 63,
5 Subpart L and Subpart CCCCC.

6 MR. DUNCAN: Okay. Why is the coke
7 conveyance system separated from the oven
8 construction permit?

9 MR. ROMAINE: Because it is being
10 constructed by another party, U.S. Steel. There is
11 a different permittee for that permit from the party
12 that is actually constructing the coke ovens.

13 MR. DUNCAN: I agree with that.
14 However, in the original set of permit applications,
15 there was no coke conveyance permits. So I am just
16 wondering what transpired that made you guys decide
17 to separate that out or was it just an initial
18 oversight?

19 MR. SCHNEPP: There actually was a
20 coke conveyance system in the original application.

21 It was later separated out. So if you look back at
22 the original submittal in July of 2006, you will
23 find a coke conveyance system in that application.

24 MR. DUNCAN: Well, I agree. I

37

1 realize this is a coke conveyance system. I guess
2 what I am asking is what was the reason for the
3 subsequent separation?

4 MR. SCHNEPP: And I think Chris
5 answered that as far as the permitting was handled,
6 we separated it from the application for the same
7 reason. We wanted to have two separate permits for
8 the two different permittees.

9 MR. DUNCAN: Okay. So this is a
10 corrective action then?

11 MR. ROMAINE: I will further state
12 that U.S. Steel and Gateway Energy took the
13 necessary actions to separate the applications. In
14 their original submittal they did not make that
15 distinction. But when they realized that Gateway
16 Energy could end up with a permit for a coke
17 conveyance system that they didn't operate or own,
18 U.S. Steel came in and applied for its own separate
19 permit for that part of the larger project.

20 MR. DUNCAN: Okay, thank you. And
21 my final question is a little bit long and I'll try
22 to make it as clear as possible, but just to help I
23 wrote down the question as well so you can follow
24 along.

38

1 As we just discussed, IEPA
2 states in the permit application that LAER was
3 utilized for PM2.5. We have also discussed the use
4 of PM10 as a New Source Review surrogate for PM2.5.
5 Considering this surrogacy, what exactly does it
6 mean when IEPA states that LAER was utilized for
7 PM2.5? Specifically, does it mean that IEPA
8 separately determined that the control measures were
9 LAER for PM2.5 or does this mean that IEPA
10 substituted PM10 BACT control measures because of
11 SPS? That was kind of long so if you want met to
12 clarify, no problem.

13 MR. ROMAINE: I have to think. It
14 is a subtle question you are asking me now, in what
15 manner PM10 was used as a surrogate. I'll first
16 comment and say at this point in time there is not
17 information for emissions of coke ovens expressly
18 for PM2.5. So the reason the U.S. EPA has taken

19 this step in part to allow PM10 to be used as a
20 surrogate is a very pragmatic one, that there simply
21 isn't a test method, a stronghold for a basis of
22 testing of emissions to implement emission standards
23 directly as to PM2.5. In those circumstances you
24 have to rely on the one for which there is in fact a

39

1 body of data to establish emission standards which
2 is in fact traditional particulate matter as PM10.

3 Even then there has been a
4 little bit of a challenge in terms of addressing
5 emissions for certain types of units which again
6 there is not a lot of a body of data that is of the
7 same level of quality as you have in filtering
8 particulate matter.

9 So with that said, I do know
10 we established limitations that address emissions of
11 PM10. However, I think in fact that it is also
12 setting limits for emissions of PM2.5. Even though
13 the limits are expressed as PM10, they also act to
14 reduce emissions of PM2.5. So I am not sure that
15 you could make the distinction that you are
16 suggesting is possible in your question.

17 MR. DUNCAN: Okay. So essentially

18 there was no separate determination that the control
19 measures were actually LAER for PM2.5, but it is
20 because of as you say the lack of knowledge or lack
21 of ability to test for PM2.5 emissions that PM10 is
22 substituted?

23 MR. ROMAINE: But I would take it
24 further and simply say that even though the limits

40

1 are expressed in terms of the intent, they are
2 nevertheless LAER for PM2.5.

3 MR. DUNCAN: And what is the
4 support for that, I guess is the gist of the
5 question?

6 MR. ROMAINE: I think it's a legal
7 interpretation of how LAER emission standards are
8 expressed.

9 MR. DUNCAN: Okay, thank you.

10 (Applause)

11 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Erica Gorman.

12 MS. GORMAN: My name is Erica
13 Gorman, G-O-R-M-A-N, and I am an engineering student
14 at Wash U. with the Environmental Clinic
15 representing American Bottoms Conservancy.

16 I have a few questions about

17 the mercury controls. Has the permittee provided
18 IEPA with technical data on how they will try to
19 insure the 90 percent control efficiency of the
20 activated carbon injection system?

