BEFORE THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

IN THE MATTER OF: PROPOSED)
ISSUANCE OF A STATE CONSTRUCTION)
PERMIT FOR RELIANT ENERGY)
AURORA, L.P.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS taken at the hearing of the above-entitled matter, held at 1322 North Eola Road, Aurora, Illinois, before Hearing Officer Peter Orlinsky, reported by Janice H. Heinemann, RDR, CRR, a notary public within and for the County of Du Page and State of Illinois, on the 3rd day of April, 2000, commencing at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

IEPA APPEARANCES:

MR. PETER ORLINSKY, Acting IEPA Hearing Officer;

MR. CHRIS ROMAINE, Manager, Utility Unit, Air Permit Section;

MR. SHASHI SHAH, Engineer, Bureau of Air, Permit Section;

MR. BRAD FROST, Community Relations Coordinator.

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS	PAGES
Hearing Officer's opening statement	3 - 7
BOA presentation by Mr. Romaine	7 - 12
BOA presentation by Mr. Shah	12 - 14
Reliant presentation by Mr. Benedict	14 - 22
Reliant presentation by Mr. Furstenwerth	22 - 30
Questions/comments from public	30 - 200
Hearing Officer's Closure of Hearing	200

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Good evening. Welcome to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's public hearing concerning Reliant Energy's permit application for construction of an electric generation facility in Aurora. My name is Peter Orlinsky, and I will be the hearing officer this evening.

Let the record reflect that it's now about 7:12 p.m. on Monday, April 3, 2000. This hearing is being held for the purpose of explaining the Illinois EPA's permit review process setting forth the relevant information about the project which is the subject of the permit application and gathering public comments concerning the permit application.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the Illinois EPA's "Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan Hearings," which are codified at 35 Illinois Administrative Code, Section 164. The procedures are intended to set forth the practice and procedures to be followed by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in conducting informal permit and closure plan hearings to provide opportunity for the public to

understand and comment on the permit closure plan applications and associated applications of the Agency, to establish procedures by which the Agency consults interested or affected segments of the public, to enable the Agency to fully consider and respond to public concern, to encourage cooperation between the Agency and other governmental bodies, to foster openness among the Agency and other governmental bodies and the public, and to comply with state and federal requirements.

Now, the conduct of tonight's hearing will be as follows: First oral statements will be made by the Illinois EPA. Next a representative with Reliant Energy -- I understand two representatives from Reliant Energy will make statements. At the conclusion of those statements, the public will be invited to address relevant questions to the speakers. Please try to limit your remarks to precise questions, most not statements. Later members of the public will have the opportunity to make statements as well.

Finally, anyone who is interested is invited to make oral statements or submit written comments. Anyone who wants to make a statement

should fill out one of the cards on the table to my left if you haven't already done so. If you prefer to submit written comments, be advised that the same weight will be given to the written comments as will be given to the oral comments. If you do wish to submit a written statement, you may turn them in tonight or you may mail them to the Illinois EPA. If you are planing on mailing them, however, they must be postmarked by no later than midnight, April 17, 2000. They should be mailed to Brad Frost, Community Relations Coordinator, Illinois EPA, 1021 North Grand Avenue East, Post Office Box 19506, Springfield, Illinois, 62794-9506.

After all comments are submitted and reviewed, the Illinois EPA will make its decision by no later than May 30, 2000. Please be aware that in making its decision the permit section will analyze potential air and noise pollution aspects of the proposed facility. The Illinois EPA does not have the legal authority to address siting issues and zoning matters. Under state law, those matters are a local concern.

Now, before we start, here are a few

ground rules. Everything that's being said tonight will be transcribed verbatim by the reporter. If anyone wants a copy of the transcript, you can talk to the reporter after this hearing or you can find Mr. Frost from the Illinois EPA, who is also somewhere around in the room tonight.

In order to make the reporter's job as easy as possible, I ask that only one person speak at a time. If you wish to ask a question, hold your hand up and wait until I recognize you. Once you are recognized, please step to the microphone in the center of the room, state your name, spell it, and then ask your question.

It appears that there are going to be a lot of people that are going to be asking questions tonight. And some of you may wish to leave early before the whole presentation is concluded. We will have a room -- I think the room behind me. We will have a tape recorder in there. So if anyone wants to make a statement and then leave early, you may go in there and make your statement there. And we will give as much weight to those statements as to the statements that are made in the front of the entire room tonight.

Now, I realize that the subject of tonight's hearing can be very emotional and many of you have very strong feelings. However, this hearing is only going to work if it can be conducted in an orderly manner. So I ask for everyone's cooperation in order to get maximum benefits for the hearing.

Before we begin with Illinois EPA's presentation, does anyone have any questions concerning the actual procedures of the hearing tonight?

Okay. Seeing none, at this point I would like to call on Christopher Romaine to make the first statement.

MR. ROMAINE: Apparently we still have some arrangements to make over there. Do you want me to go or do you want to move the tables?

MR. FROST: Wait a second. That's just not coming through.

MR. ROMAINE: We are waiting while they set up tables, which may have some noise in the background. Actually, though, there are plenty of seats on this side if people are interested.

Okay. I think I will just begin. I

don't want to keep us here longer than we have to.

Good evening, my name is Chris Romaine. I'm manager of the permit section's utility unit. I just want to make a couple points and to provide some background for tonight's hearing.

My first point is that we do care about public comments. You may wonder why we are holding the public hearing tonight to get public comments since we have already prepared a draft permit for the proposed project. At one level this is the process that is mandated by applicable rules.

MALE VOICE: We can't hear a word you are saying back here.

MALE VOICE: If you stood up, at least we could kind of read your lips a little bit.

(Discussion outside the record.)

MR. ROMAINE: Well, let me start from the beginning. Good evening. My name is Chris Romaine. I'm the manager of the utility unit in the air permit section. I just want to make a couple general points to provide some background.

My first point is that we do care

about public comments. You may wonder why we are all holding a public hearing tonight to get public comments since we have already prepared the draft permit for the proposed project. At one level this is the process that is mandated by applicable rules.

More fundamentally, however, the preparation of a draft permit is important because it means that we have found that the proposed source is entitled to a permit, that it complies with the applicable requirements as we have seen it. This should stimulate input on the project when people are concerned about it and focus attention on aspects of the project that are within our jurisdiction.

Public comments on relevant issues can certainly affect the nature of the permit that would be issued. They can result in additional conditions being placed in permits to address public concerns about a project.

In some cases, public comments have led the Agency to reverse itself so that an application may be denied. The bottom line, notwithstanding the fact that we have prepared a

draft permit, we do care and are interested in your comments.

My second point probably is not as encouraging. As Mr. Orlinsky has already mentioned, the Illinois EPA has a very specific role in the permitting of a proposed facility. Our job is to review compliance for the applicable state and federal environmental laws and rules. In particular, the permit application we are here to discuss tonight addresses air pollution aspects of Reliant's proposed Aurora power plant; that is, its emissions and effects on air quality. The Agency's action on this matter is not intended, nor can it really legitimately address other aspects of the proposed facility including aspects that are under the control of local government.

The further point is that the comments that are relevant to our process are comments on air pollution control.

FEMALE VOICE: Sir, we are getting a terrible noise. I think you are too close to the --

MR. ROMAINE: Okay. I'm sorry.

Well, the point I want to make is --

(Discussion outside the record.)

MR. ROMAINE: Well, hopefully, obviously comments that we are really interested in are ones that are relevant to emissions and air quality and the permit that we are proposing to issue. We are not in a position to second-guess the position of the City of Aurora and local decisions.

And then my final point is that we will do our best to answer your questions tonight about environmental impacts of the Reliant project. However, if you ask us questions that we can't answer here tonight, we will take your questions back with us to Springfield for further investigation and consultation with the appropriate specialists.

In addition, we are preparing a written responsiveness summary where we will attempt to answer all the relevant issues that are raised tonight. A copy of this summary will be sent to all interested people who sent us written comments or who have filled out at this hearing the registration card.

With that behind us, I will pass the microphone on to Shashi Shah. He's a permit

analyst who has actually reviewed this application.

MR. SHAH: Thank you, Chris.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Shashi Shah. I'm a permit engineer in the Bureau of Air. I would like to give you a brief description of the project.

Reliant Energy has requested a permit for the construction of a natural gas-fired power plant. The project would be located at the northeast corner of Eola Road and Ferry Roads in Aurora. The project site is currently undeveloped. The plant is intended to operate during periods of peak power demand. In Illinois, peak power demand normally occurs during daylight hours on hot summer days due to the power demand for air conditioning.

The plant would use ten turbine engines. Electrical generators on the shaft of the turbines would directly produce power. One of the advantage of a turbine, unlike a steam power plant, is that it can be quickly turned on and off in response to changing demand for power.

The facility will only burn natural gas, which is the cleanest commercially available fuel. Natural gas does not contain significant

amount of sulfur or ash as present in coal or oil. The pollutant of interest for burning natural gas is nitrogen oxides or NOx as we say. NOx is formed when nitrogen and oxygen in the atmosphere combine during the high temperature of combustion. The NOx emissions of the facility are well controlled. The NOx emissions of the larger turbines are limited by use of specially designed low NOx burners to no more than 9 parts per million. For the smaller turbines, NOx is controlled by the use of water injection into the burners to no more than 25 parts per million on one day. By comparison, the U.S. EPA's new source performance standards for the turbines would only require NOx emissions to about 75 parts per million.

Compliance with NOx emission limit would be verified by continuous emission monitors installed in stack of each turbine. These monitors would be operated in accordance with the protocol of the Federal Acid Rain Program.

The project is not considered a major source because of the permitted emissions of the pollutants from this facility would be less than the major source thresholds. For projects that are

not major, an air quality study is not required by applicable rules. However, Reliant has performed an air quality study to determine the air quality impacts from the project. Results of the study indicates that air quality would readily comply with ambient air quality standards.

In summary, the Illinois EPA has reviewed the materials submitted by the Reliant and has determined that the application for the project shows that it will comply with applicable state and federal standards. The Agency has prepared a draft of the construction permit that sets out the conditions that we propose to place on the plant to assure continuous compliance.

In closing, we welcome any comments or questions on our proposed action.

We hope -- We have people here from Reliant to address further details from now.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Thank you, Mr. Shah.

Now I would like to call our first speaker from Reliant.

MR. BENEDICT: Good evening. We are going to have some exhibits here. I realize that the

room is a little crowded. So, hopefully, everyone will be able to see them. We are going to have two speakers from Reliant tonight, myself, Richard Benedict, and Derek Furstenwerth from our environmental department. Derek is going to talk specifically about the air emissions.

But before he got up to speak on that, I wanted to address two points that I think are useful in terms of putting the project in perspective and represent questions that have been asked of me in the time that I have spent in Aurora. And the two questions relate to the actual size of the plant, and the second one is whether or not peaking power plants represent a new sort of power generation system.

(Slide presentation:)

MR. BENEDICT: If I could have the first slide. The first one, this is just a view of the general area of where the plant is going to be.

FEMALE VOICE: Not really.

MR. BENEDICT: In terms of the size of the plant --

MALE VOICE: Why don't you hold them up so everybody can see.

MR. BENEDICT: The permit that -- the draft air permit references 950 megawatts. And as many of you know, we have talked to the City of Aurora about 870 megawatts. In both cases, we are speaking of exactly the same plant, a plant that has ten turbines and ten generators in simple cycle configuration that only operates during periods of peak demand.

The difference in the two figures are, first of all, whether the -- in the 950 case, talking about gross output, whereas 870 refers to net output. Likewise, 950 refers to the initial performance of the unit whereas 870 refers to performance over time. But probably most important or most of the difference is in the assumption on the ambient air temperature.

The 950 megawatt suggestion is based on an assumption of a 49-degree Fahrenheit ambient air temperature. And that's a useful figure to compare plants throughout Illinois because that's a figure that represents an average of summer, winter, night and day, temperatures. And the output of a plant such as this is directly correlated to the outside air temperature.

This plant will be operating primarily on hot summer days and the ambient air going into the unit will be typically at 82-degrees Fahrenheit. And at that temperature, the plant will be producing about 870 megawatts. And it's 870 megawatts that we'll actually be putting onto the grid and have available for sale.

In terms of the second question that I have heard a lot about is whether or not peaking power plants represent a new and unique sort of power plant. And there is a perception among many people that peakers have only come about because of deregulation. And this really isn't the case. Electrical systems have always needed some power plants to run all of the time and some power plants to only run during periods of high demand.

It's not practical to store electricity. So you actually have to have plants available to produce it when it's needed. And the swing in northern Illinois, in fact, in terms of average ranges in peak demand is pretty significant. On average in northern Illinois, customers use about 12,000 megawatts of electricity. But on a hot summer day, that peak

demand can go up to over 21,000 megawatts of electricity. And to put it into perspective, Kane and Du Page counties on that same hot day, those two counties are using over 2,500 megawatts of electricity.

In general, it's our view and other people that have looked at the market that the market is fairly well served for base load plants but that there is not sufficient peaking capacity. And prices in the wholesale market have sent a signal that there is a need for additional plants.

In past years, what would have happened in that situation is for Commonwealth Edison to build new plants. But Commonwealth Edison is getting out of the business of building new plants and has really looked to other companies to come to the market under deregulation and build plants. Commonwealth Edison is still in the business of owning the wires that move the electricity. And as such, they still have an interest in where plants are built. And Commonwealth Edison has indicated a preferred location for power plants in northern Illinois. And their preference goes on a band of land

basically from Aurora to north of Elgin and then across McHenry and Lake counties to the lake.

And there is two reasons that this area has been identified. The most obvious is this is where the population growth has been occurring in northern Illinois. But also that area does not have many power plants currently, and so there is a feeling that there is a need for plants.

I mentioned that Commonwealth Edison has sold or I think I mentioned Commonwealth Edison has sold its existing peaking plants but those plants are still in the market. They are owned by an electric company. I want to show a picture first -- show a couple of pictures here. This is the Electric Junction substation. I'm sure you are all very familiar with that. You go out the road here, Eola Road, down by here. It's a very large substation.

This remains property of Commonwealth Edison. This is something Commonwealth Edison still owns. But within Electric Junction, within that same property -- If I could have the next picture. Within the Electric Junction property, there is an existing peaking power plant that was

built by Commonwealth Edison, that was sold to Midwest Generating, and currently serves this area. Many of the homes in this area are very close to this plant. All of Cambridge Case and Harris Farms are within a mile of the plant and about half of Stonebridge is within a mile of this plant. This plant was operating last summer and for the last couple of summers has been operating for about 200, 250 hours per year.

In terms of what the characteristics of the plant are, I have a chart I think we can have up next.

(Discussion outside the record.)

MR. BENEDICT: And this is what the chart will have. The plant -- What I have here is a comparison of the two plants. In the first column is the Reliant Energy information. The second column is the existing Midwest Generating plant. As you can see, the project that Reliant is proposing is 950 megawatts on a nominal basis. The Midwest Generating plant is 250 megawatts.

The Reliant proposal has 10 stacks. The Midwest Generating project has 12. The date of the technology for the plant, the Reliant plant is

using year 2000 technology. The Midwest Generating plant with 1970 technology. Because of the age of the plant, it basically was built before the current clean air restrictions, so there are no pollution control devices on the Midwest Generating plant, nor is there continuous emissions monitoring. The Reliant plant because it's being built currently will have both pollution control and emissions monitoring.

Also in terms of issue of noise, there is minimal noise mitigation on the existing plant. The Reliant plant will have about 22 feet of muffling within the stack, so the reasons for the stack heights, and about eight feet of insulation in the air intake.

Another major difference is that the existing plant can run either on natural gas or on fuel oil, which is essentially diesel, and has liquid storage on site for that fuel oil. The Reliant plant will only burn natural gas and there will be no fuel oil on site.

And then finally, as you would expect by modern technology, the Reliant Energy plant is about twice as efficient in converting natural gas

to electricity.

Derek will talk a little bit when he talks about emissions about the emission comparisons of the two plants. But I thought it was important to put into perspective that when we talk about a peaking power plant we are not talking about something that's dramatically new, that is untested. But it is technology that has played an important role in providing electricity in Illinois, and that by building the Reliant plant we hope also to be able to meet the needs of peaking power.

So I will let Derek talk here, and then we will certainly take any questions.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Thanks, Richard. As Richard said, I'm Derek Furstenwerth. I'm a leader in the air resource division in Reliant. I just want to expand a little bit more on what Richard said and also what Shashi and Chris had to say about the plant. I realize we have already gone on a little bit. I will try not to take too long with my comments here.

Again, the Reliant Energy Aurora facility will produce nominally under 950 megawatts

of electricity. Its environmental features include its being equipped with state-of-the-art technology to minimize air releases. It's a very high-efficiency operation. It's powered only by clean natural gas. And overall, it will improve the electric system reliability in the Chicago area.

To talk a little bit more about what some of that technology is, we have got what we consider best available control technology. As the IEPA already mentioned, the large frame 7F turbines will be equipped with dry low NOx reduction technology. This will limit emissions of nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide to 9 parts per million. The smaller turbines will be equipped with water injection for nitrogen oxide control to 25 ppm.

Beyond that, the fact that this facility will burn only natural gas will result in inherently low emissions of sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and volatile organic matter simply because there is very small quantities of any of those in the fuel.

The total emissions from the facility, and you will see these a couple times on these charts that I'll put up in just a minute. But the

total emissions from the facility will be limited by the permit to 247.5 tons per year of nitrogen oxides, 210.8 tons per year of carbon dio -- carbon monoxide, excuse me, 9.2 tons per year of volatile organic matter, 3.1 tons per year of sulfur dioxide, 28.6 tons per year of particulate matter. And --

FEMALE VOICE: How many tons?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: 28.6 tons of particulate.

We have presented some of this information before. We compared the emissions from this facility to everyday activities in the area. And one of the comments we received from people was you are comparing things on a tons per year basis from your plant to tons per year basis for everyday activities. And it wasn't maybe a very clear comparison. So we put a number of these comparisons now on a pounds per day basis or looking at the maximum amount of emissions which could come from Reliant Energy Aurora on one day.

To put this in perspective, compared to all of the emissions sources in Du Page County, on the greatest emissions day that we would have,

the facility would still only be about one percent of the emissions in the county. These emissions, these numbers that I said, they sound like large numbers. So if you are told that these -- Because the emissions come out of the stack very fast and very hot, they go high up into the air, they disperse over a very large area. So there is no possibility of all the emissions concentrating anywhere. They disperse over a very wide area.

In contrast, some of the everyday activities that we have compared this facility to, the most common ones and the ones that we think are the most illustrative are lawn mower usage and commuting, commuter traffic. And emissions from both of those are cold relative -- relative to what's coming out of the plant, they are relative low temperature. They are also very close to the ground. They don't disperse nearly as well. So when you are looking at the absolute -- When you are looking at the magnitude of these, they also -- It's a fact that they don't spread out as well.

With that, let's go ahead and have the comparisons. The first one is nitrogen oxides emissions in DuPage County. If you compare our

facility on a pounds per day basis, worst case, to an average case for lawn mowers and commuter auto traffic, you have got a little over 7,000 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides compared to 4,830 pounds for lawn mowers and 8,700 pounds for commuter traffic. So those two added together almost double the emissions from the facility that we are talking about here.

The next one is carbon monoxide. This one is really striking. Maximum emissions in pounds per day will be about 5,742 from our facility compared to 155,703 pounds from lawn mower usage and 73,668 from auto traffic. Again, a very significant difference when you consider particularly where these emissions occur.