21 MR. ROMAINE: No, it has not. We
22 asked them for that data, but they explained at this
23 point that data simply is not available. They are
24 installing a similar system at their existing

41

1 facility, but it has not -- installation, I don't
2 think, has been completed yet and test data has not
3 been available.

4 MS. GORMAN: So where does the 90
5 percent come from?

6 MR. ROMAINE: That 90 percent
7 number is taken from our experience with coal-fired
8 power plants.

9 MS. GORMAN: Has IEPA considered a
10 modified activated carbon injection system such as
11 pretreated powdered activated carbon which would
12 provide greater control efficiency for mercury?

13 MR. ROMAINE: If we didn't
14 specifically specify brominated or chlorinated
15 activated carbons, I believe it would have been, in

16 terms of our experience with coal-fired power
17 plants, certainly an appropriate treatment to the
18 activated carbon and hence the level of control that
19 is provided, in particular with certain types of
20 coals.

21 Now, I guess I am speaking too
22 quickly. In terms of this being a higher sulphur
23 coal, it may not be necessary. Obviously, the more
24 typical usage of this treated carbon is for powdered

42

1 river basin coal which is the predominant coal
2 currently being used in Illinois. I think we would
3 have to answer this one in the responsiveness
4 summary.

5 MS. GORMAN: Is there a place where
6 you documented your decision-making process to use
7 the activated carbon injection system?

8 MR. ROMAINE: The project summary
9 constitutes the summary of our decision.

10 MS. GORMAN: Is the activated
11 carbon injection system the only mercury control
12 being implemented?

13 MR. ROMAINE: No. The use of the
14 spray system for sulphur dioxide and the baghouse

15 also provides some level of control, and the
16 activated carbon is the only technique that is being
17 used specifically for mercury. But it is on top of
18 the other control measures that are present. You
19 should have some effectiveness in reducing mercury.

20 MS. GORMAN: How will IEPA insure
21 control of fresh fluid processes? Will that be
22 covered by the other control technologies?

23 MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

24 MS. GORMAN: Okay, thank you.

43

1 (Applause)

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Leah Martin.

3 MS. MARTIN: Hi, I am Leah Martin.

4 I am an environmental studies student at Washington
5 University with the Interdisciplinary Environmental
6 Clinic. I am here on behalf of the American Bottoms
7 Conservancy. I have some further questions on
8 mercury.

9 What is the basis for the
10 projected mercury emissions in the first revision to
11 the coke plant permit application? It is under the
12 Hazardous Air Pollutants section. It is listed as
13 .149 times LAER.

14 MR. SCNEPP: I believe the basis
15 for that number is the use of the activated carbon
16 injection system.

17 MS. MARTIN: Okay. Well, it
18 actually listed that as without an activated carbon
19 injection. It's a 20 percent removal with the spray
20 dryer without activated carbon injection. Would it
21 be possible for you to find that document?

22 MR. SCNEPP: It won't be possible
23 tonight, but we can address it in the responsiveness
24 summary.

44

1 MS. MARTIN: Okay. And do you know
2 if that number includes particulate oxidized and
3 elemental mercury?

4 MR. SCNEPP: I don't know that.

5 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, it would.

6 MS. MARTIN: And why didn't IEPA
7 set a mercury limit in the permit?

8 MR. ROMAINE: We don't have an
9 adequate technical basis to set a limit at this
10 time, and also there is also not an explicit
11 regulatory requirement that is the premise for
12 exceeding mercury emissions.

13 MS. MARTIN: And it states that the
14 limit is going to be set at a future date after
15 testing is done. And so when the limit is set, will
16 there be a public comment period?

17 MR. ROMAINE: I would expect that
18 that limit would be set as part of the Clean Air Act
19 permit program for the facility. That permit would
20 have a public comment period associated with it.

21 MS. MARTIN: Okay. How much
22 mercury is emitted during bypass venting?

23 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have that
24 specific number with me.

45

1 MS. MARTIN: Has the permittee done
2 any kind of study as to the projected mercury
3 emissions during bypass venting?

4 MR. ROMAINE: I don't know off the
5 top of my head.

6 MS. MARTIN: Some more questions
7 about the bypass venting as well. Does IEPA have
8 any technical data showing how the permittee will
9 comply with the 196 hours of bypass venting?

10 MR. ROMAINE: Could you clarify
11 what you mean by technical data?

12 MS. MARTIN: Ways that they will
13 try to limit their bypass venting so they don't
14 exceed the 196-hour limit.

15 MR. ROMAINE: Beyond our general
16 expertise with the operation of control systems and
17 the level of periodic maintenance that's required
18 for them, none. The numbers that have been proposed
19 reflect what would be expected, I shouldn't say what
20 will be expected, what would be upper bound on the
21 amount of outage that would typically be needed for
22 systems of the type that they are using.

23 MS. MARTIN: So has IEPA considered
24 requiring the use of subblowers which will keep each

46

1 unit online as long as possible or staggered
2 charging which is increasing time between charging
3 adjacent ovens to reduce the bypass venting time?

4 MR. ROMAINE: I don't believe those
5 techniques would provide any additional benefits.

6 MS. MARTIN: It was done at the
7 Indiana Harvard Coke Company to limit the bypass
8 venting time because they had trouble with
9 malfunctions exceeding the venting time. So that's
10 what they used to limit the bypass venting times.

11 MR. ROMAINE: If it becomes
12 necessary to meet those limits, then there are
13 certainly other techniques that could be used on top
14 of normal work practices.

15 MS. MARTIN: Okay, thank you.

16 (Applause)

17 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
18 speaker is Amy Brewster.

19 MS. BREWSTER: Good evening. My
20 name is Amy Brewster, B-R-E-W-S-T-E-R. I am a third
21 year law student at Washington University. I am
22 here with our Environmental Clinic representing
23 American Bottoms Conservancy, and I have a few
24 questions about the road sweeping program.

47

1 My first is whether road
2 sweeping is required by any other permits currently
3 in place for Granite City Steel?

4 MR. SCHNEPP: Yes.

5 MS. BREWSTER: Can you tell me what
6 those are?

7 MR. SCHNEPP: Various construction
8 and operating permits. One that comes to mind is a
9 permit for a production increase at the source

10 issued in the mid 90s.

11 MS. BREWSTER: So I know that the
12 coke conveyance permit talks about that the road
13 sweeping program there is additional sweeping. Is
14 this existing sweeping that it is referring to or is
15 it also talking about other sweeping programs in
16 place?

17 MR. SCHNEPP: It would be an
18 enhancement to that existing sweeping program that
19 would cover new roads as well as increasing the
20 frequency on some of the existing roads in the
21 existing sweeping program.

22 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. The fugitive
23 dust control plan in the coke plant permit, is that
24 required?

48

1 MR. SCHNEPP: Yes, it is.

2 MS. BREWSTER: Is it required under

3 --

4 MR. SCHNEPP: Under our state
5 rules.

6 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And is the
7 road sweeping in the conveyance permit only to
8 achieve offsets?

9 MR. SCHNEPP: Well, certainly
10 that's the primary purpose. It will also reduce the
11 particulate matter which are not used as offsets.
12 The offsets are for PM10.

13 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And why is
14 the road sweeping program in the conveyance permit
15 instead of the coke plant permit?

16 MR. SCHNEPP: That's an activity
17 that will be undertaken by United States Steel.

18 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. My next
19 question is again about the fugitive dust control
20 plan, and I was wondering why SunCoke wasn't
21 required to more fully develop how that program
22 would be implemented in their application or in the
23 permit itself?

24 MR. ROMAINE: Could you clarify the

49

1 question, please?

2 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. Well, there
3 is a fugitive dust control plan in the coke plant
4 permit, and it is not very specific. It doesn't
5 really lay out, from what I can tell, what specific
6 roads must be addressed, and I was just wondering
7 why SunCoke wasn't required to provide that

8 information.

9 MR. ROMAINE: It is not required to
10 provide that level of information because it is
11 addressing a program that has a regulatory basis and
12 it is also addressing a program that has a specific
13 capacity limit associated with it that applies to
14 plant roads. So there is a means to directly
15 address and enforce a level of control independent
16 of implementation and specific control measures.

17 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And will
18 roads be a component of that program?

19 MR. ROMAINE: Yes. There are
20 either sweeping, flushing treatments. There is a
21 variety of techniques that can be used on the roads.
22 The critical issue is achieving -- what's the
23 capacity? The specified level capacity.

24 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. So has IEPA

50

1 made any effort to distinguish between which roads
2 will be covered by the offset road sweeping in the
3 conveyance permit versus the roads that will be
4 swept in the fugitive dust control plan?

5 MR. ROMAINE: Well, in terms of
6 SunCoke they will be sweeping their own roadways at

7 the plant which would be separate from the off site
8 roads and roads that U.S. Steel, that are being
9 swept as part of the offsets.

10 MS. BREWSTER: So I just want to
11 make sure I understand. The dust control plan,
12 those roads will only be within the area of the
13 plant?

14 MR. ROMAINE: That is correct.

15 MS. BREWSTER: So it won't involve
16 any city roads?

17 MR. ROMAINE: That is correct.

18 MS. BREWSTER: Okay, thank you. I
19 was next wondering if IEPA considered any
20 alternative offsets besides road sweeping for acid
21 two reductions?