MR. THOMPSON: Is that an average over time?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: That is what we consider to be an average pound per day based on the information that we have available. So yes, that's a pounds per day number.

MR. THOMPSON: Over what time period?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: One day.

MR. THOMPSON: Worst case?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: That was an average based on the available information that we had for the everyday activities.

MR. THOMPSON: I will ask my questions later.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: The next one, volatile organic matter. You will notice lawn mowers aren't on here. We didn't have emission numbers on lawn mowers for volatile organic matter. Again, 258 pounds per day from the facility versus 5,417 from commuter traffic.

FEMALE VOICE: What is volatile organic matter? What is it?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Volatile organic matter, I actually would like to let one of the IEPA gentlemen define that.

But if I could -- I'm almost done here. Thank you.

The last everyday comparison we have is particulate matter emissions in Du Page County. Once again, about 800, a little over 800 pounds per day, from Reliant Energy Aurora and about 1,733 from commuter auto traffic. So again, just trying to put all these emissions in perspective.

As Richard mentioned, he talked a little bit about the existing Electric Junction peaking station, which many of you have lived with for 30 years now. To compare these two facilities, remember, first of all, before I run through these numbers, that Reliant Energy Aurora will put out 950 megawatts or 870 on a summer day, I should say, versus about 250 for Electric Junction's.

As you can see, the -- This is comparing allowable emissions from the two facilities, permit emissions. The first chart on the far left of the chart it says 998 versus 657. That's the total amount of electric generation. That's just so we are comparing when it's operating for 1,050 hours per unit per year compared to about 2500 hours per year of Electric Junction. They operate at their maximum. We would put out 248 tons, 247.5 tons of nitrogen oxides. They would put out 2,241. Carbon monoxide, we would be at 211 versus their 645. Their particulate matter emissions are nearly four times as high. The volatile organic matter emissions are about 10 times as high. Yes, the two emissions are about 130 times higher than ours.

And this is the last one, I promise. To also put this, as -- I know that her arms are getting tired. As Richard mentioned, the Electric Junction facility only operated about 250 hours last year. So we compared the permitted levels from our facility to the actual emissions in 1998 from Electric Junction.

Our nitrogen oxide emissions, if you can see -- Remember, if you can, we are talking about -- We are talking about a 950-megawatt facility operating for 1,050 hours per year versus 250 -- 250-megawatt facility operating at 200 to 250 hours. Our NOx emissions or nitrogen oxide emissions are almost exactly the same. And our volatile organic matter emissions are slightly less than theirs. This is particularly important in Chicago. Those are the two pollutants that are concerns since there is an ozone nonattainment here.

So the point we are making is this facility can make significantly more electricity, about 20 times more electricity, for only the equivalent of the emissions that Electric Junction is currently putting out.

So to conclude, what I'm trying to say is we think that this shows that Reliant Energy Aurora will use the best available control technology. It will be using only clean natural gas. It will not affect the air quality in this area. And we think on balance this is a good plant for Aurora. And that concludes my presentation.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Thank you. We will now entertain questions from the audience. And again, I want to reiterate that we just really want questions at this point. Everyone will get a chance to make a statement, everyone that so desires. But if you want to just address your questions to the four speakers, and they will answer your question.

I think what I will probably ask to do to make this go quicker, if everyone would just line up at the microphone, and then -- at the microphone stand here. We will put the microphone out and everyone can -- We'll go one at a time.

Please state your name and spell it.

MR. GOEBEL: My name is Chris Goebel, C-h-r-i-s, G-o-e-b-e-l. And I have the unfortunate distinction of having my initials for the models of

the generator set, how ironic. First of all, I would like to -- And it's still a question as far as the hours of operation of the set. Who determined the 250 hours of operation on the existing Eola junction station?

MR. BENEDICT: Can you hear me if I just speak?

That 200 to 250 is based on published data that RDI has and all power plants that run in the United States.

MR. GOEBEL: Because that information is not correct. I, in fact, know how many hours that that station operates because one of my customers has an office right across from that station. As a matter of fact, that station has only operated about several hours last year for over a two-day period. So the numbers which are based comparing this plant to their plant based on hours of operation need to be recalculated.

MR. BENEDICT: The 200 to 250 hours was 1998 figures, that is the latest available. It ran roughly the same in 1997, 1998.

MR. GOEBEL: With what load do the turbines operate under?

MR. BENEDICT: It's a somewhat unusual pattern that one turbine seems to represent about two thirds of the hours of operation. I don't know why that is. And the other turbines, as you indicate, run a very little amount. In fact, in 1998 only ten turbines ran. Again, I don't know why. I'm just looking at publicly available data. And the year before all 12 ran.

MR. GOEBEL: So you are saying that based on what you have just told me now is that the numbers which your fancy charts are based upon are erroneous, is that correct?

MR. BENEDICT: No, that is not correct.

MR. GOEBEL: Could you define that further, please.

MR. BENEDICT: Well, you know --

MR. GOEBEL: I have a business that operates right across and away from there. And they tell me exactly when that turns on. Because when the station turns on, they can't answer their telephone sometimes when the turbines fire up under load. Fortunately, it only happens a couple days a year.

MR. BENEDICT: And I certainly agree that

those turbines would be very loud with minimal noise abatement. I would be happy to provide the data from you from RDI. It's a source that puts data out on all plants throughout the country. And if you give me your address or fax number, I will get to you the information.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, what I would like to do is have the information made public. I don't want to see it myself. I want to see it publicized in the 60504 area.

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOEBEL: By the way, I am a power engineer.

My next question is how did you base the 2000 year technology versus 1970 technology, how do you base that number?

MR. BENEDICT: How do I base that number? Both plants have draft permits. The permit for Midwest Generating plant is different than our draft permit because that's -- that is a grandfathered plant. So I guess their draft permit is for administrative purposes, and that indicates the technology is 1970. Of course, our plant is based on equipment that is being produced right now

in the year 2000.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Actually, I would -- If you don't mind, Excuse me for interrupting.

MR. GOEBEL: Please.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I would like to go back to the previous question. The numbers that we used for carbon monoxide, volatile organic matter, and nitrogen oxides were actually numbers reported to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in an emissions inventory. The numbers -- The first three numbers, the carbon monoxide, volatile organic, nitrogen oxides, we obtained from the Illinois EPA Emission Inventory Section. They were not calculated based on assumed hours of operation.

So while we discussed what we believe to be the hours of operation, the CO, VOM and NOx numbers that were in there are from official sources publicly available information, so I would say with certainty that those numbers are not erroneous.

MR. GOEBEL: Thank you. But the other question I have is this is -- Is that based on the hours of operation or is that -- You said that's based on measured information.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I do not know. I got the information from the Illinois EPA. Perhaps Chris or Shashi could elucidate the sources of that information.

MR. ROMAINE: Well, that's information that at that point Commonwealth Edison reported to us in their annual emission report. I'm not sure if they calculated their emissions based on the hours they operated or the amount of fuel they consumed.

But our data shows, for example, for NOx that in 1997 based on those reports that site operated to emit about 90 tons per year. In 1998, there was a substantial increase and the emissions were about 230 tons per year. As I said, we have not received our reports yet for 1999. They come in in May.

MR. GOEBEL: Another question I have is it was stated in the meeting that the Electric Junction has been there for 30 years. These existing turbines have not been there for 30 years. They have only very recently been installed. So if the need of the junction is so high for demand, why aren't they even turning them on just for a few days a year and just for a short period of time?

(A round of applause.)

MR. BENEDICT: As we talked about in Aurora, that is, the Aurora town meeting, peak demand is really a function of weather. And there is about 200 -- In this part of the world, there is about 250 to 300 hours a year in any season -- in any year, excuse me, when there is going to be peak demand. During those particularly hot hours, you see almost every plant available running.

One of the things that happened in that period of 200 to 300 hours is it's very difficult to move power anywhere within the system. So there is tremendous stress on the system during those hours. You have another period of time, a little greater period of time, where there is still some peak demand related to weather but not this real needle peak --

(A round of applause.)

MR. BENEDICT: And during that period of time, we estimate for a plant with the efficiency that we have would probably typically on a typical summer be about 800 hours. So again, as I pointed out, the Electric Junction plant is much less efficient, has historically only run during a

period of extreme demand.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, several weeks ago, I was at U.S. Steel in Hammond, Indiana, doing a power audit. And I happened to witness in a room that was about three times this size an electric arc furnace with carbon rods buzzing at 100 to 300 megawatts of power, very impressive. I can't conceivably see all the homes in Du Page County consuming that much power at that period of time.

And I have an article with me, which is by the Department of --

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Can I interrupt right now?

MR. GOEBEL: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: At this point we are just asking questions. If you want to make a statement --

MR. GOEBEL: Sure. I have more questions.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: We have a lot of people waiting to ask questions. So if you can --

MALE VOICE: Go ahead. We don't mind.

MR. GOEBEL: I have some more questions.

MALE VOICE: Ask your questions.

MALE VOICE: He represents a group, sir.

MR. GOEBEL: The other question I have is if the Illinois EPA is looking at -- I have an idea for a way to improve reliability on the grid, and I have a way to do that with zero emissions. And you know the way to do is, that's to operate their plant as a synchronous converter generating zero emissions. It's a dirty little secret about this. But, for example, if you look at the Florida Keys, they had an existing generating station, which at that generating station instead of bringing it back on line, they operate it as a synchronous converter. It's producing zero emissions. So if we talk about reliability, I'm all for increasing stability in the grid. However, there is a way to do it without producing any emissions at all; and that's operating as a synchronous converter.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: I think if -- Was that a question?

MR. GOEBEL: Pardon me?

MR. ROMAINE: Was that a question?

MR. GOEBEL: Yes. Why doesn't the IEPA

allow it to run as a synchronous converter to generate zero emissions?

MR. ROMAINE: We have allowed Commonwealth Edison at the Zion plant to run their turbine as a synchronous converter. I think that's the term you are using for this --

MR. GOEBEL: Right. But that's up in Zion, and that's not down here.

MR. ROMAINE: And they have taken advantage of that feature. But that does not create power. That simply allows power to be more effectively distributed and to reduce the stresses on the grid.

MR. GOEBEL: Right. It improves the power and it improves stability.

MR. ROMAINE: That is correct.

MR. GOEBEL: That's an idea that I haven't even heard about discussed here. It would be I think certainly advantageous. I think you guys could all go home with the IEPA and say, you know, "We have won one for the Gipper." And we come home and, gosh, we have created this system and we have created stability in the grid, and we have done it with zero emissions.

MR. ROMAINE: I think, in fact, if that was

as simple as that, people would be proposing that solution. I think that's a rather simplistic approach to the increasing power demands in air conditioning.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, I don't think it's a simple solution. But as far as the emissions go, as far as this plant and producing --

Oh, that brings up another one, where does the -- Where is the plan from Reliant Energy which shows the topographical distribution of the pollutants? It's said the turbines are -- go up high and distribute the emissions. Where is the plan that shows where the distributions are and why isn't that made public?

MR. ROMAINE: Okay. You are asking about the modeling evaluation?

MR. GOEBEL: Yes. The emissions modeling. Where are the distributions, and where is that -- When is that going to be made public for the group of citizens here who have homes like myself that are nearby?

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: That is a good question.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: This issue of modeling was something that the Agency worked on. We actually came to the decision to require Reliant to do modeling in February. We have gotten some modeling stuff from them. I think we have had a problem with getting that information in the library. We will get that information into the library sometimes this week so the people can look at it.

MALE VOICE: You have already issued a permit, and you don't have this?

MR. ROMAINE: No.

MR. GOEBEL: In summary is what you are saying, just to paraphrase -- correct me if I'm wrong -- for the people that cannot hear you, is that you have not received that information yet; is that correct?

MR. ROMAINE: No. We have received that information. We had preliminary information in January. There has been some supplementary information since that point in time. We can certainly put it in the library so the public has a chance to examine it.

MR. GOEBEL: When would that information be available for all the citizens of Du Page County?

FEMALE VOICE: When?

MALE VOICE: When?

MR. ROMAINE: Brad, how soon do you think we can get it there?

MR. FROST: I can get it there by Wednesday or Thursday.

MR. GOEBEL: And this is the distribution for all, everything? VOCs, Mercury, everything.

MR. SHAH: I've got extra copy. There can be two or three copies here.

MR. GOEBEL: Does that show a topographical distribution with regards to recognizable geographic boundaries that people can see where they live and see where these emissions are going to start precipitating out?

MR. ROMAINE: No, it doesn't. That's not the way modeling is routinely done. The modeling looks at the point of maximum impact. And based on those points of maximum impact, if we have no problems there, we don't go further address what impacts are at lesser points.

MR. GOEBEL: I think with all due respect, the citizens here would like to see that map superimposed upon recognizable geographic

boundaries, so they can see where they live and see where the pollutants come out.

(A round of applause.)

MALE VOICE: Or I will sell you my house.

MR. ROMAINE: I think -- I'm not sure if that's going to be possible or not. One of the concerns --

MR. GOEBEL: Excuse me? That's not going to be possible?

MR. ROMAINE: I don't know.

MR. GOEBEL: I went to school and understood that as a student that government worked for people. I'm asking you as a citizen --

FEMALE VOICE: We pay you.

MR. GOEBEL: I'm asking that as taxpayers that is a responsibility to the citizens to provide this information.

MR. ROMAINE: The point I was trying to make is that that information, in fact, is something that goes beyond the modeling that is normally required of major source that Reliant has voluntary performed at our request. When you see impacts and they are not of concern at the point of major impact, then it isn't necessary to go

further, because you know that at other points those impacts are going to be less.

The other point is that those impacts are certainly not fixed in time. If you have been to school, you realize that the weather patterns change. And what you are looking at is a particular snapshot that says under this particular worst set case set of meteorology, this would be the point of maximum impact; and at other points it would be far less than that. So you can't assume that your house would, in fact, be accurately represented. It would be somewhere in the range of something being less than the point of maximum impact.

MR. GOEBEL: Well, where are the points of maximum impact?

MR. ROMAINE: I think given the alignment of this facility, they are somewhere to the east, given the prevailing winds and the fact that these stacks are more or less in a row.

MR. GOEBEL: I think "somewhere to the east" is too wide a description I think for most people in this room.

MR. ROMAINE: I guess I would suggest

that -- Would you like a copy of the modeling and you can examine it?

MR. GOEBEL: Not myself. I think that has to be provided publicly as a governing body. It is the Illinois EPA's responsibility to protect citizens. '70s, we have Love Canal and things like that. While this isn't at this level, but it's the government's responsibility to the citizens to provide this.

MR. ROMAINE: I agree completely.

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOEBEL: I have some more questions. A couple things I would like --

MALE VOICE: Go get them.

MALE VOICE: Go, Chris.

MR. GOEBEL: A couple things I would like to know about is in the operation of this facility is that about three weeks ago there was a head-on collision on Butterfield Road between the Eola and 59, right about underneath the E, J & E tracks. Underneath the E, J & E tracks, there is a place where moisture can condense. And whose responsibility will it be to turn off the plug or to pull the plug when moisture condensates in that

area, creates fog, which I think a lot of these citizens that live around the area, we have seen fog in that area. I know the exhaust temperature may be high, but what will happen when that happens?

MR. ROMAINE: Explain further what hot summer days you are talking about with fog.

MR. GOEBEL: Well, let's just say moisture in the morning hours or later in the day or in the evening, if any moisture condenses.

MR. ROMAINE: I just can't understand the relationship.

MR. GOEBEL: Let's say limits visibility. And it's not an emissions issue, but it's a visibility issue. Whose responsibility is it then? Is it not yours or whose?

MR. ROMAINE: I guess I still don't understand, and perhaps you can help me. Would this facility be operating under cold, foggy days?

MR. BENEDICT: No. In the plant -- The plant will primarily operate -- Almost always --

(Inaudible voices.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You know, we are only taking questions right now from the microphone

because the court reporter can only hear that way. If you have a question, feel free to step up, get into line; and we will be glad to answer the questions.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, we'll get a chance to use the microphone so we'll make this a civil presentation.

As far as the moisture condensation, and we forget about one major pollutant here, which is carbon dioxide. I can't breathe carbon dioxide. I don't think anybody can. We would all kick the bucket if we did. So where is the carbon dioxide going to go from this facility? This is a major contributor to this. I don't have chlorophyl running in my blood here. So where is all this CO2 going to go? Where are the distributions for that?

And on a hot summer day, when people are outside possibly enjoying a barbecue in the back yard, and notice that the air is just not right, where are they going to go? Who are they going to call? Who are they going to write and say, you know, "This is not right"?

FEMALE VOICE: Right.

MR. GOEBEL: Who is -- What's the

procedure for that?

MR. ROMAINE: Well --

FEMALE VOICE: Right.

MR. ROMAINE: I think the issue of carbon dioxide is totally irrelevant to this matter. Carbon dioxide is produced by all fuel combustion units. It is something you need to be concerned about in closed spaces, but it is not an ambient problem. If you are complaining about hot weather, I think everybody complains about hot weather; but there is very little you can do about it.

In terms of odors, there is no odors from burning natural gas. If you burn natural gas in your home furnace, that is the level of odors you have from this facility. If your neighbors burn natural gas and it's burning properly, you don't have odors from burning natural gas. If your furnace isn't adjusted properly, you may have problems.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, as far as breathing carbon monoxide, you know, we can breathe carbon monoxide. You are put in a chamber and breathe it, you wouldn't know and we would just -- We would lose consciousness.

And my question is where do people go if they notice a diminished air quality within their area? Who do they complain to? What is the procedure for that?

MR. ROMAINE: Excuse me. You were talking about carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide?

MR. GOEBEL: CO2. Or and then I will be a generalist here and say specifically when air quality becomes substandard. Because we are not all walking around with test instruments to see what is in the air. But we can just stand out in our back yards and say, you know, this is just -- We can't do something here, it's just not easy to breathe. What do you do then? What happens?

MR. ROMAINE: I guess I need to know more about that. Because, in fact, based on monitoring, Du Page County is in attainment of the ozone air quality standard, it's in attainment of the other air quality standards. If you are experiencing problems, it suggests that there is an immediate problem in the particular vicinity with a nearby source that is not operating properly, so you should pursue it and file a complaint.

MR. GOEBEL: Even if it is operating

properly, what are the procedures?

MR. ROMAINE: Well --

MR. GOEBEL: I mean I don't see any procedures here that everyone can take home and say, look, if this facility goes up and it's done, how -- what's the method of registering a complaint?

MR. ROMAINE: Well, I think the first point is based on the modeling that has been presumed that we availed to folks. There is no reason to believe that this facility will have a significant impact on ambient air quality.

MR. GOEBEL: Oh, another question I have is on -- The number that's based on the lawn mowers. Are these modern lawn mowers or are they like Lawn-Boys and two-cycle engines spewing out blue smoke? Which ones are the emissions based on?

MR. ROMAINE: I'm not sure about that comparison. And I guess I would turn it over to Reliant. I also would suggest that, in fact, the issue is not comparison with other sources. It's to make people aware that this facility does have emissions, they are controlled. We don't believe it will have an effect on ambient air quality --

significant effect on ambient air quality. The fact that there are other sources in the area does not necessarily justify that we would allow this facility to come in as well.

MR. GOEBEL: So what you are saying is at this time is that this hearing really is a waste of my time at this point? Is that what you are saying?

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOEBEL: You just said it.