22 MR. ROMAINE: No, we did not. It
23 is the obligation of the applicant to propose
24 offsets to us. That we then review the proposed

51

1 offsets to find out whether they are acceptable.

2 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And how does
3 IEPA plan to monitor the effectiveness of road
4 sweeping to actually achieve the promised level of
5 offsets?

6 MR. ROMAINE: There are provisions
7 in the permit that address the levels of silt levels
8 on roadways. That's probably the most rigorous
9 approach to verify the effectiveness of the program.
10 In addition, there are requirements for record
11 keeping. And by verifying the records, we can
12 verify that the sweeping program is properly in the
13 limit.

14 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And does the
15 road sweeping program addressing offsets, did that
16 take into consideration PM2.5 reductions or only
17 PM10?

18 MR. ROMAINE: It was expressed in
19 terms of PM10 reductions offsetting PM10 emissions.
20 We did not reduce the emissions of the coke plant to
21 express those in terms of PM2.5. In fact, it would
22 be very difficult to do that in any meaningful way.
23 Likewise, we did not adjust the offsets to express
24 those in PM2.5, in terms of PM2.5.

52

1 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And under
2 Illinois State Regulation 203.303 Part B it requires
3 that an offset have approximately the same
4 significance to public health and welfare. And I

5 was wondering whether IEPA took into consideration
6 the differing health effects of PM10 and PM2.5.

7 MR. ROMAINE: We did not. We did
8 take into consideration the relative role of road
9 dust and PM10, PM2.5, and road dust as distinguished
10 from emissions of PM10, PM2.5 from the coke oven.
11 Given the low levels of these road dust emissions,
12 it was believed that they had comparable
13 significance, if not more significance, for benefit
14 for public health than releases from elevated
15 stacks.

16 MS. BREWSTER: And do you have any
17 documentation of that analysis?

18 MR. ROMAINE: I am reporting
19 information that has been provided to me by our Air
20 Quality Planning Section. I am not familiar with
21 the particular studies or analyses that they used to
22 come to that conclusion. It is stuff they have been
23 working on as part of their preparation of the PM2.5
24 attainment demonstration for the area.

53

1 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. In a March
2 2007 e-mail to SunCoke IEPA officials stated that at
3 least a portion of the sweeping offset program would

4 be accepted, and I believe the totals were 169
5 tenths per year of PM and 31.5 tenths per year of
6 PM10 which would even out to about 200 tenths per
7 year. And in the draft permit that we have, it says
8 that offsetting road sweeping will total 236 tenths
9 per year of PM10. I was just wondering how that
10 final number was reached as compared to the number
11 in that email from earlier this year.

12 MR. SCHNEPP: I believe what
13 happened was there were some samplings and soil
14 loading measurements done at the site in August.
15 That data was used to revise those numbers, and
16 that's why you see the increase in the offset.

17 MS. BREWSTER: And the study you
18 refer to, is that the study that's present in the
19 addendum to the command in August where they
20 actually tested the roads?

21 MR. SCHNEPP: Right, that's the
22 study from August.

23 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And in
24 another March 2007 e-mail IEPA discussed wanting to

54

1 make sure that the road sweeping program was top
2 notch, and I was just wondering what IEPA's

3 definition of top notch is.

4 MR. SCHNEPP: Well, to begin with I
5 would expect top notch would be a vacuum type
6 sweeper versus a sweeper that does not vacuum.

7 MR. ROMAINE: That particular
8 issue, these are not road sweepers to keep leaves
9 out of the sewers so they don't clog the sewers.
10 These are not leaf sweepers. They are specifically
11 intended to collect dust, fine particulate matter
12 and then do more than simply send that dust back up
13 in the air. They would be associated with or have
14 filter type control devices as part of the sweeping
15 device. I believe that's what was being referred to
16 in that correspondence that you are referring to. I
17 can't be sure, though.

18 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. And just as a
19 side question on that, has IEPA done any studies or
20 seen any studies as to how effective these
21 particular sweepers are?

22 MR. ROMAINE: This is something
23 that again we are relying on our Air Quality
24 Planning Section for. This is a matter that is

1 addressed as part of the research that was done as

2 part of developing attainment demonstrations for
3 particulate matter.

4 MS. BREWSTER: Okay. The coke
5 plant permit seems to have an offset ratio of one to
6 one, is that correct? Am I reading that correctly?

7 MR. SCHNEPP: Yes.

8 MS. BREWSTER: And why was that
9 specific ratio decided upon?

10 MR. ROMAINE: That's the ratio
11 that's required under the applicable New Source
12 Review regulations.

13 MS. BREWSTER: Under the state
14 regulations?

15 MR. ROMAINE: And the federal
16 regulations.

17 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Ms. Brewster,
18 I don't mean to interrupt you, but do you have a
19 number of -- a lot more questions?

20 MS. BREWSTER: One more, I promise.

21 HEARING OFFICER KIM: That's fine.

22 MS. BREWSTER: My last question is
23 that from another e-mail I have seen, at one time
24 IEPA had requested PM2.5 sampling by U.S. Steel, and

1 I was just wondering why that was later discarded.

2 MR. ROMAINE: I am not familiar
3 with that discussion.

4 MS. BREWSTER: My understanding is
5 that it was discarded because it was going to slow
6 down the permit process and at least one member of
7 your staff, I don't recall who, said it was more of
8 a petition issue versus a permit issue, and I was
9 just hoping you could clarify that.

10 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have any
11 information to respond to that tonight.

12 MS. BREWSTER: Okay, thank you for
13 your time.

14 (Applause)

15 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
16 speaker is Peter Goode.

17 MR. GOODE: Mr. Kim, I don't have
18 any questions.

19 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you.
20 The next speaker then is Dale Stewart.

21 MR. STEWART: Thank you. I want to
22 thank the panel for giving me the opportunity to
23 speak here this evening. My name is Dale Stewart,
24 S-T-E-W-A-R-T. I am executive secretary-treasurer

1 of Southwestern Illinois Building Construction
2 Trades Council.

3 My job is to represent the
4 Southwestern Illinois Building Trades Council to
5 voice their concerns and support issues concerning
6 new and existing construction in a 12-county
7 jurisdiction. Building Trades consists of
8 approximately 15 international unions with roughly
9 12,000 members, many of them friends, neighbors and
10 family.

11 We are in complete accord of
12 the EPA issuing a permit to Gateway Energy and Coke
13 Company, LLC, for a proposed heat recovery coke
14 plant in Granite City, Illinois, and issuing a
15 permit to the U.S. Steel Corporation for the coke
16 conveyance system. These projects employ hundreds
17 of union craft workers and will help strengthen the
18 economy in this area for years to come.

19 U.S. Steel is a large employer
20 in southwestern Illinois and pays high wages and
21 benefits to the plant employees and construction
22 employees. This proposal will be done with state of
23 the art technology and will lessen some of the
24 existing EPA concerns that are ongoing at the steel

1 (Applause)

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
3 speaker is Jean Bowers.

4 MS. ANDRIA: She just went out the
5 door.

6 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Do you know
7 if she is planning on returning?

8 MS. ANDRIA: No.

9 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
10 speaker then is Jason Chism.

11 MR. CHISM: My name is Jason Chism,
12 C-H-I-S-M. I am vice president and grievance
13 chairman for United Steel Workers Local 50. Our
14 local represents the 520 employees of the coke and
15 iron making facility at the U.S. Steel Granite City
16 Works. The SunCoke operation comes at a model time
17 for our industry which has to compete globally for
18 raw materials. This operation will make Granite
19 City more self-sufficient on coke and energy but
20 will do so with the best environmental technology
21 known today. Local 50 supports this operation
22 because it will strengthen steel worker jobs for
23 decades to come and at the same time minimizing the
24 impact on the environment. Thank you.

1 (Applause)

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
3 speaker is Russ Saltsgaver. I apologize if I didn't
4 do a good job.

5 MR. SALTSGAVER: That's fairly
6 close. I want to thank you for allowing me to speak
7 tonight. My last name is spelled
8 S-A-L-T-S-G-A-V-E-R. I am president of United Steel
9 Workers Local 1899 which is based here in Granite
10 City. We have roughly 1300 employees of U.S. Steel
11 main plant and many other employees at other various
12 steel companies, credit unions and scrap yards
13 throughout the area.

14 First of all, I would like to
15 stand in support of this heat recovery coke facility
16 that Gateway Coke is willing to put in here in
17 Granite City and I also stand in support of the
18 conveyance system that U.S. Steel has put
19 application in, and we now have a temporary permit
20 and hopefully these will turn into permanent permits
21 so we can get this project going.

22 As a third generation steel
23 worker, and I am very proud of that as many others
24 in the community are, these projects that we are

1 talking about are very much needed for the
2 manufacturing industry and the viability of the
3 Granite City Works in this community. As a proud
4 member of United Steel Workers Union, the community
5 and economic growth of southwestern Illinois is a
6 priority not only tonight, tomorrow, the next day,
7 but every day.