MR. ROMAINE: That is not what I said. I said very carefully at the beginning of this hearing that this proceeding, we are interested in public comments. We are interested in things that are relevant to our proceeding. What I was saying is the fact specifically compared to that that the fact that we currently have lawn mowers, there could be better lawn mowers, that isn't really relevant to whether we permit this facility or not. The question is what are the impacts of this facility on air quality and to the perform --

MR. GOEBEL: It appears to be relevant because that's what the major preliminary source of the polluter is providing as information. They are

using based on furnaces and lawn mowers and all that as reference.

MR. ROMAINE: I think part of the problem that you have in this field is that people can't see air pollution. It's one of the problems with it. And whenever we talk about air pollution, we get into this problem because we talk in tons. Tons are big numbers. But in fact, when you think about how many people live in the Chicago area and how many cars we have and how many furnaces we have and how many industries we have, and our furnaces and steel mills and smaller plants and printing industries, emissions get into the tons. When you look at the inventory for the Chicago area, you are talking about 1500 tons of NOx per day. That's only a fraction of the emissions that we have in the entire state for NOx.

What this means is that this plant is certainly a significant plant. We are concerned about it. But when you are looking at the impact of these emissions after dispersion, it's really just another addition to the overall loading of pollution. It's something that we have to address as a state, as the Illinois EPA, overall. That's

one of our initiatives at this point is really to rollback emissions of coal-fired power plants. If there is a place where emission control is needed, it's the NOx emissions from coal-fired power plants. The downstate facilities affect the Chicago area. The USEPA has been working on it, the other states have been working on it. And that certainly is a very appropriate place to focus attention.

And there we are talking about large amounts of emissions. So I understand the tons are scary. There is no question. I understand that. That's why you have to break down and think about other things going on. Modeling is also complex. The point here is that there are sources. There is enough dispersion so these emissions once they reach the ground will not be at concentrations that push us up above the ambient air quality standard. The USEPA federal government has established ambient air quality standards. They are out there to assure that we have good targets to know what is safe and unsafe. We have monitoring stations. We have a monitoring station in Lisle I believe, the Morton Arboretum, for ozone. We have monitoring

stations for NOx. It's not as if we don't have a good idea of what the state of the ambient air is. And we also are aware that we have a problem with ozone and we are working on it.

With that said I guess --

MR. GOEBEL: I think with all due respect about that, yes, the emissions are being monitored, but now we are introducing a whole new huge variable. Why can't this thing be located 60 miles west of here or in some planned area?

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOEBEL: My question to you is will this worsen the air quality in the area?

MR. ROMAINE: No. Based on the modeling --

MR. GOEBEL: I can't understand that. Based on the answer that you have given to me, which is we are producing all these emissions, the answer has to be unequivocally yes. So why can't this be located 60 miles away from the area where the emissions are potentially less and the impact is less?

MR. ROMAINE: There are several answers to that. In terms of the modeling, it should not

have a significant impact on air quality in the area. That's just the nature of the very low concentrations, good dispersion. Obviously, it adds to the overall loading, but that's a different concern. And that's -- I'm not saying it's going to get any better with this plant. I'm saying it's not going to get any worse.

In terms of the issue of where it's located --

MR. GOEBEL: I can't believe you -- Excuse me.

MR. ROMAINE: Excuse me. Excuse me.

In terms of where it is located, we don't make that decision. In terms of why Reliant has picked this site, I think it's up to Reliant to explain why they have picked this site.

MR. GOEBEL: We know why.

MR. ROMAINE: Our job is to review the application for the application that's proposed.

MR. GOEBEL: We know why this site has been chosen for this area. But with all due respect, we are the Environmental Protection Agency.

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOEBEL: I think if we take a survey of

this whole room, we will find that probably about -- if we exclude the suits up here, we look at the -- We take a percentage based on the suits versus average Joes, we are going to find out that about 99.44 percent of this room is opposed to this facility.

(A round of applause.)

MALE VOICE: It's a residential area. That's the bottom line.

MR. GOEBEL: Thank you. I will defer this to the next question.

MR. ROMAINE: I understand that people are opposed. And I wish there was something we could do for you in that regard.

FEMALE VOICE: You can.

FEMALE VOICE: You can.

MR. ROMAINE: We go by the regulations. The question is whether it complies to the regulations on the books. Whether it will have a significant impact --

FEMALE VOICE: You don't have regulations.

FEMALE VOICE: You don't have regulations.

MR. ROMAINE: We certainly do have regulations.

FEMALE VOICE: For the peaker power field.

FEMALE VOICE: Not for peaker power plants.

MR. ROMAINE: Certainly we do.

MR. GOEBEL: They do have regulations for turbines and all that. But specifically there is no --

FEMALE VOICE: Absolutely.

MR. GOEBEL: -- to my knowledge, correct me if I'm wrong, but to my knowledge there is no overseeing body which controls where emissions sources are located.

MR. ROMAINE: If you are asking a question about whether there is a process that coordinates siting, you are correct that the state -- Illinois does not have that sort of process, local siting or statewide siting of power plants. That is certainly correct. That is not something that the Illinois EPA could do under current laws. If you want to change that, that is something that has to be directed to the Illinois legislature.

MR. GOEBEL: So what will the Illinois EPA do when about 200 sites are going to be proposed for facilities similar to this in the area? What are you going to do then? Who are you going to

call, Ghostbusters?

MR. ROMAINE: We look at them one at a time, and at some point we draw the line and say at this point there is too much.

FEMALE VOICE: Draw the line.

FEMALE VOICE: Draw it here.

(Inaudible voices.)

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: I would caution, though -- And I have gotten in trouble for saying it in Lake County, and I think my friends --

MR. GOEBEL: Your responsibility is to the government and to the citizens.

MR. ROMAINE: That's correct.

In terms of the impacts of these plants on air quality, the impacts aren't there for us to say no. Now, there are other things we can do to control them, to minimize the emissions to effectuate more stringent regulation, tighten on monitoring to make sure we comply with the emission limitation. But the emissions aren't exceeding the air quality standards. The emissions aren't exceeding the Federal New Source Performance standards. We have noise standards in Illinois

that protect people against noise that is fairly stringent.

What standards would you like us to apply to it?

MR. GOEBEL: I think that's the responsibility of the Illinois EPA.

My question is fast forward in the year 2010, what is the Illinois EPA going to do when suddenly about 200 of these facilities are going to be operating within the State of Illinois? What's going to happen then? And yet, they all meet emissions. All -- Let's say, for example, we have an automobile that meets a certain emissions standards. This is an awfully huge automobile.

MR. ROMAINE: That's interesting you ask that question because, in fact, what we are currently working on putting together is a budget for NOx emissions that would establish a cap on total NOx emissions from power plants and natural gas-fired power plants and coal-fired power plants put together. Part of the issue that we have got to deal with is to generally roll back the emissions of the much older coal-fired power plants.

At this point USEPA has the program called the NOx State Implementation Plan Call where they are trying and they have put in a rule that would require 22 states to work together, come up with an overall approach in limiting NOx emissions from power plants. So if that program is successful and precedes any further court challenges, we will have a program in place that addresses and restricts overall the NOx emissions from power plants which is what is critical for improving air quality not only in Chicago but also in Madison, Wisconsin, across the Midwest, and the northeastern United States.

MR. GOEBEL: Is the Illinois EPA plan looking at scrapping cars for earning credits on emissions?

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You know, these questions are getting a little bit far afield. We are now an hour and a half into this. There is a line of people here. So I'm going to ask you to ask one more good question and then pass it on to the next question.

MR. GOEBEL: With all due respect, I will pass to the next. But the only thing I'll have to

say is that appreciate your time in doing this, but I think that there has been to be some standards that are done. I think you are aware of that.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Thank you for your comments.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ARRIGO: My first question --

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Excuse me. Would you give us your name.

MR. ARRIGO: Steve Arrigo. The first question is to Reliant. There seems to be some terminology that keeps changing here, and I'm kind of trying to get a grasp on this. But when you were trying to sell us on the fact that this was a capacity plant that is inefficient, therefore, expensive to run, therefore, it could only run at peak demand; is that correct? Is that what I heard at the Aurora meeting?

MR. BENEDICT: Compared to base load plants, that's correct.

MR. ARRIGO: Tonight you called it an efficient plant.

MR. BENEDICT: It is, indeed, the most efficient peaking power plant. So as I said, you

have base load plants that run all the time and have a certain profile. And you have peaking plants that are specifically designed only to run during those periods of high demand. Among peaking plants, this is certainly the most efficient.

MR. ARRIGO: Okay. Correct me if I'm wrong, if something is efficient, and it's producing electricity efficiently, is it not going to produce less emissions per kilowatt and megawatt or however you measured it at the output?

MR. BENEDICT: What I was specifically referring to when I talked about efficiency was the efficiency of converting natural gas to electricity. And that's what we call the marginal measure of the production. When someone makes a decision whether or not to run a plant, what they look at, they have already made the investment of the plant or made a capacity payment or what have you, so the question is before you turn on the plant what's going to be the cost for fuel to generate the electricity. And the statistic I quoted to you tonight simply said that our plant compared to the Midwest Generating plant is twice as efficient as converting natural gas into

electricity.

MR. ARRIGO: I think you kind of walked around the question here. My question was if the plant was more efficient, was designed to be more efficient, would it not produce more electricity with less emissions?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Two plants that have the same emission rate in terms of pounds per hour, if one is more efficient than the other, then, yes, for the same pounds per hour that come out of the plant, we will have the same number -- you will have a greater number of megawatt hours generated. So what you said is correct, yes.

MR. ROMAINE: But in terms of your specific question about emissions, it's not. Emissions is a different measure of performance of power plants. In fact, more efficient plants can have more emissions as well. Simply it depends on the type of control technology or the measures that are used to control emissions. So energy efficiency is a very different type of behavior than emissions efficiency.

Now, it's true that the less efficient plant will use more energy. So if all things were

equal, the thing that uses more energy but it's less efficient would have more emissions. But you can also have things that are much more efficient in terms of energy but at the same time have more emissions associated with it.

MR. ARRIGO: My question is have they built this plant to make money, to wrap up quickly, shutdown quickly, to get the maximum dollars for the power they are selling; or have they truly built this thing to be the most efficient plant that they could possibly build?

(A round of applause.)

MR. BENEDICT: You can't answer that question without going back to the fundamental principle of the fact that here in this area on a hot summer day people use tremendously more power than they do on an average point of view. You can't store the electricity. You have to have plants available to generate that electricity for when it's used. So our plant is certainly less efficient than a plant that runs all the time. But our plant is specifically designed to come on quickly, to be able to follow the demand. Because when everyone turns on their air conditioning, they

don't call up the power company and say, "Our demand is going to go up." There have to be units there that can follow that demand up, and that's what ours does. So among peaking power plants, ours is the most efficient technology.

Now, for base load, it's a different kind of plant. And in the overall scheme of things, that plant is more efficient. But it's not practical to build base load plants that you sit around and only run for peak periods. That kind of plant is designed to be turned on and to run for a prolonged period of time. Our plant is specifically designed to be able to be turned on quickly, run for a short period of time, and then shut down.

MR. ARRIGO: I certainly understand the concept of peak, peak power plants. But thanks for your information.

Speaking of peak power plants, using your numbers, total need for the northern Illinois area of ComEd is 21,000 megawatts at peak demand. Du Page County represents only -- Du Page and Kane County represents only 2500 megawatts. This plant is going to produce 870 megawatts. In my numbers,

that's just about all of the peak power that the whole two counties are going to need at peak demand.

MR. BENEDICT: No. Actually if you divide 870 by 2500, that's about a third. A third of the power that is needed on a hot summer day in Du Page and Kane County will be produced by this plant.

MR. ARRIGO: Excuse me. You just, you just told us what a peak power plant is and when it runs; right?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes.

MR. ARRIGO: You said peak power is 2500. If it's based on the numbers you gave us for the whole county or for the whole state, basically peak demand here is double what normal demand is. So the base loads are running at 1200. So the actual requirement is only 1200 megawatts for peak demand. Am I correct?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. That is correct.

MR. ARRIGO: Okay. I just want to make sure that I have my numbers right. Apparently you don't quite have your numbers right.

MR. BENEDICT: I do. And we also say that when we talk about one of the issues that

happened -- The gentleman before you talked about siting the plant for peak demands I think he said 60 miles away. One of the problems you have when you do that is there is only so much capacity on the electrical lines. And generally where Commonwealth Edison gets in trouble is on peak days where there is an area that is being served very well on an off-peak day, on a day like today. On peak days, the system is constrained because of the capacity that's available to move power.

And the big problem that Commonwealth Edison has is that the majority of the generation it relies on is far south from where we are right now, in sort of the Joliet, Will County, Grundy County area. And they have a big problem moving that power north to Aurora and to Du Page County and further north. And that's why Commonwealth Edison specifically said that they would like to see new plants located, as I mentioned before, from Aurora, north to Elgin, and then across to the lake. That's specifically where they have identified because of the issue of moving power here on hot summer days.

MR. ARRIGO: Well, are you going to

guarantee us then that this power is going to be used in Du Page and Kane County?

MR. BENEDICT: From a point of view of physics, power is going to flow to the nearest level.

MR. ARRIGO: No. It's going to load the grid so that they can use it in New York or wherever they are needing it, where they are sucking it out. Let's be honest about this. That is not the truth.

(A round of applause.)

(Discussion outside the record.)

MR. BENEDICT: Now, you all know what property costs in Du Page County, especially property along the --

FEMALE VOICE: Would you sit down.

MR. BENEDICT: It's very expensive. There would be no need for Reliant to buy land here to build a plant here --

(Inaudible voices.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You know, if we can't conduct this in an orderly manner, we can all go home right now. The hearing officer -- I'm sorry -- the court reporter is having a hard time

taking this down. So please limit your comments to the person at the microphone.

FEMALE VOICE: We are all having a hard time taking this down.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: While I've got -- Let me just mention if anyone does want to go home early and want to make a statement, the room behind me does have a tape recorder. If anyone wants to go put their statement on the tape recorder right now, we would ask that you leave by the exit and come around and go into the room behind me.

MR. ARRIGO: I think before you interrupted me, he was busy tap dancing around here.

MR. BENEDICT: The point is that there is a tremendous amount of power that's consumed here. And we believe that by locating a plant here we can serve that need efficiently. And on peak days, it's very difficult to move power. It would be practically if not totally impossible to move power from this plant to New York. Besides, it would be our goal to build a plant to serve New York. We would be locating our plant closer to New York. And our company is certainly active in the Mid-

Atlantic area. And we are looking to build plants there. But there is a need for a plant here in Du Page County, and we would like to build that.

MR. ARRIGO: Excuse me. When you put power into the grid, what happens to the power that was coming up here from the south? Does that go elsewhere?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, first of all --

MR. ARRIGO: Does that get turned off then or does that go somewhere else?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, first of all, from a point of view of economics and emissions, our plant is going to be efficient in the free market. And I believe in a free market. I think our plant will over time replace some of the less efficient, some of the more polluting plants.

MR. ARRIGO: Right. So that needs to be run more often. So what we will do is -- EPA is trying to do, cut down the emissions of the coal burning and oil burning plants, and we will replace them with inefficient gas burning plants that will put out other kind of pollutants. And this is better?

MR. BENEDICT: No. What this will replace

is older, less efficient peaking power plants. Because it's a newer, more efficient peaking power plant.

MR. ARRIGO: Well, let's talk about that. You just mentioned one not far from where you are going to build this one. What's going to happen to that plant?

MR. BENEDICT: Again, in Illinois and other states, we have chosen to deregulate the wholesale generation of electricity. And there is going to be a market for electricity. And I believe that that market is efficient. And I think that plants such as ours that provide better value, a better profile in terms of emissions, will be the ultimate winners in that market. And the older, less efficient plants will not compete.

MR. ARRIGO: Meanwhile, you are just going to add to the pollution that's already pollutant to this area.

MR. BENEDICT: Well, again I think it's very important that you have an Agency such as --

MR. ARRIGO: You are saying "you think," and I --

MR. BENEDICT: Could I answer your

question.

MR. ARRIGO: Tell me what you are going to do.

MR. BENEDICT: Could I answer the question. Okay? I think it's crucial that we have government regulation in terms of emissions. And I think it's very good that we have the IEPA process. But I think in terms of how the plants are turned on and off and how plants are built, I agree with the state legislature that the free market is going to be more efficient in making those decisions than having state regulators.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: If I may, Richard. I would also like to say that by going through the IEPA process and going through the permitting process and the analysis that the Illinois EPA has performed, we have shown them that having this plant here will not have an adverse impact on air quality. So your question was we are going to keep building and building and adding and adding and making air quality worse, and the answer is this is not going to make the air quality worse.

MR. ARRIGO: Wait a minute. That's -- I mean it's just like me saying that, "Well, we are

going to put 100 more cars on the roads here today, that's not going to have any effect on air quality. We are going to put 100 more trucks on the roads today, that's not going to have any more effect on the air quality." Listen, let's get down to the fact you are going to put emissions into the air. Those emissions are going to create pollution, that pollution is going to exist up there whether you go home at night in Texas or not. And we are going to live with that. And you are telling us that it's not going to affect our air quality? Do we look stupid?

(A round of applause.)

MR. ARRIGO: You are talking about one percent, that's one percent. There is more than 100 companies in this area, in Du Page and Kane County. You are going to produce one percent of the pollution? That's a small amount? I don't think so. I think that's a large amount. You want to compare it to cars and to lawn mowers? When you fire this thing up, are you going to get rid of all the cars and the lawn mowers? I don't think so. So all you are doing is adding.

And I'm talking to the Environmental

Protection Agency. What are you doing to take into account the added pollution that's in here? How do you regulate that? You put out standards that say this is okay, this is the right amount; but you can't tell me that it's not adding to the and degrading the quality of the air in our environment.

At what point can you tell me at what point do we produce too much and does it start to kill plants, kill wildlife, poison our ponds, poison are rain water? At what point? Tell me what that is. Tell me what I can live with before we go any further.

MR. ROMAINE: I'm searching in here. I think it's a fairly straightforward answer to that point. We do keep track of emissions. Obviously, this is an ozone nonattainment area. Emissions of NOx and volatile organic material are very important. As part of that process, we keep track of emissions, a three-year inventory type, where we go through and completely review.

In 1990, based on our data, the total emissions for the metro Chicago area were on the order of 2100 tons per day of NOx. In 1996, they

were on the order of 1700 tons of NOx. In 1999, they are in 1600 tons. So, in fact, what we are experiencing as a result of the acid rain program already is significant reductions in NOx emission in this area. And as I mentioned, those reductions will continue to occur as part of this NOx control program that USEPA is mandating. So, in fact, the progress overall is getting better. It's slow.

MR. ARRIGO: Can you tell me what's causing that? What's the major reason for that?

MR. ROMAINE: Several reasons. Certainly the USEPA's motor vehicle control program, that is a significant effect. I'm sure you all know that. How many have testing? But that's a very important effect. Every time you get the new model years, the engines are getting lower and lower. In terms of NOx, the other thing is the USEPA's acid rain program, that has taken us a major step downward. And there should be further reductions that come from that program. And then as I said, we have a program that's coming to get further reductions on top of it.

MR. ARRIGO: What guarantee is there that this plant is not going to raise that?

MR. ROMAINE: You are right. That will be a little bit of backsliding.

MR. ARRIGO: This is an acceptable risk?

MR. ROMAINE: No. In terms of impact on local air quality, the amount of emissions are such that there should not be a significant effect. And I'm not going to say it's going to be the same, a little bit better, a little bit worse. Essentially no effect.

MR. ARRIGO: At what point --

MR. ROMAINE: Based on the modeling that has been performed to the best of my ability, our -- the modeling ability.

MR. ARRIGO: I understand you want to stabilize the grid. Commonwealth has a benefit to put this here, to put more power into the grid here because it's got to be trucked up someplace, brought up someplace. But that doesn't mean that it's right to put it here. Because this is -- The reason there isn't heavy use out here is because people live out here.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ARRIGO: Conversely, one of the reasons people live out here is because there isn't heavy

industry out here. So now you want to bring heavy industry into an area that's been designated a residential, and you want to bring heavy industry because it meets the acceptable amounts of emission? Why not put it someplace where it's not going to have that effect on residential people?

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: Okay.

MR. ARRIGO: They are the only ones who are going to suffer from that because it's going to cost them more. It's going to cost them more to transmit the power. It's going to cost them more to build the infrastructure than putting it here. But I will tell you something, they are coming into our back yard. They are costing us so that they can make tons of money here. That's the problem with this whole thing is you are looking at the environmental impact, but you are not looking at the residential impact and the fact that people live here.

FEMALE VOICE: That's right.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: And I would have to agree with you. I think we have made it very clear that

we are here to address air emissions, air quality impacts. We don't have decisions about where people propose projects. We don't tell local communities whether or not they should site something. That's just not the way Illinois' laws are written.

MR. ARRIGO: Are you in the environmental -- Are your environmental rules set up for different areas, for residential areas versus industrial areas?

MR. ROMAINE: No. We protect all air quality the same.

MR. ARRIGO: So, therefore, if we want to put a steel mill here and it meets the -- met the emission quality, we would put a steel mill here, too.

MR. ROMAINE: That's the nature of the regulations that we have. The issue for that steel mill is if it's appropriately zoned does it get approval from the local community. We would make sure that it did not violate the ambient air quality standards. We would make sure the emissions are properly controlled. We would make sure that it was --

MR. ARRIGO: Who controls the IEPA?

MR. ROMAINE: State legislature.

MR. ARRIGO: Well, I want to thank Chris Lauzen for showing up. I wish more would show up.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ARRIGO: Which is the motivating seat down there to impress on these people to look at these issues because you are affecting the people that are voting for you.

And I'm going to hand it over to somebody else.

(A round of applause.)

MR. THOMPSON: Hi, my name is John Thompson. And I'm not a power engineer. Just a couple quick questions.

I still didn't quite understand some of the data. You seem to expound on those charts a lot with the comparison to the Midwest comparison to lawn mowers and cars, which I believe are two of the most effective -- if not the two most big sources of pollution. What does that mean, pounds per day rule, talking the air in July compared to the cars being driven in July and the lawn mowers driven in July and the averaging over a year? I

always like to know how the data is and you didn't really answer my question earlier.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I'm sorry. The way that we got that data is the data from the power plant was that's a basically 15 hours per day operation, which is the most we can do to comply with the noise ordinance at our maximum emission rates. That was the plant comparison. The lawn mowers and the --

MR. THOMPSON: Could you try and compare apples and apples?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I am. I'm trying to explain to you how we came up with the emissions numbers for all the things that we compare. So that is during a hot summer day that we are talking about. I would consider that to be the worst case, an average hot summer day. We also, we looked at the number of households that are in Du Page County, and we assume that each household -- This is household as defined by the census, meaning basically a family living at one residence. And we said that each household accounts for one hour per week of lawn mowing. And we said that goes over 20 weeks per year. Although the number of weeks per

year is irrelevant because we are really only looking at one day. So we took the number of households and divided it by, you know, got that number of hours of lawn mowing, divided that by seven to get an hours, you know, an amount of lawn mowing per day and came up with publicly, you know, published emission information for that and said that's our pounds of emissions from lawn mowers.

From commuter traffic, we look also at census data, which was based on the 1990 census but updated with '98 information, and talked about average commute time for people who live in Du Page County. We tried to normalize that to the amount of time that people would actually be driving within the county, and we divided that by the number of workweeks in a year, which is typically 50. And we then divided that by five, five workdays a week to get one day worth of auto emissions.

MR. THOMPSON: And that's reasonable to Reliant's pounds per year. Are you telling me that's when they are peaking out on a hot day in July, they are going to have 30 to 45 days, that's your -- pollution. You are certain of that?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: That's correct.

MR. THOMPSON: You are certain on that?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: So the worst day.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I hope you are right. Other question is you are not doing anybody around here any favors. This is a business decision. I do the same kind of thing for a living in an industry, telecommunications industry. It's been a little bit ahead of the electricity, the power industry, in terms of deregulation. How much of your power is forecast to be used by folks here in the DuPage-Kane area versus other parts of the state, other parts of the country? Somebody has to have looked at that, one of you business folks. What's the numbers? Is it 20 percent there, 80 percent here? And can you provide us with that documentation?

MR. BENEDICT: Our analysis is that all of the power would be used in this area. But one thing that happens, and we made this clear when we talked in Aurora, we have not signed power contracts for the capacity for this plant. It's

very difficult to get customers to buy capacity from you until plants are permitted. It goes back to the fact that lots of plants that have tried to be built in Illinois have been turned down. So it's not a fact that any plant that gets proposed gets built. So we don't currently have power contracts. But we assume that most of those contracts will be with customers who are looking to buy power in the wholesale market for this general area. That's why we are building the plant here.

MR. THOMPSON: Let me understand you then. How much is this costing you?

MR. BENEDICT: $400 million.

MR. THOMPSON: You have a $400 million investment and you don't have the contracts? You don't have handshakes? You don't have any business -- sort of -- You are talking about assuming. You don't make $400 million investments with assumptions like that.

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. That's exactly what's done in the peaking power business. You look at the fundamentals of the market.

MR. THOMPSON: You guys are smarter than that. You have to be kidding.

FEMALE VOICE: That's not on his card.

MR. BENEDICT: We do not have any contracts for the outtakes for these plants.

MR. THOMPSON: Have you built any relationships with these wholesalers that -- with a handshake, "Yeah, we are going to buy from you." Come on, you are going to spend 400 million bucks.

MR. ROMAINE: That is correct. No, we don't have any handshake agreements for the sale. We are certainly talking to the wholesale customers for power. We are talking to them about these plants. We have put proposals to sell capacity to them, but we have -- We have certainly not reached a point where we have either a handshake or a written agreement.

MR. THOMPSON: So you have RFPs out there, they haven't responded to you yet. Are they the companies that serve this area only or nationwide, international?

MR. BENEDICT: They are primarily companies in this area, yes.

MR. THOMPSON: How many of them?

MR. BENEDICT: I would say probably a half a dozen.

MR. THOMPSON: Out of how many total?

MR. BENEDICT: I don't market the power, so I couldn't tell you. But the universe of wholesale customers is not huge.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. You can't -- You understand where I'm going with all of this. I mean we are asking the people here who you are going to be serving, and you are saying you don't know. That's your marketing people.

MR. BENEDICT: No. No.

MR. THOMPSON: Do you have any information you could make available to us?

MR. BENEDICT: No.

MR. THOMPSON: We want to know who your RFP is, is that public information?

MR. BENEDICT: No. We are certainly not going to tell you who's our RFP.

MR. THOMPSON: Why?

FEMALE VOICE: Why?

MR. THOMPSON: Why?

MR. BENEDICT: Because we are in a competitive business, and we have competitors who are also interested in that information.

MR. THOMPSON: My company sends out RFPs on

the internet and lets any other telecommunications provider respond to those.

(A round of applause.)

MR. THOMPSON: Do you have any laws that require you to do that, or do you know? Just say if you know.

MR. BENEDICT: I do know. In Illinois we have a deregulated power market on the wholesale power side. It's a very competitive market. We are very protective of who we are talking to and what's going on. Not to hide anything from the public, but because it's a competitive market.

I can't speak for telecommunications. Maybe when we have ten years of deregulation of power, the same way you have ten years of deregulation in telecommunication, maybe it will be on the internet.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So you are talking to a half a dozen companies in this area, but you don't know what the base of your companies are that you are talking to. You don't know if it's 100 or 80 or 50?

MR. BENEDICT: I said it's a small universe of companies in the wholesale market.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And if I -- And what does that mean? Twenty, thirty?

MR. BENEDICT: Again, again, we are in a competitive marketplace. We feel that there -- that companies are here, that when you have a free market that you are going to get a good allocation of resources, the customer is going to get lower prices.

MR. THOMPSON: I understand how our capitalist society works. I don't need an explanation on that. Thank you.

You talked about this is basically for air conditioning in the summertime? Is that when it peaks out? I mean didn't you mention that?

MR. SHAH: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: How much do we have to turn off our air conditioners during the hot days of the summer to not have a plant put like this? We are always talking about all the gas prices right now that are going on, they are going up so high, and nobody is talking about not using gas and not driving. We are just talking about how you can make deals with OPEC. How much do I have to turn my air conditioning off? It's hot in here tonight.

I'm not minding it too much. Do you know what I'm saying?

(A round of applause.)

MR. THOMPSON: Could you give me a gauge on that? I'm not trying to ask a stupid question, but it's a meaningful question.

MR. ROMAINE: I can't give you a gauge on that. I agree complete by with you. The reason these power plants are being built is people are using too much energy.

MR. THOMPSON: You said air conditioning.

MR. ROMAINE: Well, yes. That's the simplest --

MR. SHAH: That's the hot weather. That's the first thing that will begin for 24 hours a day logically. And there is more energy drawing equipment in the house, too.

MR. THOMPSON: ComEd had a lot of -- I don't know what you call -- brownouts or blackouts. I live in Wheaton right now, but we are trying to buy a site for my daughter's school very close to this area in Warrenville. So I'm also, obviously, very concerned. But to my knowledge, most of the brownouts or blackouts, whatever you call them, are

due to distribution issues, bad plant. They weren't due to not having enough power to pump into the homes.

You know, a couple of the gentlemen went over the numbers here. How many people are not getting power right now because there simply isn't enough power to give them? I mean they are turning on their air conditioner, it doesn't work, that sort of thing. Is that happening to anybody? Because it doesn't happen to me.

FEMALE VOICE: No. There is a surplus.

MR. THOMPSON: Where is that power coming from right now?

FEMALE VOICE: It's all over.

MR. ROMAINE: The simply answer is we are not -- We are not prepared to -- We are not here to discuss the power demand issues. We are here to review this plant for possible regulation.

In terms of I guess my personal opinion, if we didn't have those transmission problems, we may have had generation problems last summer. My understanding is that the power demand during that very hot five-day period was pushing the generating plants to the very limit.

And the problem that ComEd has is you don't have the ability to tell people not to build -- or buy air conditioners. It's a tough situation.

MR. THOMPSON: This is, indeed, a free market issue. It's a matter of you competing with those companies that are pumping in this energy so that you can make your money. That's pretty much what it comes down to, right?

MR. BENEDICT: What it comes down to is the problem with the grid here is basically the generation is not where people live. And it's very difficult to get the power to where people live. So the --

MR. THOMPSON: That's the problem. You are putting in a plant where people live. That's the whole issue.

MR. BENEDICT: No. That's your opinion.

(Inaudible voices.)

MR. THOMPSON: That's a fact.

MR. BENEDICT: It's not a fact. If you go back to the point of -- I mean certainly I think it's fair to say, and I think Chris would agree with me, if people stopped using air conditioning

in their homes, there would not be a need for peaking power plants.

MR. THOMPSON: Chris who? Who are you talking about? You are talking about Chris Lauzen?

MR. ROMAINE: No. I'm Chris.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. BENEDICT: And he can comment if he disagreed.

However, so the issue as long as people want air conditioning, the answer is to either build peaking power plants near where that demand is or to build a lot more transmission lines. Transmission lines have their own set of problems in the fact that they are very disruptive to neighborhoods, they have to go through neighborhoods. It's difficult to shield them from view and so on.

But the fact remains, there is a tremendous demand for electricity here. And we have talked about the fact that, you know, that there are certain negatives of having power plants. But there are certainly also negatives of not having sufficient electricity. And do brownouts cause problems with motors and air conditioning and

people not having sufficient air conditioning during brownouts, yes. There are examples of that.

And if people can't afford air conditioning during hot summer days, do people, especially the elderly, have problems? Yes. We have seen that in Illinois. So, you know, again, you have to look at the trade-offs. You can't look at any one single parameter.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. One last question. When you talk about air pollution, what about pollution in the ground and with the water? I know there is a Big Woods, and I don't know this area really, really well but there is a Big Woods Forest Preserve up the street there. I think I saw a little creek. I saw some woodlands, some savannah area, etcetera. What happens to that? What happens to all that? When you get -- Have you looked at those kinds of things? Whether it be raining bringing the pollution down to the ground or maybe there are some things going on with the water that have been pulling out of the ground.

MR. ROMAINE: Water pollution would be subject to a separate permitting program. They would have to obtain appropriate NPDS permits to

minimize runoff during the construction process to make sure that dirt movement doesn't contribute to the deterioration of streams. They would also have to operate with a stormwater runoff permit from our water division to make sure that during normal operation there is an acceptable runoff in the parking lots.

My understanding is from the other discharges that the facility would go to the Aurora sewage treatment plant. Is that correct?

MR. BENEDICT: The Fox Valley Metro sewer, yes.

MR. ROMAINE: Yes. Okay.

FEMALE VOICE: Wells.

MR. THOMPSON: Some went into the Fox Valley sewer system?

MR. BENEDICT: Any of the processed water. Rainwater is contained on the site, and then is gradually put into the existing dispersal rainwater.

MR. THOMPSON: What about the water pulling up from wells underneath the ground levels, how are you doing that?

MR. BENEDICT: Most of that water

evaporates. The water that does not evaporate goes to the Fox Valley Metro, which is the sanitary sewer system.

MR. THOMPSON: Who is paying for the sewer?

MR. BENEDICT: We are. We are.

MR. THOMPSON: You are?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

FEMALE VOICE: Do you get a water bill?

MR. THOMPSON: The deep drilling with the radioactive materials that can be produced, have you reviewed that, addressed that? Do you have an idea of the levels of that? Deep aqua --

MR. ROMAINE: That is not something that we have reviewed yet, no.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. When will we be reviewing that?

MR. ROMAINE: That is, in fact, an issue for the water pollution folks to see that that material can be appropriately handled and that they don't have any trouble meeting the wastewater discharge.

MR. THOMPSON: You mean the water of your department? Are you the air pollution people?

MR. ROMAINE: We are the air pollution people, not the water pollution people.

MR. THOMPSON: Will that be reviewed as well? I would think you would want to hit all the areas, air, water --

MR. ROMAINE: That will have to be addressed by a separate permit.

MR. THOMPSON: It will be?

MR. ROMAINE: Well, I'm sorry. That would have to be addressed with the Fox River. Have you discussed with the Fox River --

MR. BENEDICT: Fox Valley Metro. In other words, Fox Valley Metro has standards in terms of the wastewater that they will accept into their system. And they are governed by a separate, as Mr. Romaine mentioned, they're -- Fox Valley is under federal and state regulations in terms of the water that's discharged in the sewer system. So the check is both in terms of Fox Valley will monitor what we put into their system, and we have to meet their standards. Now, once they put the water back into the ecosystem, the federal and state government will monitor that.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. GOFF: Mark Goff in Warrenville.

A couple things. Actually I have three different topics. One is, pardon the stupid question, but you guys kind of treat us as stupid people. In a home environment, you are an EPA environment type situation, so hypothetically if I have four or five rooms in my house, would I keep one room at a higher temperature, much higher or concentration, say, living room area, than I would in a bedroom areas and stuff like this?

The reason I'm leading to this is is that why -- Have you ever heard the term hot spots? Why is there such a concentration of not only noise but, obviously, the environmental stuff? We have I88 to the south of us. We have got the Butterfield Road expansion, that's eventually going to be a four-lane highway. Obviously, we have got Du Page extension, another runway system. Okay. We almost had a football stadium here, too.

So how much noise and pollution do you want to put in one concentration of an area? And I do understand the grid system. And there is no reason why this could not be put in a more conducive environment that would actually spread

the necessary requirements that we need to live on a day-to-day basis over a wider area. Like I don't mean to put or throw this upon Kane County or anybody else but, obviously, there are less dense areas, that is where the growth is going out, I88. So why not plan ahead and forecast, and apparently the Reliant guys have no idea what the term forecasting is or putting things into the financial, i.e., contracts and stuff like this.

The other question I have got is being a commercial helicopter pilot, I understand what the term we call density altitude, updrafts and everything else. You are putting this power plant on the end of 36, 1836 runway, of Du Page. Now, I can't believe that the FAA wouldn't like to know about the environment that they would put on a final approach to Du Page. Okay? We have got jet traffic, helicopter traffic. We have got private and all this kind of stuff. You have got student pilots out there that would not handle this thing well. Okay?

The other thing, do -- We keep talking about everything to the east it seems to Aurora. And I know you guys don't have the

responsibility of, quote, trying to be a good neighbor. I would hope you guys are a little bit more conscious of that, being a public organization. But this record keeping that I hear, on a couple of situations, one, you guys using 1997 -- or 1997 information. Is that correct, that you mentioned that there was no earlier records of the mini turbine station, that's the latest and greatest information you can get?

MR. BENEDICT: For the actual output, we looked at two different sources. For the output, we had 1997 and 1998 data. For the emissions, it's --

MR. FURSTENWERTH: 1998.

MR. BENEDICT: 1998.

MR. GOFF: This is the day or the world of computers. Kind of ironic, isn't it, that that data is that old and you are actually doing a modeling.

And obviously, you know, I'm sorry, but you guys have already opened the foot and inserted -- or opened the mouth and inserted the foot in this thing is that -- you know, making a statement that you guys do not understand or know

what the geographic footprint of this discharge to this plant and not being willing or sounds like willing to convey that information to the general public is unbelievable. All right.

(A round of applause.)

MR. GOFF: And my final comment I have got is on the -- your fancy charts again we can refer to. Can I understand that when they light this power plant up for whatever, one day or the time frame, they are instantly doubling the number of cars and lawn mowers in the immediate environment for the duration of that operation? Is that a true statement?

MALE VOICE: The equivalent.

MR. GOFF: The equivalent.

MR. BENEDICT: Well, first of all, no, it's not doubling. Second, we didn't say all cars, only commuter traffic. So those statistics for example don't include --

MR. GOFF: So tomorrow morning if you guys are in operation, I just want to make sure I understand. We are just the dumb residents in the area that you want to put this in.

FEMALE VOICE: To the east.

MR. GOFF: Is that Monday morning if the power plant is up and running, a summer day, 100 degrees, one of the worst stupid days that you would turn on your plant in the first place, okay, environmentally, that you are going to actually double the numbers of cars that are on the freeway. Is that not right instantly?

MR. BENEDICT: No, that is not correct.

MR. GOFF: Can you elaborate on that for me with your chart?

MR. BENEDICT: Sure.

MR. GOFF: I knew which one you would pick. Okay. Try the other one. You guys always go for the best. Right.