8 Any project that brings 70
9 good paying jobs with benefits, medical benefits,
10 pensions, 401Ks which is unheard of today, is very
11 important to this community. Also we are looking at
12 1100 construction trade jobs that will be a big
13 input into the community and also give people much
14 needed work in this community. In addition, these
15 1100 local building construction workers will be
16 needed to complete the project. This initial
17 investment will provide an infusion of cash into our
18 economy and provide stability for our region, not to
19 mention securing the future for 2245 employees
20 working at the U.S. Steel Granite City Works.

21 U.S. Steel has been
22 forward-thinking throughout the years. They are a
23 very old company and they stay fairly

22 the Chamber of Commerce, Southwestern Madison
23 County. I spoke last night and I have also
24 submitted written letters of support dated November

64

1 2, 2007. I am here tonight on behalf of the Board
2 of Directors and over 250 businesses that are
3 members of the Chamber of Commerce.

4 I have been asked to voice our
5 support of the proposal of the heat recovery coke
6 plant project at the Granite City division of U.S.
7 Steel. We understand that this project will not
8 move forward until all environmental requirements
9 are addressed as required by the Illinois EPA. We
10 of the Chamber of Commerce are in agreement that
11 this project is extremely important to the future
12 employment stability and to the economic viability
13 of our entire region. Thank you.

14 (Applause)

15 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The last card
16 that I have is for Patrick McKeegan. If there is
17 anybody else that is interested in speaking, if you
18 could go back and fill out a card before we finish
19 here, then I would appreciate it. Thank you.

20 MR. McKEEHAN: Mr. Kim, I am

21 Patrick McKeehan, M-C-K-E-E-H-A-N, with the
22 Leadership Council's Office of Western Illinois and
23 I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight and
24 know that we have submitted letters in support of

65

1 this project for the record.

2 Our organization is comprised
3 of 125 businesses representing -- business leaders
4 representing industry labor, education labor
5 throughout Madison and St. Clair County. We believe
6 that U.S. Steel's \$350 million investment is good
7 for this region. We believe that U.S. Steel's
8 commitment to modernization of its operation will
9 secure the livelihood of its employees and the 1,000
10 plus workers that will construct these operations.

11 Finally, we believe that U.S.
12 Steel values the health and welfare of its work
13 force, this community and our region. On behalf of
14 my 125 members in the region's business community,
15 we publicly ask for your official approval of these
16 final permits. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
19 speaker is David Beard.

20 MR. BEARD: My name is David Beard,
21 B-E-A-R-D. I am here tonight to support this
22 project because like those people stated before, I
23 have four children and I am very concerned about my
24 children's health and the health of those poor

66

1 children working or living in that low income
2 housing and all the other individuals in this town.
3 And because of SunCoke making this commitment to
4 this city with the best available technology, these
5 children have a chance to have good jobs and get
6 some good health insurance and hopefully raise this
7 entire community up. You don't have to go very far
8 around here to see a lot of empty factories. And
9 those people are living in that low income housing
10 because of one reason; most of those factories are
11 shut on them.

12 I am tired of watching our
13 jobs go overseas. We finally have a company wanting
14 to give back to this community. And anybody in this
15 community that doesn't support this, I think is
16 wrong. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next

19 speaker is Jonathan Ferry.

20 MR. FERRY: My name is Jon Ferry,
21 last name is F as in Frank, E-R-R-Y. I just have
22 one general comment and two statistics I would like
23 to quote. The first statistic is aimed at, I
24 believe it was, Mr. Warner's comments concerning

67

1 asthma in Madison County. According to the National
2 Center of Health Statistics, the national average
3 for children with asthma is right at about 8.9
4 percent. Nine percent is the Madison County rate.
5 That shows that there is really no statistically
6 significant difference in the amount of children
7 with asthma in Madison County as to the national
8 average.

9 That would seem to indicate
10 that, unlike Mr. Warner pointed out that U.S. Steel
11 is a big cause of asthma supposedly, it would seem
12 to indicate that it is no different really than the
13 national average.

14 The other statistic is just
15 that the economic impact of this steel mill is
16 approximately \$2 billion to Madison County alone for
17 a year. And my comment is simply that, based on my

17 last card that I have now is Edward Schmidt.

18 MR. SCHMIDT: My name is Ed
19 Schmidt, and I retired from Granite City Steel.
20 Been in the area all my life. And my grandparents
21 actually sold property there where the coke plant is
22 and I own property right across the road from the
23 coke plant. And my concern and question is what is
24 the EPA doing or going to do to protect the property

69

1 owners in the immediate area?

2 MR. ROMAINE: Our job is to protect
3 the public in terms of air pollution and other
4 impacts of waste water and solid waste. We are not
5 involved in making the siting decisions with regard
6 to issues with regard to property value. Those are
7 addressed locally as part of zoning decisions.