MR. BENEDICT: No. The best would certainly be the volatile organic compounds. But if you want to look at NOx --

MR. GOFF: But we are talking, if I understand the chart, high school math, no new math in here. 7,000 pounds versus, obviously, 8412. Okay? Now versus -- Can we see the other chart just for a second? Okay. Versus only 5,000 pounds versus the 155. Aren't we a little --

So can we go back to the other one and

use that one. I like to use the extreme factor instead of your conservative factor. So in using that chart, help me understand the math. When you guys turn on the plant, haven't I essentially doubled the commuting traffic for that duration of the operational period?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes. If you are all looking at all the commuter traffic, that's enough. That's about two thirds more, yeah.

MR. GOFF: New math. I haven't gotten all the new math, so -- That's all I have.

(Inaudible voices.)

MR. HERRUP: Hello. My name is David Herrup. I have one comment and then a couple of questions. We are having this meeting and some information about the geographic distribution of the pollutants has been withheld from us, although this has been available to the EPA and to Reliant for quite some time. Will there be another meeting once this information is available so that we can comment intelligently on it, or is this something that will be -- that will not be subject to public comment?

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: There won't be

any more public hearings. But you can, as I mentioned earlier today when we began, we will be accepting any written comments you want to make. If you get those in to us, we will certainly give them every weight that we give the comments that you make tonight. So if you didn't get that address before you leave, stop by the table over there, you can get the address of where to send their comments.

MR. ROMAINE: Let me also clarify. We did not specifically ask Reliant to prepare a map with geographic distribution. Consistent with the typical approach for a major facility, we simply asked them to evaluate the points of maximum impact. Taking this a further step in coming up and saying, well, your -- At this location the prediction is it's -- this impact at your location or in this general facility is a further step that is not normally done for the air quality review process.

It's all done sort of theoretical, worst case points. This whole modeling exercise is a theoretical evaluation looking at what is the worst day, what are the maximum emissions, what is

the worst meteorology. So that's why I was concerned that we may not be able to get that information put together. I, obviously, understand that is of concern to you and that will certainly, hopefully, help us get that information.

MR. HERRUP: I would like to make one comment, that a public meeting on this subject has a very different quality than a letter mailed to the IEPA. It is quite a different forum. And it really does hide information and make it difficult for the public to comment on it.

(A round of applause.)

MR. HERRUP: I have several other environmental issues. My understanding is that Reliant proposes to drill a deep well. And there are communities in the vicinity that rely on well water. I'm not aware of any environmental impact studies. I haven't seen anything on the web about this. We rely upon this well water in Warrenville, in unincorporated Du Page, and for all I know in Aurora also. I would like to know what guarantees there are that the water sources will be protected. Six of the turbines are water injection. I assume that they will consume large quantities of the

water. That's one question I have.

The other question concerns disposal of the water. I'm sure that I will hear that this is not the proper forum for that. But I'm here anyway and Reliant is here. They can answer. There are residues from the deep aquifer water, radioactive residue, and all this other stuff and they vary. Have you taken samples of the water? Do you know exactly with what pollutant -- with what substances you will be dealing? Does your disposal plan include -- Is it comprehensive? Will it deal with everything you have?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. There is -- In answer to your first question, there are no other deep aquifer wells within a mile of our proposed deep aquifer well. And that's the general good engineering practice in terms of spacing of the wells. There is a -- There is outside of a mile, in the Big Woods Forest Preserve an inactive City of Aurora deep aquifer well. And we review the data of the water that was secured from that well. And that's the composition that we work with in terms of Fox Metro, in terms of what we will be disposing into Fox Metro. And we meet all of the

standards that Fox Metro has for accepting wastewater.

MR. HERRUP: And radioactivity also, you have sampled that? Do you know exactly with what you will be dealing?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, I don't believe the issue is radioactivity. I believe the issue is radon. And we do have, yes, we do have an idea of what the radon is. And more importantly, if there were an issue with radon at any point, in other words, what our sampling has shown is incorrect, we would not be able to put that into the waste stream unless we met the requirements. So that is certainly a check on what we are doing.

MR. HERRUP: Where is this information available? Is it available electronically? Can you send it?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, Fox Metro has published standards in terms of you must meet the following to be able to use the system. And I can certainly send that, those specific citations to you. But I assume that the Fox Metro standards in general, you know, are available.

MR. HERRUP: What I'm referring to is the

water from the well which is outside of the mile radius which you quoted you used for good engineering, whether the information about the quality of that water is available and whether that guarantees that the water taken from the site will be a comparable quality?

MR. BENEDICT: Right. And my answer to that is we have to meet the requirements. So if the sample that we use which should be appropriate is not appropriate, then we would have to do something else to meet the standards.

MR. HERRUP: So you are prepared to do that?

MR. BENEDICT: Absolutely.

MR. HERRUP: In a public manner and so that we will know that the way the water waste system has been modified, it's been necessary to modify it?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. If we have to modify the wastewater system in any way, we would certainly let the City of Aurora know. One of the things that we have agreed with the mayor, that it's not a requirement of zoning, but it's something that we agreed with the mayor, is that

the -- specifically on the issue of water of the deep aquifer well that we would review this matter with the appropriate subcommittee of the city council every five years. There would be an annual review. But I will also say tonight if we do anything special in terms of water that we are not planning on doing we certainly would also let that committee -- I believe it's EWQ in the city council know.

MR. HERRUP: What is the volume of water you will be taking and extracting from the well during peaking operations?

MR. BENEDICT: The annual amount of water that we would use would be -- The maximum would be 42 million gallons.

MR. HERRUP: So that would be roughly 2 million gallons a day during operations?

MR. BENEDICT: I -- I don't know if I can do the math that quickly. The other figure I know is it's -- The maximum is 650 gallons per minute. And it would be -- Yeah. I know it's a lot of numbers. And as Derek mentioned, at most you would operate for 15 hours. Typically you would not operate 15 hours. But I think the important number

is the 42 million gallons per year, which is, you know, certainly a significant amount of water. But again in context represents in terms of use of water in Aurora about one percent of the water in Aurora on an annual basis.

MR. HERRUP: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Before the next questioner, I would just like to say it's now after 9:00. We have 27 people who have indicated to us that they want to make statements yet tonight. So I would just ask if you could to make your questions as brief as possible. Limit them to the most important questions you have got so we can get out of here at some reasonable hour. Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Into the fresh air. My name is Nicolie Jordan, like Michael. I'm not a power engineer. I'm a professor at the University of Illinois. I have one comment relating to the preceding question, set of questions.

In a power plant built north of Chicago deep aquifer drilling depleted the water supplied for wells within a six-mile radius. We want to see those figures. We want to see the aerial dispersal figures, and we want another

public hearing. These are vital environmental concerns.

(A round of applause.)

MS. JORDAN: Everyone here should write to the EPA in Washington and make clear that this information was not available tonight.

(A round of applause.)

MS. JORDAN: Do write. Every day Reliant loses is another day of clean air.

Two questions. There is a forest preserve very close to the projected site. How will the pollution from this plant affect the wetlands directly across the street that are supposed to be protected by the state as well as by the federal government?

Question number two, what will the IEPA do to ensure that this wetlands will be protected? Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: The protection of the wetlands will be provided by making sure this facility does not violate the air quality standards, that this facility should not have a significant effect on air quality, and as a result

it should not have a significant effect on the wetlands.

MS. JORDAN: That is so incredible given the figures on a start-up day.

MR. ROMAINE: Excuse me. I didn't catch that.

MS. JORDAN: That is hardly credible given the figures for pollution on the start-up that we just saw from this. And what will the IEPA do?

MR. ROMAINE: Well, I guess I need to -- In terms of credibility, the issue there is it's credible to believe that the wetlands are all right when we already have something on the order of between 1600 and 2,000 tons per day of NOx emissions in the Chicago area already.

MS. JORDAN: To make it worse. There are thresholds for human life and for animal life. And what many of us have been saying tonight is when those thresholds are tampered with, we see this in the east coast, New York Times article, I know this is part of your drive to decrease coal emissions, to protect those lakes and the Adirondacks. If something is not done here, we are going to be in the Adirondacks with these plants.

MR. ROMAINE: I guess and that's why I come back and say that's the issue of total reductions in emissions power plants. This particular power plant next to those wetlands will not have any particular impact. What you need to be concerned about is the large number of coal-fired power plants, the huge number of automobiles. That is the environmental issue for Illinois and the Midwest and the northeast.

MS. JORDAN: I refer you to charts that were shown at the beginning of this meeting for start-up dates. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

MR. SMERZ: Could you display that one picture, the first one with the area photograph of the whole property itself, please.

My name is Paul Smerz. I live on Brick Street. That's 2,000 feet east of the proposed plant. And again, I'm very disturbed that there is no footprint of the fallout from this plant and what it actually can do.

For you members of the EPA, this right here is a nice picture, a nice aerial view of Aurora's last dumping ground. As you can notice,

there is 600,000 square foot warehouses that are being built there. I don't know if there is any study done, any environmental studies on the hundreds of trucks that go in and out of there on a daily basis or the trucks that sit there with their heaters or air conditioning that don't rely on electric or rely on diesel fuel and sit there idling all hours of the day and night. They were planning on putting a plant in there right now.

As you can see, my house is located where you see that tab that says the proposed property. I'm just 1,000 feet east of there. There is also 22 other residents in there. There is 50 adults there is 20 young children. We are in the direct path of the easterly air flow that is a prevailing wind. It's there all the time. I have only lived there for nine years, so I don't know what it did before then. We've got a direct sight line for the plant. We are going to be looking exactly at the back of this plant. So it seems like all aspects of the quality of our life are going to be ruined by this plant.

As you discussed earlier, saying that property in Du Page County is expensive, my

residence and most of the residences in our area are about two-acre parcels and they are very expensive. And I have heard from about 99.9 percent of the people that this is not going to add to our value.

And what's unfortunate that every day when I come home from work when I get away from the world to go in to enjoy my air conditioning or heating, that I'm going to have to look directly at this plant. Because my living area in the house looks exactly at that front view. That's unfortunate.

What we are concerned about in our neighborhood is we are in direct path of the air flow. We are in direct sight of this plant. Our wells are all wells that are individual wells by each house. So there is 22 private wells, if not more. And the last lady saying that story right here, if our wells dry up, it's going to be, you know, part of this plant that's just sucking the water, it's a concern. Because we don't know how the water table, how the aquifers are divided. They are shallow aquifers. There is deep aquifers. I don't know if they are interconnected or not.

But it is a concern of ours.

Secondly, I learned that -- I was educated here tonight at this meeting. For one, my comments before that Du Page County has halted further permit process for any peaker plants that go onto county land because they aren't sure of exactly what environmental impact of these power plants are and they don't want to approve any of these until they know. So I think they are probably working with you guys to find out actually what the environmental impact is. It doesn't seem like at this time anybody can give a definite answer. Obviously, it's great to Reliant, but the County seems to think that there may be a couple of questions.

If we are looking at this plant putting out 500 tons of matter in approximately 90 days, we are talking about how much better this is than the other plant that's over there, which is the Midwest existing peaker plant. Now, we are putting two of these peaker plants within a mile radius of each other. Okay? Along with these warehouses, along with all the other property that's being developed in that area, it's turning

it into an actual waste land.

So if Reliant is putting out 500 tons of particulate but that other plant, that little plant over there in a deregulated market is still going to sell energy because electrical companies are cheap, they are going to go wherever they can to get money to run that plant because not one of these is going to sit there dead, and what happens with that is when this -- is both of these peaker plants turn on at the same time, that one that's 400 times worse is going to throw in 2,000 tons of matter into the air. I know that's an exaggeration to an extent. But if it's four times worse, and you guys are putting out 500, then there is a potential to have 2,000 more tons of matter in the area. It's a concern of mine.

I have also noticed that in past right in the immediate or my immediate knowledge, that there is a peaker plant that was built up in West Dundee approximately two years ago. That's 20 miles north of us. 20 miles isn't too far to feed power down the grid. They are building one in Manhattan, Illinois, right now. That's about 50 miles south of here. That's still pretty close to

feed the electrical grid in this area.

Secondly, both of these are in very unpopulated areas. Another thing you talk about with this plant is it's only putting out one percent of the emissions with this whole county during the period of time that it operates. That one percent of the emissions that this plant generates is also going to be placed back down onto one percent of this county. And that's our living area, the people in this room.

I also would like to know when the meeting is going to be for the water pollution.

MR. BENEDICT: I can answer that question. That was a question before Aurora. Aurora has looked at that matter and has decided, has ruled, that that is not an issue. And the fact is that there are no other deep aquifer wells within a mile of our deep aquifer well. We are certainly aware that there is shallow aquifer wells. Those two aquifers are separated by an impervious barrier. And when we drill our well, it will be cladded so that when we go through the shallow aquifer we do not feed off the shallow aquifer. We only take water from the deep aquifer. And we did that

specifically because we were aware that there were shallow aquifer wells. So in this particular area, those two aquifers don't compete with each other for water.

MALE VOICE: Paul, ask him if he knows what gravity is.

MR. SMERZ: I'm assuming you know what gravity is as far as drilling the hole through the aquifer, is that going to draw water from the deep aquifer such that you make a major draw of the aquifer?

MR. BENEDICT: That's why we clad the well as we go through it to make sure that that impervious barrier is maintained.

MR. SMERZ: True. But as you drill through there with a percussion drill, obviously, there is probably going to be some fracturing and nobody can determine that, you were -- yourself.

Is there any guarantees on the water supplies? Obviously, there is no guarantees right now. But if your plant does decide to start up and does dry out the wells in the area around there, is there any action we can take to get water?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, as I have mentioned,

we have agreed with Mayor Stover's oversight of this by the city council. I would certainly if you felt there was a problem, I would certainly contact the Aurora Water Department. And again, we talked to Aurora very extensively about water. We talked about the issue of either hooking up to the water supply system in Aurora or digging the deep aquifer well. And for various reasons, especially the sort of peaking quality or the fact that our demand happens at once, it was felt that the best engineering would be dig the deep aquifer well. We have taken further steps to make sure we don't impact residents like yourself who rely on shallow aquifer wells.

MR. SMERZ: Okay. My question, though, to you gentlemen here of the IEPA is to actually take a serious look at the impact of this whole development as a whole. Obviously, we can each have past EPA regulations in certain areas; but I'm not so certain that the whole development as a whole has been looked at as a cumulative deterioration of the environment around it. And if it turns out that this plant might push it over the edge as far as an area and as far as occupancy and

whatever they call it where it's overpopulated as far as industry is concerned, if this may push it over the edge as far as being environmentally safe for the surrounding areas. Thank you for your time.

(A round of applause.)

MS. PUFAHL: Good evening. My name is Sandy Pufahl. And a couple of my questions have been answered. Can you gentlemen from Reliant define a deep well? What is --

MR. BENEDICT: It's defined as going to a certain strata. I believe it's --

MS. PUFAHL: How deep?

MR. BENEDICT: Well, it depends with that the start will vary.

MS. PUFAHL: How deep in your survey?

MR. BENEDICT: Generally it's over 1,000 feet.

MS. PUFAHL: Is it going to be over 1,000 feet here?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes.

MS. PUFAHL: Would that be the Lake Superior aquifer?

MR. BENEDICT: It's what's called the

Cambrian Ordovician aquifer.

MS. PUFAHL: Okay. Now, why is the City of Aurora concerned with wells that are in Du Page County and not concerned -- We are not concerned with what the City of Aurora -- We have no say so.

MR. BENEDICT: No. I said that Reliant was concerned with.

MS. PUFAHL: No. You said Aurora. That was a concern of Mayor Stover. And if we had a concern, we had to take it up with him. I believe that's what you said.

MR. BENEDICT: What I was -- What I attempted to say, and perhaps I didn't state it clearly --

MS. PUFAHL: Okay.

MR. BENEDICT: -- was that we talked to the City of Aurora about the use of a well versus Aurora city water. And a decision was made that a well made more sense. What I further said was Reliant, realizing that there were shallow aquifer wells in the area, not in Aurora, but the surrounding communities chose to make it a deep aquifer wells. If you -- So that's the first point.

The second point is the City of Aurora is going to have continued oversight in terms of water. And what I indicated to the previous person was that if they feel there is a problem, I would suggest the appropriate party would be to talk to the City of Aurora.

MS. PUFAHL: We can't talk to them.

MR. BENEDICT: Of course you can talk to them.

MS. PUFAHL: No, we can't. They made it very clear. They have no jurisdiction over us. We can't talk to them.

(A round of applause.)

MS. PUFAHL: We are unincorporated Du Page County. Du Page County cannot talk to Aurora. Du Page County -- unincorporated Du Page County. The people of Du Page county, the elected officials have no say so over Aurora. So we are captives.

My other question of you is where do you live?

MR. BENEDICT: I live in Texas.

MS. PUFAHL: Where?

MR. BENEDICT: I live outside of Houston.

MS. PUFAHL: Do you live near Reliant?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes, I do.

MS. PUFAHL: How close?

MR. BENEDICT: I'm not sure. Probably 16 or 17 miles.

MS. PUFAHL: Do you live downwind?

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You know, we are getting a little far afield here.

FEMALE VOICE: No, we are not. No, we are not.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: It's 9:30. A lot of people want to go home here.

MS. PUFAHL: This is a public forum.

FEMALE VOICE: It's worth my time, it should be worth yours.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You may speak as much as you want, but I would ask you to ask relevant questions.

MS. PUFAHL: This is relevant.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Where this gentleman lives has no bearing on this hearing tonight.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, it does.

THE WITNESS: I think it does because this is about the quality of our life. The people from

EPA, can you list your mission statement for me? Can you read it to me? Do you know it? That's on your web site, your mission statement.

MR. ROMAINE: No, I can't. Can you read it for us? I don't have it.

MS. PUFAHL: Yes. "The mission of the IEPA is to safeguard environmental quality consistent with the social and economic needs of the state so as to protect health, welfare, property, and the quality of life."

(A round of applause.)

MS. PARKER: My name is Julie Parker. As this is a residents floor, I would like to not have any comments from anyone here from Reliant, including these gentlemen, and the gentleman standing on the riser back there who is also from Reliant. I can guarantee they live nowhere near Channelview, Texas, which is a stench, stinking city full of refineries, power plants and such. I have visited there. It is, it is the armpit of the Houston area.

Further, I would like to, for the record, with all due respect, thank you for coming here tonight to hear our concerns. I am concerned,

though, Mr. Romaine, with your frequent rolling of your eyes and acting in -- not concerned about this issue. And I would like that to go on the record.

MR. ROMAINE: Can I --

MS. PARKER: No. I also -- I have a right to speak just as you have.

MR. ROMAINE: If I have, I apologize. I appreciate your interest. I sometimes find some humor, I have to say it, in the way the personal dialogues go. I appreciate the heartfelt comments. I understand your concern about this issue.

MS. PARKER: I want to remind you all that we pay your salaries. That have -- We pay taxes and that's why you are here to protect us.

I would also like to present to you a couple of the permits that you have issued. Excuse me. These are what they look like. They come off of a word processor. You print -- You just press the print button and basically they just fly out the permits, they all look alike. If you want copies, I can get them to you. They do not look into these power plants at any level. They all look the same. And I can push a print button as easily as anyone else and flip out these

construction permits just like that.

Finally, how will the EPA explain the catastrophe potential for this plant ten years from now. For example, the explosion in the gas line that was connected to your facility in Shreveport, Louisiana, that is a concern. There are three main gas lines that run in this area. We are not convinced that there will not be problems with the gas flow into this area especially during the peak need, which will be an increased need. Can the gas lines, can the infrastructure handle that type of input of the natural gas?