8 MR. SCHMIDT: Well, U.S. Steel has
9 been in contact with me and there was some talk of
10 putting a buffer zone in. Is the EPA requiring a
11 buffer zone?

12 MR. ROMAINE: We require that air
13 quality standards, and this is -- our goal is to get
14 air quality everywhere in this area except on that
15 property in terms of pollutants other than PM2.5 and

16 ozone. We have combined that obligation and we are
17 in attainment. My understanding from talking with
18 U.S. Steel is that they are moving forward with the
19 plans to put in berms and other features that would
20 provide a visual separation between the operations
21 of the coke facility and the nearest residences. I
22 would suggest that perhaps the representatives that
23 are here from U.S. Steel may want to chat with you
24 some more tonight.

70

1 MR. SCHMIDT: Well, they have
2 already talked to me. They just ain't offered me
3 enough money yet.

4 (Applause)

5 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Is there
6 anybody else that wishes to make a comment?

7 MS. RICHARDS: Actually I do. I
8 should have signed this. My name is Mary Richards,
9 and I want to say I represent the women of U.S.
10 Steel. And U.S. Steel has not only thought about
11 this community project and getting us more jobs,
12 they are cleaning up the internal part of our plant,
13 making it better for all of us workers that are
14 already there. And if the old crew, the old

15 retirees could see the interior improvements, not
16 just paint on the outside, but we are cleaning the
17 interior of the plant and making it a better place
18 to work. And that alone is going to make it better
19 for us employees, along with this new project will
20 definitely help. And I thank you.

21 (Applause)

22 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Is there
23 anyone else that would like to make a comment? And
24 I will again remind you that there is a public

71

1 comment period which I will address shortly. But
2 written comments will be accepted and will be given
3 the same weight as public comments that were taken
4 tonight.

5 Oh, I am sorry, Ms. Andria.

6 MS. ANDRIA: I did have some
7 additional comments.

8 HEARING OFFICER KIM: That's fine.

9 MS. ANDRIA: While I appreciate Mr.
10 Ferry's comment about the nine percent, the
11 statistics were taken from the American Lung
12 Association. I suggest for him to get up close and
13 personal verification, that he go to the local

14 schools, to the nurse's office and see the bags of
15 inhalers, that he go down to the clinic, and our
16 elected officials are trying to get more clinics for
17 the kids, especially Madison and Venice because
18 there are so many children with asthma. And if he
19 would just goes down to talk to the doctors and the
20 nurses, I think he would see that it is a problem.

21 I have a couple things. I
22 think it was Chris who said about the road sweeping
23 as a control strategy and it came from the Air
24 Quality Planning Department. On Tuesday of this

72

1 week I was at another public hearing, that's three
2 of them this week. It was on PM2.5, was the
3 designation, and it was the Air Quality Planning
4 Committee who was holding the hearing, and we talked
5 about designations of what was not meeting federal
6 air quality standards for PM2.5, and they talked
7 about the state implementation plan and to try to
8 bring it into attainment, to bring Madison County
9 into attainment, and I asked if road sweeping was
10 used as a control strategy to help bring it into
11 attainment. And the Air Quality Department, Mr.
12 Colleal (sp) said, no, that the sweeping, road

13 sweeping, was being considered for permitting of
14 U.S. Steel and the coke plant as a control strategy.
15 So I don't think that it is being used as a
16 surrogate or as a control strategy anywhere else.
17 That's part of one of our problems with it.

18 Also there is for -- there is
19 a monitoring going on, special monitoring, to try to
20 ascertain what exactly is being emitted in terms of
21 the species of the particulates that are coming from
22 the plant, and there is -- it is called a speciation
23 analysis and that's going on right now. And my
24 understanding is it is going to be finished in a

73

1 month or so. So I guess my question is why are you
2 doing this now and why aren't you waiting until you
3 have the results so you know where to control and so
4 that everybody can get on with living and the jobs
5 can continue and everything can be in attainment.
6 Everything kind of is on hold when we are not in
7 attainment. And I know that the company would like
8 to be in attainment and the workers would like their
9 jobs secured for a long time. So why can't you wait
10 a month to see the results of the speciation
11 analysis.

12 MR. ROMAINE: I guess I will just
13 comment very generally on that. We really are
14 talking about two separate issues. Even though this
15 is a nonattainment area, the regulations that are in
16 place in the Clean Air Act do provide that economic
17 projects can go forward. It does not put any freeze
18 on any construction activity. It does establish
19 very stringent requirements for major construction
20 activity, but this project meets those requirements.