Natural gas is a fossil fuel. And I think we can all from basic chemistry understand that we have about 40 to 60 years left of it. That is all. Oil, petroleum, natural gas, 40 to 60 years. We had better start coming up with something different to power our air conditioners, our cars. And I would respectfully suggest looking into the many other and especially other European countries, the types of energy generation that's being built. In Minnesota --

(A round of applause.)

MS. PARKER: Success has been found in

Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other states with various types of alternative renewable, and I stress the word renewable, sources of energy. This is not a renewable source of energy. This will rampage the state. It will deplete our fossil fuels faster than ever. And we only have one planet earth to dig these fossil fuels from.

(A round of applause.)

MS. PARKER: They take millions -- millions of years of dinosaur bones basically composting themselves to find this fossil fuel. Yes, we are finding more sites. But 40 to 60 years, think about our children, think about your grandchildren. This is not the responsible way to go. If it means that we have to come back on appeal, a judicial appeal, we will do that because we know we can appeal this.

(A round of applause.)

MS. PARKER: Your decision here tonight, or when you do so choose to make that decision, will be reviewed by the members of C.A.P.P.R.A. and it will be reviewed by other residents. And we will at that time make a decision on how to proceed.

Recently I saw a film and it was very

interesting about a woman who found chromium six in well water or basically water that was used to generate electricity. Now, the company went out and told all the people in the surrounding communities that it was safe to have chromium; in fact, chromium was good for you. And that was about the time chromium was used to lose weight and things like that. This is a very interesting case. And it is out of California. And I have spoken with their attorney Mr. Matthews, as Terri Voitik, our president. And this is a very similar case. And I suggest that you do your homework and understand that the water that will be trucked out from this plant will have to go somewhere. The contents of that water we have no idea what that will contain and where this chromium six or any other pollutants will be dumped.

It will be too late in 10 to 20 years when we have cancers, lymphomas, lung diseases, heart diseases, and deaths, to go back and look at this hearing and say, "Gee, you know what, we should have taken a harder look at this issue."

(A round of applause.)

MS. PARKER: Finally, I want you to know

that I am aware you allowed a permit for Roxana, Illinois. Reliant chose not to build there. The people in Roxana who wanted tax dollars from this project are waiting for this plant to be built. Basically we have wasted tax dollars in holding many of these hearings because of the deregulation and having to come forth before you asking -- basically the company is asking for permits, wasting people's time, wasting tax dollars, your time, and our energy.

If you are going to allow permits to be granted, I would respectfully request that you do your homework. And if there is a -- Do you have the -- Oh, and please, please, look into the FY2000 Performance Partnership Agreement between the IEPA and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. This was published in 1999 in November. And there are several sections which address the residential siting of such plants and their danger, whether it be from any of the chemicals that we have spoken about tonight or not.

Finally, you should know that this company, Reliant Energy, has recently had their CEO of their wholesale group step down in March of 1999

with no explanation. This wholesale group is new. They plan on making 70 percent of their profits from this venture. That means they have to get power in the grid. There is no two ways about it. They can't make money unless the power is in the grid.

So you are incorrect, this is not a situation where we have information that we can rely on and count on ten years down the road. Basically the effect to the environment is extremely unclear at this point. And I think in each of your hearts you know that. And I think if Reliant would dig deeper into their hearts, if they have any, they would realize that this is not the way to go. There are alternatives that are all over the web. There are alternatives that we've talked about for over 20 years to producing energy. Thank you very much for your time.

(A round of applause.)

MR. WARFEL: Hi. My name is Mike Warfel. I live in Warrenville within sight of the plant where it's planned to be built. My first question is to the EPA. I had spoken with one of the city attorneys for the City of Aurora and they told me

that they did not enforce any sort of performance standards, power plants or anything of this sort, because the EPA takes over enforcement there. And they felt that there could be a jurisdictional conflict. My question to you is does the EPA in any way limit Aurora's duty or Aurora's rights to enforce standards on this power plant?

MR. ROMAINE: Not to my knowledge. They have the same rights of enforcement of a citizen.

MR. WARFEL: So what you are saying is that the City of Aurora by virtue of having the EPA in there still has the same authority to enforce standards on the power plant as they would over any other industry as far as the EPA is concerned?

MR. ROMAINE: Yes. Now, I assume you mean can they go and enforce standards that are adopted or are you asking the question that they can adopt new standards that they would then enforce?

MR. WARFEL: For example, noise. I don't know, can they come in and have a stronger standard than what the EPA allows?

MR. ROMAINE: Can they? That is preempted? I don't know the answer. I'm turning to --

MR. WARFEL: I don't need to hear the

answer to it today. You have a turn-in copy of my questions, and you can send it to me.

Next question is -- No. This is for Reliant. How do you determine when to start up the power plant as far as demand goes? How do you determine that?

MR. BENEDICT: Generally what we sell in a plant such as this is capacity. So we give -- a wholesale customer buys a certain amount of capacity from the plant. And that's an insurance policy for them so that when demand increases -- As I mentioned before, when you sell electricity to the customers, they don't call you up to say that they need more electricity. You sell electricity when you see the increase in demand and you turn on plants to follow that increase in demand up. And so again we sell capacity. Those customers have the right to dispatch the plant as the demand goes up in the area.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. So does your decision to turn on the plant at, say, 4 o'clock in the afternoon on Wednesday, July 7, does that have anything to do with price, the price of electricity at that hour of the day?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. Certainly in a free market price sends the signal when power is needed.

MR. WARFEL: Okay.

MR. BENEDICT: But they are also -- So it's both a price signal and a physical signal that the market in terms of their customers are using more power both.

MR. WARFEL: So your decision to turn on the plant at any given time is based on the dollar amount that you can make at that time? This is how you select the days that you will operate your plant?

MR. BENEDICT: Dollars and just demands of other retail customers who are buying, you know, being supplied by the wholesale provider.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. I'm going to read a section from Title 35. And it's Section 201.160, Standards for Issuance of Permits. "No operating permit shall be granted unless the applicant submits proof to the Agency that the applicant has taken all technically feasible measures including changes in work rules to minimize the duration and frequency of startups and to reduce the quantity of emissions during startups."

My question is as regards Section 201.160, since the proposed power plant is intended to operate only when electricity can be sold at a maximum profit, is it reasonably foreseeable that the frequency and duration of startup will run contrary to the public interests? Does the EPA include profitability as a component of technical feasibility, and at what point does profitability outweigh the public interest?

MR. ROMAINE: You are asking the question about startup. And the issue of profitability plays, if possible, a minor role in that discussion. The question that we focus in on for that particular regulation that you quoted is on technical feasibility. The concern is not so much is power needed, presumably power is needed, that's why they are turning on. The question beyond that is can they manage that startup process in a manner that gets them up and running as quickly as possible with the low NOx burner being effective. Likewise, can they get it up and running as quickly and as effectively as possible so they can turn on the water injection to minimize emissions.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. So you are telling me

that you are ignoring the part about reducing the frequency of startups, that that is not -- That's not taken into consideration?

MR. ROMAINE: That is a consideration for certain types of facilities where they have an ability to control the number of times they turn on and start up. Certainly in that sense, if somebody has a lot of breakdowns because of malfunctions, because they haven't been properly maintaining equipment, that is a factor we can take into consideration. But when somebody is operating a peaking power plant and the demand for their services is caused by an outside force, we have not chosen to take advantage of that provision to minimize the number of startups.

The problem that we would be facing is then we would be asking them to continue their operation when they were no longer needed. So again, I think it goes back to the point that was made about this is a peaking power plant that is responding to a very specific type of demand when the --

MR. WARFEL: When the profit is at the most.

MR. ROMAINE: And that is certainly correct. I can't disagree with that. It's also the point in time which the reason the price is the most it's because the most people want the electricity, and there is a limited availability of people to provide to meet the demand.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. I think we know where the EPA stands on that issue.

This is not -- My next question is not an air quality issue, but it is an EPA-related issue. No. Reliant's. How much sewage -- And by sewage I mean wastewater from your operation. Is any of this going to be dumped into the normal sewer system, or is this going to be trucked out? How does that work?

MR. BENEDICT: All of the processed water from the plant goes into the Fox Valley -- Fox Valley Metro sanitary sewer system. So it's all treated.

MR. WARFEL: Now, is it discharged into a collector sewer at the site; or is it hauled by truck?

MR. BENEDICT: No. There would be a sanitary sewer from the units into the Fox Metro

system.

MR. WARFEL: What is the maximum discharge at any given point in gallons per minute? What's your maximum discharge?

MR. BENEDICT: It's 650 divided by 4. So I guess that's about 212 gallons -- 162 my friend tells me, 162 gallons.

MR. WARFEL: 162 gallons per minute. Okay. Now here's some questions to the EPA. We -- I believe that you regulate bypassing of sewage into the waterways by, say, Fox Valley Metro, under heavy flow conditions, say, during rainfalls. They have unintentional and in some places intentional bypassing into the waterways. Will you be looking into the effect of this additional sewage being dumped into the system and what effect it can have on already overloaded sewers? Also, will you be looking at the capacity of the conductor lines going from the Reliant plant to the treatment plant to determine that you will not be bypassing into the streets or into the waterways?

MR. ROMAINE: I'm not in the water program. On the second case, certainly the capacity of

sewers is something that is of concern to us. There is a permitting program for I believe sewer connections and sewer lines. On the other point, this would certainly be a fact that would be looked at when the Fox Valley treatment plant is periodically examined to see its compliance record.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. So we are relying on Fox Valley Metro to enforce the water pollution requirements in this instance?

MR. ROMAINE: We would be -- We would be looking at the discharge and how Fox Valley treatment is operating I believe. I can check that further with my water folks, but I think that's where the focus would be.

MR. WARFEL: Now, were you aware that -- What did you say, 100 and 200 some GPM?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: 162.

MR. WARFEL: 162. I will withdraw that question. I based some calculations on 900 GPM, which is no longer relevant.

Now, Reliant, do you currently own or are you in the process of applying for permits for or are you thinking about buying any additional peaker plants in the Chicago area, any of the

above?

MR. BENEDICT: We have one peaker power plant that's currently in construction in central Illinois. We have an air permit for another peaker power plant in McHenry County, and we have this project.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. EPA, now, does this fall into the same dispersion area, the one that he mentioned in McHenry, do these two overlap in the dispersion area?

MR. ROMAINE: I don't believe so. If you are talking about local neighborhoods, these are affecting in terms of, you know, these low levels of insignificant -- different areas.

MR. WARFEL: So this is actually a local problem and not a regional problem, and we should be concerned locally about this?

MR. ROMAINE: I guess I need to clarify. In terms of the immediate dispersion, the local effects on air quality, there would be separate local effects. In terms of other issue, the overall loading of the pollutants in the Chicago area, clearly both of those plants are in the greater Chicago area along with a number of

Commonwealth Edison, you know, the overall leading. And so if you are concerned about the metropolitan area, I would look at the overall issue.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. Then you will look at the overall issue?

MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. I don't completely understand everything about this plant, but I have heard talk that it comes in just below the threshold of being a major point source. EPA, can you address that?

MR. ROMAINE: That's correct. That we are looking at the federal USEPA regulations for prevention of significant deterioration. Under that program, the major source of this type would be one with a potential to emit 250 tons per year. They are coming in a hair under that number, that is correct.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. Now, I'm going to read a section from Title 35, Section 201.150, "Circumvention. Except as provided in 35 Illinois --" I'm not going to read this whole thing. But to get to the point, "No person shall cause or allow the construction or operation of any

device or any means including the creation or the use of any corporations or other business entities having interlocutory partnerships or substantially identical ownership which without resulting in a reduction of the total amount of any air contaminant emitted conceals, deletes or permits air contaminant emissions which would otherwise violate these regulations."

My question, Reliant, do you intend to in any way attempt to circumvent EPA regulations by having more than one plant?

MR. BENEDICT: No.

MR. WARFEL: EPA, what do you plan to do to ensure that they do not circumvent regulations?

MR. ROMAINE: The particular rule you are looking at is designed to go to the issue of -- I believe it's stack design to unnecessarily dilute emissions. It also goes to the idea of dummy companies.

The issue that would be posed is if Reliant proposes to build another plant next to this facility at that point we would look at those two facilities as one facility, as one source, as they are both Reliant facilities. That isn't the

circumstance that applies when you are looking at the distance physically and geographically between the facility in Reliant McHenry that's proposed and the facility here in Du Page County.

MR. WARFEL: So I'm hearing on one hand that we shouldn't be concerned about the emissions because it's not a local problem and this stuff disperses all over the place, and we shouldn't worry about it. But on the other hand, if they build them 30 or 40 miles apart, it's not the same place. The stuff is going to fall locally. They are not combined. Is that what I'm hearing?

MR. ROMAINE: I hope not.

MR. WARFEL: That's what it sounds like. I'm just trying to clarify this.

MR. ROMAINE: In terms of permitting, we look at permits for individual sources. Facilities that are that far separated are looked at as separate sources for purposes of permitting. For purposes of planning, we look at those two power plants, all the other power plants in the Chicago area. We have to address all those emissions in terms of making sure that we make the necessary progress toward attaining the ozone air quality

standard as well as generally improving air quality in the area.

(Discussion outside the record.)

MR. WARFEL: I just have one last question.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Okay. Before you continue, though, I see that the line for questions keeps getting longer and longer. And at this rate we are never going to get to the comment section. So I am going to ask you once again, if you standing on this line now, make sure you just ask questions. If you want to address comments, that time will come yet. So try to keep your comments short, concise, to the point. And if you have got a lot of them, maybe you can just ask a few of them and give way to the next person in line. Thank you.

MR. WARFEL: Okay. One final question. This is a money question. And you don't have to give me exact figures. I would just like a ball park figure. Reliant, in the past two years, for sporting event tickets, vacation packages, dinners, gifts of any kind, parties, related-type events and expenditures, approximately how much have you donated to individuals, family and friends, and

others employed or associated with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency? Ballpark figure.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Zero.

MR. WARFEL: Thank you very much.

(A round of applause.)

MR. MC GUFFIN: My name is Bob McGuffin. I suppose the fear of everybody assumes that this plant will, in fact, go in. The second fear that we have is that this plant will be run in some sort of continuous fashion and not be run as a peaker plant to which it's built. Would you be agreeable to any restrictions posed in the permit given to you by the IEPA specific hours, days of the week, and months of year in which this plant can operate? For example, it can only operate Monday through Friday from the hours of 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. from the months of, say, May to September.

MR. BENEDICT: Well, I --

MR. MC GUFFIN: If, in fact, this is going to be just a peaker plant for us.

MR. BENEDICT: There are two answers. We have in the draft permit, there is a limitation on hours. So there is certainly a limitation on that.

MR. MC GUFFIN: What are those?

MR. BENEDICT: It's on average, it's --

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes. Technically it's a limitation on the total amount of fuel that can be burned by the plant.

MR. BENEDICT: Which translates into hours.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Right.

MR. BENEDICT: The second issue is we have agreed with the City of Aurora, separate from this process but with the City of Aurora, that this plant will only operate during a 15-hour day period, which I believe is 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., except in a bona fide emergency. That's something we have done separately. That's not part of this process. That's certainly enforceable.

MR. MC GUFFIN: That is in writing?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes, it is.

MR. MC GUFFIN: And is that seven days a week?

MR. BENEDICT: I don't know that we addressed that issue. Typically the weekend is not a peak period, but I don't think that was specifically addressed.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Okay. Does the IEPA have the ability to enforce any hours of limitation in

the permit?

MR. ROMAINE: If such a limitation were placed on the permit, we would have the ability to enforce it.

MR. MC GUFFIN: You are the authoritative body to say that this plant shall only run weekdays during business hours, to protect the public from it being used as a wholesale power generating plant to sell power willy-nilly all over the place. I realize that the tons of pollutants is a limitation from them running it year-round. But if this, in fact, is a peaker plant, I think the limitations should be imposed so that it can only run during the peak hours.

MR. ROMAINE: I can't see any real objection to tightening up those limitations, sure.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Beautiful.

The next question I have is, in fact, an air quality question. In regards to ozone -- correct me if I'm wrong, this is not my field of expertise -- it is a combination of NOx plus volatile organic compounds and sunlight, is that correct?

MR. ROMAINE: That's correct.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Isn't that correct, the reaction and then you get ozone. What is the federal limitation on tons annual of emissions for NOx? Not the IEPA limitation but is there a federal limitation for annual dispersement of NOx to qualify as a minor source pollutant? I believe the number I heard was 25 or 50 tons. And Illinois, in fact, is one of the few states in the country that will issue a waiver to go ten times that amount.

(A round of applause.)

MR. MC GUFFIN: And from what I have heard in my reading -- and, again, this is not my field -- that Illinois is attempting to control ozone by backwards chemistry, saying that NOx isn't the problem. It's the volatile organic matter which is the problem. So let's limit the VOM and just let whoever wants to put out NOx just go ahead and put whatever you want, when, in fact, there is no way for you to limit VOM. Because it's released every time someone cuts the grass, leaves decay. It's a natural byproduct of the biology that we live around. Am I close to correct on this?

MR. ROMAINE: No. It's more complicated.

And if I'm smiling, I will explain. Susan Zingle behind you has asked this question many times at other hearings. And it's --

MS. ZINGLE: Have you noticed I haven't sat down. I have other questions.

MR. ROMAINE: Okay. The issue that's going to the NOx waiver, this is not just Illinois, it's something that Illinois pursued jointly with Wisconsin, Michigan and Indiana. It was based on analysis of the nature of ozone air quality in Chicago and really the Lake Michigan basin. And it really goes to the -- I guess the simplification. It's true that ozone is formed by the reaction of volatile organic material and nitrogen oxide and sunlight. But the actual form of nitrogen oxide that is involved is actually NO2.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Okay.

MR. ROMAINE: It's one particular form of nitrogen oxide. Most NOx when it comes out of combustion sources is formed as NO. What that means is that the immediate effect of nitrogen oxide emissions in the Chicago area is really to improve ozone air quality. Sounds strange. But when that NO comes out of automobiles and stacks

and combustion units, it actually goes out and scavenges ozone.

What the modeling showed is that reducing nitrogen oxide emissions with control programs that simply went after the nonattainment area actually made ozone levels go up in most of the area. Far out regime, you could get improvements but we have to get into attainment anyway. So that was the basis of the waiver.

Following that waiver, certainly in conjunction with that waiver, we realized that we did have a problem with nitrogen oxides. And the problem isn't nitrogen oxides in terms of Chicago area that are in the air, it's the ones coming in. Likewise, the nitrogen oxide emissions in the Chicago area are a problem for areas downwind. So we do need nitrogen oxide controls overall. We need substantial reductions in nitrogen oxide emissions from downstate power plants. When I say downstate power plants, I mean power plants in Indiana and Missouri. You know, the wind swirls around, this is a regional problem.

So the problem a lot of the urban areas see is that they are experiencing high levels

of ozone coming into the areas because there are these dispersed coal-fired power plants. We are committed to getting further reductions in NOx emissions. When we go after them as part of the USEPA's nitrogen oxide state implementation plan call, we will go after them everywhere. We can get the nitrogen oxide reductions downstate. With a little bit of penalty for controlling NOx in the urban area isn't going to be that significant, we can get to attainment.