21 In terms of what we are doing
22 to come into attainment, that is another ongoing
23 effort and we have to come into attainment whether
24 there is a coke plant or not, and either require

74

1 appropriate further reductions from a number of
2 different source categories, one of the major
3 components that we are looking at is reductions in
4 emissions in night emissions of nitrogen oxide and
5 sulphur oxide on a regional, if not super regional
6 basis, looking at essentially the eastern United
7 States, and those are things that will be going in a
8 different time frame, but the goal, the ultimate
9 goal that we have to reach is attainment of the air
10 quality standards of PM2.5.

10 are components of dust that are in the PM2.5 range.

11 MS. ANDRIA: Is there any benefit
12 of proving to either U.S. Steel or Gateway Coke by
13 getting this in the works now, rather than waiting
14 until the speciation analysis is complete?

15 MR. ROMAINE: I am not aware of any
16 particular benefit, other than the fact that they
17 are moving forward with the project and they want to
18 move forward.

19 MS. ANDRIA: We last night -- we
20 had -- we requested that the transcript be
21 expedited. And given that some of our questions
22 that were asked by the Wash U. students Mr. Romaine
23 did not have answers for and he said he would
24 provide them, usually we don't get the answers until

76

1 the responsiveness summary. And these answers are
2 really important because there is a lot missing from
3 the data that's been provided, even though we have
4 tried to get a complete record.

5 So I would ask if you could
6 ask that the transcript be expedited, and I would
7 also request that Mr. Romaine answer the questions
8 before waiting til it is too late for us to comment

9 on the answers.

10 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Well, to the
11 extent that Mr. Romaine has answered, I believe it
12 was, Mr. Duncan, some of his questions, I am sure
13 that that is something that they can try to work out
14 on their own. To the extent that questions will be
15 provided in response to any other questions or
16 comments that were raised by anybody else, I believe
17 we have described the procedure set forth is that
18 the opportunity given for the Illinois EPA to
19 respond will be in the form of the responsiveness
20 summary.

21 There is no way we could
22 commit to anything earlier, other than I suppose if
23 it is possible -- I am not going to speak for
24 Mr. Romaine or his work load -- but I will say that

77

1 the official and the formal means for responding to
2 that is in the responsiveness summary.

3 MS. ANDRIA: I want to ask them a
4 question. Then I also, do you ask -- I asked about
5 the expedited transcript. We would really
6 appreciate having it at least with two weeks to view
7 the transcript since this is -- there is some

8 complexities with this one, that we would like to be
9 able to do that. So we don't want to get it and
10 then have to do everything within a week.

11 HEARING OFFICER KIM: All I can
12 tell you is that subject to the work load of the
13 court reporter, we do make every effort we can to
14 get the transcript in a timely manner and to make it
15 available.

16 And you did ask some of the
17 students if they had any other questions. Again, if
18 anyone has any questions that are presented in the
19 post-hearing comment period, we will attempt to
20 anticipate those as well. So even if something
21 wasn't asked tonight, if it is something that is
22 relevant and goes to the issue of the permit
23 applications at hand, then we will attempt to answer
24 those as well in the responsiveness summary. So

78

1 this is not the last opportunity to raise a question
2 that you would like to have us consider and try to
3 answer.

4 MS. ANDRIA: But what I guess I was
5 referring to was being able to comment on your
6 answers because some of it is information. It is

5 health issue. Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Is there
7 anyone else that would like to make a comment or
8 make any follow-up statement or question? Seeing no
9 other members of the public with questions or
10 comments, I would like to bring the hearing to a
11 close. I remind everyone that the comment period
12 for the record in this matter closes on December 8,
13 2007. So any written comments must be postmarked
14 before midnight on December 8 to be accepted as part
15 of the record.

16 Copies of the exhibits again
17 will be available upon request. I would like to
18 thank you for your participation this evening. The
19 time is now approximately 8:50 and this hearing is
20 adjourned.

21 HEARING ADJOURNED

22

23

24

81

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)SS
2 COUNTY OF MACOUPIN)

3 TITLE: Proposed Issuance of Construction
Permits/PSD Approvals to United States Steel

4 Corporation in Granite City and Gateway Energy &
5 Coke Company, LLC in Granite City

6 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

7 I, Carla J. Boehl, do hereby certify that I am a
8 court reporter; that I reported in shorthand the
9 evidence taken and proceedings had on the hearing on
10 the above-entitled case on the 8th day of November,
11 2007; that the foregoing pages are a true and
12 correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
13 aforesaid and contain all of the proceedings
14 directed by the EPA or other persons authorized by
15 it to conduct the said hearing to be so
16 stenographically reported.

17 Dated at Springfield, Illinois, on this 13th day
18 of November A.D., 2007.

19

20

Certified Shorthand Reporter

21

22

23

24