But that's sort of a long complicated answer to something that doesn't seem to make sense. And the only other comparison I can give you is that it's sort of like ozone. Ozone at the ground is bad. Ozone in the upper atmosphere is great. So, you know, depending on where it is, the circumstances are different. And we certainly do need volatile organic material reductions in the Chicago area. We have gone after them for the last 20 years. And the programs get stricter and stricter. And it gets more and more expensive and effects the economy to go after those, and it is weighing the most cost effective way to get the reductions that essentially we all pay for. It's

to go after the larger coal-fired power plants and to get some sort of cap on the nitrogen oxide emissions statewide.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Can you speak quickly about the legislation enacted about a month ago, lawsuits were filed on behalf of the east coast states requiring those of us in the Midwest to clean up our power plants and stop the pollution from heading to the east? Are you familiar with that?

MR. ROMAINE: I'm generally familiar with that, yes. I don't believe Illinois was covered by those lawsuits. In fact, that's -- We have a commitment. We, in fact, our director at that time chaired the Transport Assessment Group that worked on some of these things. We are working to get substantial reductions in the emissions because there is no question that Illinois's NOx emissions contributes to the east coast problem to some degree. Maybe not as much. You are right, they contribute to acid rain. They contribute to PM10. Nitrogen oxide emissions hasn't gotten the attention it needs, and we do need to get substantial reductions in it. And certainly the lawsuit by the eastern states has focused attention

on it. I think the USEPA also has an enforcement initiative against coal-fired power plants. That is also focusing attention on NOx emissions.

MR. MC GUFFIN: This is a news flash here. Violations of the Clean Air Act with the full federal ... and states that don't submit a budget showing they might control future highway congestion or construction, rather, and growths of vehicle traffic. One of the cities named is Chicago. This is from The Wallstreet Journal, December 2nd of last year. Any comments on this, about transportation budget?

MR. ROMAINE: No. I'm not familiar with that particular document. But I would certainly say generally that if Illinois does not develop an attainment demonstration on a timely basis there are sanctions that USEPA impose and those will, in fact, go to transportation, not necessarily transportation control measures, that improve the -- But in terms of additional roads which would have serious consequences for the Illinois economy.

MR. MC GUFFIN: How do you feel that the air quality of the Chicago area will be affected

with the introduction of these power plants plus the phasing out of the -- What's it, MTBE, out of gasoline? Are you familiar with that?

MR. ROMAINE: I can't answer the issue on MTBE. I'm not sure how much of our gasoline actually has MTB in it. We are a pretty strong ethanol state. In terms of the impact of these new peaker power plants on ozone in the Chicago area, it really depends. Can we keep making the substantial improvements and get a budget in place statewide? If we can do that, we can get to attainment.

MR. MC GUFFIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LUND: Hello. I'm Vivian Lund. I'm the Mayor in Warrenville. And I have come this evening just to make a short comment, as we have more residents in Warrenville who will probably be directly impacted by this new plant than residents in Aurora. We feel -- I feel personally responsible to come this evening and tell you how important it is to our community that the EPA publish the guidelines or the regulations that are going to be put in place for the new plant and how you are going to enforce those regulations that are

put upon this plant.

The areas of most concern for our residents, at least the ones that have been communicated with me, have -- Of course, there is nothing we can do about the aesthetics. It's going to look like a big plant, and it's going to be pretty ugly. But the emissions and the noise pollution are two very important issues for us. Because the prevailing wind is from the southwest, we are located, our largest neighborhoods are located directly northeast, it's very important that we know what the levels of allowed emissions and what happens when they are added to the existing conditions that are out there and the noise pollution and what is allowed and how would you regulate that. So I think those are the two issues that are most important to our community. And if we could have some direct communication relative to those two issues directed to the City of Warrenville, we would appreciate that very much.

MR. ROMAINE: Thank you.

MS. LUND: Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

MS. OLSON: Good evening. My name is Vera

Olson. That's V-e-r-e-s-a. (Inaudible).

I would like to know why Mr. Shah included a statement of high demand for electricity in his opening marks. Has the IEPA done a study or taken a position on the need for power plants?

MR. SHAH: Peaker plants by definition will operate when energy that is demanded --

MS. OLSON: I understand that. But you said there was a demand for peaker plants in your opening statement. And I would like to know if there was a study done or the EPA has taken a position of why you thought that was in a public meeting a responsible comment to make.

MR. ROMAINE: I don't think the statement was there was a demand for peaker plants. It was when -- I hope what was intended to be said was --

MS. OLSON: He said a demand for electricity.

MR. ROMAINE: What is anticipated or expected or planned to operate at periods when demand for electricity would be high. So the demand for electricity, I hope we didn't suggest that the plant demands or the demand for plants was there.

MS. OLSON: Well, then whatever, whatever he said. It will be by the reporter.

MR. ROMAINE: I apologize.

MS. OLSON: How does the EPA plan to address the problem of the upcoming NOx budget? And while you are working on the plan, why don't you put a moratorium on the peaker plants until you are trying to do what you figure out in the future. We are talking 43 peaker plants.

(A round of applause.)

MR. ROMAINE: I guess the issue that we have is we have to work with the current laws before us. And that's why we have to do. In terms of addressing the NOx budget, this isn't going to affect the NOx --

MS. OLSON: Not plants, 43 -- Don't you think 43 will have an impact on the NOx budget?

MR. ROMAINE: It is certainly a fact that would have to be considered. It doesn't really change the budget. It simply means we will have to get more reductions out of the coal-fired power plants or these guys are going to have to operate less. It's going to have to come out of the environment or out of the atmosphere one way or the

other.

MS. OLSON: And while you don't know how to do it, put a moratorium on siting of those peaker plants.

MR. ROMAINE: I guess we have heard the proposal. And it's under consideration. That's all I can say.

MS. OLSON: Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: I'm going to cut off questioning in 15 minutes. So I would hope that the people that are still in line can limit your questions to your most important questions. Because there are still a number of people here that are waiting to make statements on the record. So please just go to your important questions and state them quickly and succinctly, and we will move on to the next.

MS. ZINGLE: Okay. I will do my best.

I have some questions for Reliant. My name is Susan Zingle. I'm executive director for the Lake County Conservation Alliance. We heard a lot earlier this evening how you are cleaner than coal and how you are cleaner than the oil-fired

Electric Conjunction down the street. Frankly, I'm not particularly impressed. I'm willing to agree that natural gas is cleaner than coal; but I would like to be assured that, in fact, you are doing the cleanest natural gas and the cleanest plant that you can.

On your application you have the model number on file, but you don't list the serial numbers. You say they are not available. Have you purchased the turbines yet?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. We have purchased the turbines.

MS. ZINGLE: Do you have other plants under construction where you could possibly use those turbines? What I see here is that you have got four turbines, the GE at 9 parts per million using dry low NOx. You have heard the people here address extensive concerns, both about air quality and about water, and yet you have six turbines that come out at 25 parts per million that use water injection. In fact, if you could use the turbine, the GE model with dry low NOx, you would both lower your air emissions by about two thirds and reduce your water. Won't you be a good citizen and good

neighbor and give these people the best product you can?

(A round of applause.)

MR. BENEDICT: The two machines are both extremely sophisticated in terms of NOx control. The two machines serve different functions. The larger machines are the ones which have the nine parts per million are the machines that we anticipate would run the most hours, run big blocks of peak energy. They are the ones that will generally be run. The smaller units, which on a parts per million basis are higher, but still well below the standard that we heard earlier today at 75 parts per million are designed for very quick startup, very quick response, and the ability to be turned on and off very quickly. So you have two sorts of machines at the site that meet different customer needs. Both use extremely sophisticated technology and are well below the standards set for NOx emissions.

MS. ZINGLE: They are below the standards set for the 250 tons. Now, if, in fact, all your plants were taken together or you added one more turbine over the 250 tons, you would be subject to

using best available control technology, to using lowest achievable emissions rate, you have to put SCRs on these things. You can be cleaner than you are. And I would like to ask you as a good neighbor and as a good citizen won't you consider cleaning up your act a little bit more, help the overall NOx budget, help these people who live here and help the people in Warrenville. You don't have to be like this. Thank you.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: If I may address that last question. I think that was a question, I'm not sure. But the SCR is not practical for application on simple cycle turbines such as these. Because the exhaust is very high, there is an upper temperature limitation on at what temperature selected catalytic reduction can be operated. So certainly if this were a combined cycle plant, which would be -- you would be able to situate the SCR at lower temperature environment, that would be something that would be required. On top of that, I would submit that the best available control technology that we have proposed for this plant on the -- State permit would hold up to federal review as well. Thanks.

MR. ESLER: Thank you. My name is Donn Esler. I live in the Butterfield subdivision a few minutes from here. My question firstly is -- I'm completely new to this kind of thing. I don't design power plants or anything like that. But it seems to me as though you fellows use the same standard, that is the environmental standards, whether the power plant is surrounded by a soybean field or whether the power plant is surrounded by the homes of my neighbors and I.

MR. ROMAINE: That's correct. I guess the other way I say it is we assume that at some point there could be a residence in that soybean field, we assume that any place that people could be they are entitled to full protection.

MR. ESLER: So you don't necessarily use a different standard when people are raising families five minutes from a power plant as you do when they are ten miles from a power plant?

MR. ROMAINE: That's correct. In either case, the same stringent level of protection is provided to make sure that the plant will comply with the ambient air quality standards. The ambient air quality standards represent the USEPA's

careful review of the data. They are set to protect sensitive individuals. The thing about NOx, it's a respiratory irritant. So it's specifically designed to protect people that, in fact, are sensitive, young children, people with asthma. It's well protective for healthy adults, but that's the standard we apply no matter where the plant is built.

MR. ESLER: Thank you. I did have one other question. Is there any means by which this power plant could be operated more than the limits that we -- the total hours, the total fuel consumption or whatever it is. I guess what I'm saying is it would be ridiculous for any of us to find a $400 -- $400 million shopping mall going up and only being open one hour a day. If we are only using 10 percent of their capacity, and clearly they are not here to serve the public good, they are here to turn a buck. And I'm asking you if by purchasing pollution credits or by any other means, whatever they may be, is it possible for this plant to operate more than what you are basing your figures and your evaluations on?

MR. ROMAINE: I think this really is a

question for Reliant, but I will answer it to start with. Practically, sure. However, that's the nature of peaking power; that they are, in fact, building a shopping mall that's going to be operating and open ten hours a week because that's when people want to do their shopping. Do you want to further respond?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes. I can expand on that. And I think it's totally accurate to say, I think we can say with certainty, that this is as much as the power plant will operate. There are enforceable conditions in the permit that limit us to this 1,050 hours per year per unit and total tons per year of operation. And in order for us to operate any more than that, we would have to go through the permitting process again. And in a practical matter, we would have to go through the somewhat longer federal permitting process, although we are effectively being held to the same standards that we would have to go through in the federal permitting process. There is the same opportunity for public input and so forth if we want to do that.

However, I am speaking hypothetically.

We don't have any intention of increasing the amount of operation. The reason the plant was permitted the way it was is because our analyses showed -- I'm getting out of the environmental area, so it's a little scary -- our analyses showed that this is as much as we need to run for this plant to be a sound investment. There is no reason for us to run more because we have already done the economics to show it's a sound investment.

MR. BENEDICT: Yes. And I mentioned earlier what we sell from this plant is capacity. So we are selling to our customer, wholesale buyer of electricity, the capacity. They know that when they need the energy this plant will be there. Because you can't store electricity. And if you know you are going to need that peak electricity at some point, you need to have the capacity. So how we cover the $400 million is those capacity payments which come in every month. They will cover our fixed cost. So that's how we make money on a plant like this.

MR. ESLER: Okay. So in other words, you would pass on that opportunity to sell six widgets because you can meet your overhead at four?

MR. BENEDICT: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Okay. You know what, I would like to go on to the next questioner, please; or we will never get out of here. So thank you.

MR. ESLER: Thank you very much.

MR. CRAIG: Good evening. My name is Evan Craig. And I'm the volunteer leader for the Lake County group of the Sierra Club. There are several issues that I think we need to follow up, so I'm going to bounce around a little bit.

Gentlemen from Reliant, did you adjust your operating hours to avoid this design being considered as a major source?

MR. BENEDICT: No. We looked at what we felt the market needed in terms of capacity, and we designed the plant to meet that need.

MR. CRAIG: And so the tacit observation that all these permits are written for a smidge less than 250 tons per year of NOx, you consider that a coincidence?

MR. BENEDICT: No. It's not a coincidence at all. If we felt that there was a demand for more power or we felt that there was a demand for a

base load plant, we would have permitted a base load plant; and we would be building a base load plant. We felt that in this area this was the need that was there, and this is the plant we designed.

MR. CRAIG: I'd appreciate it if you would answer the question. I didn't ask you whether you were proposing a base load plant or a peaker plant. I asked you about when you are going to run, I forget, 1400 hours, 1500 hours, and when you tailored the number of hours in order to address the major/minor source thresholds that were discussed earlier.

MR. BENEDICT: No. We designed the plant with the configuration with the four large turbines and the six small turbines because we felt that's what the market needs in this area. In other parts of the state we developed different size plants because we felt that's what was needed in that.

MR. CRAIG: Can the gentlemen from the IEPA consider that a credible statement?

MR. ROMAINE: That's a good question. I have no reason to disbelieve it. What I am more suspicious of is that other plants have inflated their numbers to come in to just below 245 to give

themselves the most flexibility and still avoid major source thresholds. So I have no doubt that some people are certainly overpermitting themselves based on what I believe to be the demand for peak power.

MR. CRAIG: Okay. So is NOx emission from this proposal more representative of the major source threshold or of the pollution potential of the plant?

MR. ROMAINE: I think the 1100 hours is a more realistic estimate than some of the higher numbers that other people are permitting their peaker plants. I don't know why somebody really needs to get a peaker plant permitted at 2500 hours other than the fact they can do it and still be made minor.

I base that on the information for -- I hate to do it but Midwest Electric Junction's plant, which shows even last year it only operated somewhere less than 200 hours. It also is based on the information at Rocky Road. Last year it operated at about 500 hours.

So these plants based in my belief are going for a very specific need. And certainly I

would have to agree that they are going after a particular service that is a very profitable service to provide.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: One more question, please, and then pass it on.

MR. CRAIG: I better choose wisely then. Let's see, if this plant were placed west of here, where would the prevailing winds carry the emissions? And if it is placed here, will the prevailing winds carry the emissions from this plant to where I live in Lake County?

MR. ROMAINE: I can't really speak to the particular prevailing winds. It will certainly add to the general emissions that Du Page County contributes toward Lake County, toward more urban Cook County. It's part of the air shed.

MR. CRAIG: Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

MR. PARKER: Phil Parker, Warrenville. A couple quick questions.

If Reliant exceeds the allowable emissions and/or hours of operation, are they going to be subject to a fine?

MR. ROMAINE: That's always a strong

possibility, yes. They may also be required to go through repermitting if they have, in fact, operated as a major source. At that point they would certainly have to go through permitting as a major source.

MR. PARKER: Maybe.

MR. ROMAINE: No. Guidelines say if you operate as a major source -- Well, you are right. You may get maybe one bite of the apple. But after that, you do it twice and then you are going through full major permitting.

MR. PARKER: And if there were fines, do you know what they would be fined per day?

MR. ROMAINE: No, I don't.

MR. PARKER: I would guess, just a guess, it probably pales in comparison with the millions of dollars that they can generate with their power?

MR. ROMAINE: One of the concerns whenever we have penalties is to recoup whatever economic benefit a source had from their noncompliance. So that certainly would be a factor. If they had any profit from that, the goal of the penalty would be to extract that profit from them. So people should not profit by noncompliance.

MR. PARKER: There was a question earlier about quote, unquote, credits for pollution and/or hours of operation. My understanding, and it may be incorrect, is that as coal plants are phased out, there are going to be credits that power plant companies can purchase to run for more hours and pollute more; is that correct?

MR. ROMAINE: Yes and no. It is certainly true that to operate more hours existing plants may have to get credits from other power plants. That sort of a credit arrangement does not have any effect on established permit restrictions. If they have committed to be a minor source, they have to be a minor source. They cannot buy credits from somebody else and say that says they are no longer -- You have got to be minor.

MR. PARKER: If, in fact, the deep aquifer contains high levels of radon, which I think I have heard comments by different officials that it does, does the IEPA have any regulations where levels can be released by steam, by evaporation, as this water is cooling, it goes into the environment. It's not all going to be trucked out or dumped into the sewer. Some of it is going to come out into the

environment. Are there any levels that are allowable? Any studies done?

MR. ROMAINE: We have no specific limits on that. We would have to address it. We will address it under our general authority to address air pollution. And there certainly are guidelines that are set by USEPA for noncriteria pollutants that we can look at that set levels that should to the best of people's knowledge know it's safe.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I would like to amplify on that just a little -- amplify on that just a little bit further as a result of some of the water quality information that we have and we discussed earlier in the modeling that we did for the EPA. We did a review of the potential impacts from the -- from the natural --

MR. PARKER: From a mile away or over a mile away.

MR. FURSTENWERTH: Yes.

MR. PARKER: In a different aquifer?

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I'm sorry?

MR. PARKER: From one over a mile away in a different aquifer, is that correct?

MR. BENEDICT: We used the same aquifer, same aquifer.

MR. PARKER: But over a mile away, there can be different levels of radon or --

MR. FURSTENWERTH: I can't speak to that. I'm not a water person, but it's the best information we have available.

And Sharon, can you come up and briefly address that.

MS. D'ORSIE: Yes. Not very many people came.

I'm Sharon D'Orise. I'm an industrial hygienist who is licensed in the State of Illinois. We did look at the issue of radon and radium and the, you know, the K series and the fact that we do have these elements in the groundwater. And to put it in perspective, the -- We did get data from the nearest available groundwater source. And that groundwater source has about roughly about four picocuries per liter of radium. Okay. The number -- The key number being four as a reference.

The EPA drinking water standard is 300. So it does at least frame the problem for us.

We did some -- We did some, you know, some basic air modeling to see what would that mean. And we would have to make some assumption but kind of the bottom line is when you model what would happen to those products as they go through, you know, the cooling tower and then they would disperse and whatever. I mean it's about -- The number calculates out to be about a millionth of the value that we would find in the ambient air as a typical value. So I mean I feel based on -- in just kind of framing the problem with the information we have available that there is not a radiation problem from using the groundwater as a cooling water source. Does that help?

MR. PARKER: Do you work for Reliant, or do you work for the IEPA?

MS. D'ORSIE: I work for Reliant.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: You know, it's now 10:30 and I'm going to cut the questioning off. If there is time later on, we will resume it. Certainly everyone up here you can talk to afterwards, but we do have some public comments to be made.

And first I would like to call on

Dennis Egan to make his comments, and then we will take it from there.

MR. EGAN: Thank you. My name is Dennis Egan. I was present a couple months ago when Reliant made a presentation and I asked a few questions. I had suspicions about the answers I was provided so I asked for the analysis that you have been referring to earlier, the Reliant Energy Du Page County Facility Air Quality Impact Evaluation. I have a few concerns with the analysis.

I guess the first concern is that the use of a rural dispersion factor, and that's consistent with a picture that Reliant put up that's 30 years old. It's not consistent with the area at the present time. There are other dispersion factors that could be utilized.

You talked about the footprint earlier. That's on page 3. It's unclear whether the piece had been identified. As you are well aware, what you would then do is run more analysis. So they ran more analysis, and then they said again that it was unclear whether the piece had been identified. That's on page 3 of the analysis.

They modeled the stack in two pieces. The first bottom piece was 43 feet at the maximum width, slendering to 16 feet at the minimum width. On top of that, they placed another column, 62 feet maximum width by 13 feet minimum width. Now, I don't know how you get that kind of model to flow from a 16-foot width to a 62-foot width. But I am sure that that would affect the model. And given the previous statement that they didn't know what a peak is, that would only impact that.

Then they talk about the fact that stack height was taken at 45 foot. And they said this was conservative. That assumption impacts the shift of that original footprint that they don't know where it's at. They used the default ambient temperature at 68 degrees. That's not indicative of when these plants are going to be operating. By their own charts, they said it's going to be operated during the high temperature periods. We all know about the ozone problems. By the air force chart, they talk about 80 degrees when they talked about a rating, which is more indicative of the temperature, not 68 degrees, as they used in their model. They took a fall setting. It seems

inappropriate.

They used meteorological data from 1987 to 1991. Why aren't we using recent data? And it's from O'Hare and Peoria airports. It's not indicative of this area.

What really bothered me was that NOx annual average was used. I asked the specific questions two months ago as to whether or not the model took into effect temperature inversions and specific days. And I was told that the annual averages were not used. Unfortunately, this model used annual averages for NOx. To me that would be a misrepresentation of what was made in that presentation.

And finally, to close, the values of NOx, SO2, particulates, are all compared to the average annual USEPA evaluations in that report. These units are running over an annual period as you are well aware. They are running over a short period of time. And they should be compared to a specific duration, and they should be permitted against a specific shorter duration. It was brought out earlier that your hands were tied by the current regulations. If the EPA which protects

us doesn't have appropriate regulations for this, please get those regulations before you allow these people to be permitted. Thank you very much for your time.

MALE VOICE: Bravo.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Okay. Before I call the next member of the public, we did receive a comment today from State Representative Mary Lou Cowlishaw, and she asked that it be read into the record so I will do that right now.

She said, "As a state representative of the 41st district, I represent that area of Aurora that is in Du Page County. The residents of that area and nearby municipalities have serious concerns about issues relative to peaker power plants. I share these concerns.

Today, April 3, 2000, I am going to Springfield early to meet with the people who developed a legislative proposal to address our concerns. Attorneys must review any such proposal before it is introduced. There are many suggestions being discussed that I'm not at liberty now to reveal the suggestions. However, the IEPA

will be depended upon to spearhead the studies needed to provide fundamental facts upon which objective decisions can be made.

I am convinced that peaker power plants are a state rather than a local matter. Whatever the laws or regulations, they should be uniform throughout Illinois. With the assistance of Governor George Ryan's able staff and the entire legislative membership, both house and senate of the Fox Valley region, a plan will evolve that will enable us to reach a reasonable approach to regulation of peaker power plants.

State Senator Chris Lauzen, Du Page County's Bob Schillerstrom, Aurora Mayor David Stover, and many others are working cooperatively to address the issues of concern. We are especially grateful for the IEPA for its leadership."

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Okay. I will now call the next members of the public. I would like you to try to keep your statements as brief as possible so we can go home sometime before midnight if at all possible.

And if you have already made your statement during the questioning period, you know, please take that into account and don't -- You don't have to reiterate what you have already said.

Next speaker is Jean Marie -- I think it's Kauth, K-a-u-t-h? I guess she is no longer here.

Some of these are hard to read, but this is Paul -- I think S-m-e-r-z, is that right?

MR. SMERZ: I had spoken a little bit earlier in this meeting. It's Paul Smerz, S-m-e-r-z. I spoke earlier and we are within 2,000 feet of this plant, proposed plant. And the things that struck me the most -- especially with the EPA is there is no footprint. There is no real knowledge of the actual outfall that this plant is going to have. Nobody actually has an answer about that.

And secondly, one of the things that does bother me about this specific plant is this plant puts out 100 percent of its pollution in one third of the operating time of a normal plant in an area around here. So that means that this plant is going to be run three times dirtier than any other

given plant at any given time. I think that's a big issue. I have got a wife and two children at home. I say this plant is in my back yard literally. I'm going to look at it every single day when I come home. It's right at my back window where we and sit and eat dinner and everything else. I will be looking at it every day. And I would, obviously, I can't get compassionate and get through to anybody; but I would hope that you consider the residents of Warrenville, the residents of the surrounding areas as part of the impact this plant is going to have. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Next is Maurice Rosenhard. Pass.

Terri Voitik.

MS. CAPEZIO: I will go in Terri's spot, and Terry will go in my spot.

My name is Kathy Capezio. I'm a resident of the Cambridge Chase Community in which Midwest's development is literally a block from my house. My family resides one half mile south of the proposed plant, a community where the average age of a child

is three to four years old, with numerous newborns and expectant mothers.

The following are issues and concerns of mine: This will be running at times children in the surrounding neighborhood are outside playing. These children's bodies and lungs are still developing. I believe this is covered in the FY2000 Performance and Partnership Agreement between the IEPA and USEPA on Page 23, Section 8, "How will this plant effect people of all ages with asthma and pulmonary disease."

I believe you have a responsibility to these children and you will -- You will guarantee that these children's health will not be affected. Also, summer school sessions are held right here in the Stonebridge Community schools and which are not provided with air conditioning during the summer months. Will you guarantee that these children with asthma will not have asthma attacks or suffer any other severe repercussions?

Also, with Reliant's intention of wholesale energy outside of Illinois, why would the state and the IEPA support this when the added pollution is not necessary? With all the proposals

in the State of Illinois, what is really needed to supply our state with power and brownout and blackout time for Illinois taking into consideration the growth factors.

Finally, about a mile and a half southeast of which the wind would take the pollution, I don't know if you guys are aware that the Naperville area is going to be building an indoor amusement facility. What better place to go on a hot-filled day but to an indoor amusement park. Are you comfortable in permitting these people and these emissions to be expelled into the air and let it hit their filtration system? It is your responsibility.

Okay. These are our concerns that need to be seriously looked at as well as the issue that Reliant wants to build ball parks, soccer fields, on the facility for the City of Aurora at a small lease fee. I don't think that that should be an issue with the children's health involved.

This area is populated heavily with children. We moved here for the great education and prosperous futures the Naperville school district has to offer. Only the environmental --

Only the IEPA can put these peaker plants on hold until you could prove to us that these will not have any repercussions. Please study their Naopa plant once it's up and running for at least five years. Test the waters. If this thousand foot well does carry radon, it's going to be expelled into our air which is part of your air emissions permit. There are lives at stake here in which you have a responsibility. Thank you for your time.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Is Terri Voitik present?

MS. VOITIK: Yes, I am. Thank you.

First of all, I would like to thank the IEPA for being here tonight and taking the time to hear us. My name is Terri Voitik. I am a registered nurse. I am founder of C.A.P.P.R.A. and the mother of three married adult daughters and the grandmother of three small beautiful girls, all that reside in the western suburbs of Du Page county. That is why I'm here.

I wish to reiterate that a project of this magnitude, namely, a merchant peaker power plant that is not a public utility and cannot and

must not be built here or anywhere else in our state without a guaranty from both Reliant and the IEPA that we as a community and as the population will not have to sacrifice our health, nor will our quality of life be affected by the construction of the proposed 950 megawatt ten-turbine peaker power plant scheduled for our neighborhood.

The following points are of major concern: I emphatically request that you, the IEPA, take each and every one of these facts and concerns and review them carefully.

First and foremost, there are no regulations for air quality emissions on nonpublic utility merchant power plants. These plants operate intensely during periods when air quality is at its worst; namely, on ozone alert days. The standards do not and should not apply.

Incidentally, these are the same days we as citizens are asked not to fill our gas tanks nor run our lawn mowers. We need new stringent controls on 24-hour concentrations.

Two, high levels of ground level ozone, a product of nitrous oxide released into our air have exceeded safe limits dozens of times in

recent years in this area causing our region to be classified as a severe ozone attainment area. This plant in one day will be releasing 5.4 tons of nitrous oxide into our air further exacerbating the already poor air quality.

Three, we live in the Fox River Valley where fog is a way of life in the early morning hours. Has anyone taken this into account? Where are the independent air modeling studies we have asked repeatedly for?

Four, other co-pathways other than inhalation make significant ways of exposure. Air toxins are persistent and biocumulative. There are multiple sites proposed to this area. What are the cumulative effects?

Five, particulate matter, particularly PM 2.5, which is finer and more dangerous than the course PM 10 material, are small enough to lodge in lung tissue and are minute enough to invade the body's defense mechanism. Current air quality standards do not regulate this fine particulate PM 2.5 matter.

I have some health statistics and facts. There are 10,000 asthmatic children in

Du Page County alone. Seven and a half percent of our parents have asthmatic children. Chicagoland is the third in the nation for SIDS deaths With toxic airborne particulates linked as to one of its causes.

C, it is confirmed that on the average indoor levels of particulates are roughly two thirds of the outdoor level. So much for staying inside.

D, other diseases linked to air pollution are bronchitis, lung cancer, and cardiopulmonary disease.

E, ozone can burn holes in lung cells.

F, children are at a higher risk due to greater exposure because they breathe more per body weight and receive larger doses while engaged in active play resulting in greater oxygen needs.

We as a community should not have to remain indoors on hot summer days because of poor air quality. Summer days are a time to be enjoyed by infants, children, adults, and the elderly.

My last question is water from the 1,000-foot well will be containing radioactive

radon, barium, and other particles. Where will this hazardous waste go, up in the stack in the steam, into the municipal waste water system? How will it be disposed of?

In conclusion, I respectfully would like to remind you, the IEPA, that your role is exactly as stated. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, you are the body who is responsible and accountable to protect us, the population, and the environment. I implore you to return to the boardrooms and take into consideration the enormous amount of intelligent input you have received and will receive, and you will continue to receive. And together with our city and our county and our state lawmakers redraft regulations and legislation as well as siting plans for all privately owned merchant peaker plants before colossal blunders and deadly mistakes are made and our children and their children are negatively affected.

I beg of you to do what is right for our children, our community, our beautiful surrounding natural environment, which we also embrace in spite of the economic consequences.

And one more thing, by the way, Reliant, children are our most precious natural resource. Let us put them first when making our decisions. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: The next is Ken Karrels.

MR. KARRELS: Good evening. Most of the items I want to talk about were pretty much covered. The only thing I would like to stress is that since there is already a peaker power plant in the area that if they are granted a license I would like to see the hours that the plant is authorized subtracted from theirs so that we can at least control the air pollution in the area and also take into consideration the traffic here on I88 and I59. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Next is David Herrup.

Nicole Jordan.

FEMALE VOICE: She already spoke.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Chris Goebel.

FEMALE VOICE: He already spoke.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Robert and/or

Mindy McGuffin.

FEMALE VOICE: They are gone.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: James Santerano.

We may get out of here quicker than we thought.

This one I'm not sure I can read, but it looks like Joseph M-a-w-n maybe? Okay. On Bushnell Road.

Steve Arrigo.

MS. LAUGHLIN: He already spoke.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Mark Goff.

MR. GOFF: Mark Goff in Warrenville. I did already speak, but the one other thing I have not heard to this date yet is one of the facts that we keep talking about, the requirement for peaker plants. I think with all the news and everything else that everybody refers to or used the excuse of, the requirement for peaker plants. I think if you played back the tape on the news that the ComEd guys at the executive level admitted that their infrastructure sucks. Okay. And it's not the input source to the system, it's the overall infrastructure of the ComEd systems; i.e., there wasn't a peaker plant or main power requirement in

downtown Chicago that caused the outage. It was transformer issues. Okay? It's the infrastructure and not the feed. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Arno Peterson?

MR. PETERSON: Good evening. My name is Arno Peterson. I'm a member of the Prairie Road Farm subdivision, which is located immediately southeast of the proposed power plant.

The permit documentation indicates that a total of 497 tons of emissions will be emitted from the power plant. I have heard numbers that it will run 15 hours a day for a total of roughly 1,050 hours. That's a little over two months. The times of year that this will operate is during the heavy ozone alert days when everybody is asked to cut down the driving and also asked not to mow their lawns. Why is such an industry allowed to dump one year's worth of contaminants into the air in less than three months? Why is this measure interval only one year? Why isn't it less, like weekly or daily when the peaker power plants will come up and down in operation? Why is this method of measurement allowed in a

nonattainment county such as Du Page County? Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Connie Schmidt.

MS. SCHMIDT: Hi. I'm tall, so I'm trying to figure out where I should be on this thing. My name is Connie Schmidt. I live in Warrenville.

I submitted a letter to you that I will not read. I just want to let for the record know that it represents the Sierra Club, 2500 members that live in and near Du Page County. We have several different Sierra Clubs in the greater Chicago area. And this is the chapter for Du Page County.

I have a couple of comments. One, I have been to several IEPA hearings. I have never been to one where questions were responded to. Usually you just say the questions and no one responds. I want to thank you for that. I think it must be a difficult process. So I want to -- I sincerely want to thank you.

My only concern is that at some points during the discussion tonight it appeared that there was decisions already made, more so than

gathering information, on the part of the IEPA. And I hope that's incorrect on my part.

Secondly, I want to let you know that this community has brought about with ComEd several years ago and we were very involved with the Illinois Commerce Commission at that point, at that point with power lines, major power lines, were strung down the nature trail that we enjoy here in Warrenville. We were promised that this would improve the power grid and there would be no further problems with power for the Du Page County area. Now we are coming back and we are hearing that there are problems. This is from what I have heard in contradiction to what the gentleman from Reliant has stated that ComEd had said they need more power. I have heard from ComEd officials that they don't need more power. So I think the IEPA might want to investigate that because it seems contradictory.

I also want to say that regarding air pollution, real briefly, I concur with the gentleman that was prior to me. The air pollution standards that you give us, the gentleman from Reliant, are based on annual emissions because you

should, peaker plants are only going to operate under 45 days a year, you are taking the annual emissions and cramming them into 45 days of operation.

More specifically, I would hope that the IEPA would want to in establishing new regulations consider daily emission standards, possibly even hourly, in that during the evening there is less concern with the amount of output, also much less need for electricity. Whereas during the hours of, let's say, 10:00 till 4:00 in the morning till 4:00 in the afternoon, when our children are outside playing in the summer, the peak usage of electricity is that time. So I would hope that we would want to regulate the amount of power emissions that were happening during that time.

Fourthly, I just want to underline that water is a concern for everybody, the Sierra Club, the residents, individual residents who are on well and septic in this area, and enjoy that individual kind of control over their home and home systems and wouldn't want to have to be mandated because of a new neighbor in the neighborhood to

have to go to a city water system that was supplied by Lake Michigan.

I have two more real brief comments, and one is that property value. I am not speaking about just my property. This is not a NIMBY thing. This is what I want to say about property value. Because the ComEd lines went in, okay, just to let you know an example, my homeowner property value went down 16 percent assessed evaluation as of talking to my assessor in January. And it was specifically related to the power lines that went down the Prairie Path.

If property values are going to decrease across the Du Page County area, I would assume that would provide less money for the schools and many of the local amenities that we now enjoy. This would greatly decrease our standard of living. And this is the very reason that people are here in Du Page County to start with.

My last comment is the same as my first. I really mean it when I say I thank the IEPA for listening, and I hope that they really are and that this isn't already a decided issue, and that they will take all these comments back to

heart and think carefully about what the people in this community are asking for. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Next is Sandy Pufahl.

FEMALE VOICE: They left.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Joe Kozak.

Mike Warfel.

MALE VOICE: He left.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: John Thompson.

Michael Dunker.

FEMALE VOICE: He left.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Brian Carr.

Julie Parker.

MS. PARKER: No further comment.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Evan Craig.

MS. LAUGHLIN: He's gone.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Susan Zingle.

MS. LAUGHLIN: She is gone.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Eve Reid.

Don Esler. And I believe that's it.

Was there anyone else that wished to make a statement?

MR. FURSTENAU: Good evening. My name is

Dick Furstenau. I'm a councilman in Naperville, Illinois, just to the east of us here. I came over here tonight to get an understanding of what was going on with the peaker plants and better understand what it all meant because there is a lot of, as you can see, a lot of concern in the community.

And I was invited over by Chris. I wasn't aware that it was even going to take place until he invited me over. I wanted to thank him for that publicly, number one.

Number two, I think I really want to comment on the participants here tonight because I think they have done an excellent job. They have dug out a lot of information. They have brought a lot of things to the attention of you folks that I think are important. And I would hope that through all of this that we take the comments seriously, that we go back to Springfield, if that's where you folks are from, and thoroughly review all of the comments because I think there is a lot of issues that have been addressed here tonight by the public that need to be looked at seriously.

And one of the reasons that I wanted

to comment tonight, as I learn more about this, is the fact that somebody had told me there were 31 of these petitions sitting on the desks in Springfield to bring 31 more of these plants. I came here tonight and I got a piece of paper that said there are 43. I don't know what the number is. I suspect it's probably somewhere around those numbers. But as a public official, if we can come into a community, and if the property happens to be zoned properly, we can get a peaker plant, bothers me tremendously when we have got 43 or 31 or 35 of these things sitting down on somebody's desk in Springfield. That's a problem.

So we need to regulate this by the state. And I know you have gotten letters from the state senators here, and I know the state senators are going to try to do that or at least take a look at it. But I hope you wouldn't go through and very quickly approve all of these before we get something in the legislature that's going to control some of this stuff. All we are doing here based upon the numbers that I also got tonight, which tells me if we built all of these peaker plants, we wouldn't need the power plants we've got

because we have got almost enough power in the peaker plants to supply the whole state with power, so I think that's a problem also.

So I want to thank you for your time and your diligence here. It's five after 11:00 and the folks have made their point. And I think you have responded well to that and I wanted to thank you for that. You carried out your duties as a public officials very well.

And I want to thank the people here for their very good comments and searching out the truth in some of this. I don't know, I'm not a chemist, I'm not an air pollution person, and I don't know the depths of all the arguments; but I know you folks, that's your station in life. And that's what you need to do. And I would hope that you would not make a hasty decision, that you would take a look at all of this. And the cumulative effects of this is what the real problem is. Thank you very much.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Thank you.

Do you have a comment you want to make?

MS. KIFER ASSIAN: May I speak.

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Yes.

MS. KIFER ASSIAN: I'm Alderman Nancy Kifer Assian of the City of West Chicago, Illinois, a neighbor and good friend of this part of Du Page County. I'm also one of the founding members of the Thorium Action Group.

I'm asking you in plain terms -- and I think it's been said over and over again -- for the IEPA of the State of Illinois to have a moratorium on the granting of any permits to power peaker plants until we can get the regs clarified and the regs consistent over this county and this state and so that we can address some of the concerns that you admitted tonight were issues that you needed to address.

The air emissions, your number one regulatory area right now, the NOx issues, the use of a more realistic formula of averaging instead of the yearly averaging, which is an oxymoron to the term peaker plant, where you are going to have high periods of emissions. The waste issues, which I don't think you are addressing. And how many, how fast, how close together are you going to let

happen in Du Page County in the State of Illinois?

I'm not blaming you. Since deregulation, this has been happening so fast and so furious that I am sure you have not had time to address these issues. I think you owe it to yourselves as an Agency, you owe it to the people of the State of Illinois and Du Page County in this case to take your time to get it right, to get proper regs on the books on these issues that have been brought up tonight; these issues that you have shown that you, too, have some uncertainties about, questions about.

I am here to remind you that you work for us, the taxpayers of the State of Illinois; and that is a great honor and a great privilege. And I think you know that you have the ability to do the right thing. And I for one I think all the people in this room will go to all of their local and state representatives and ask them to approach the Governor of the State of Illinois and the legislature, house and senate of the State of Illinois, to ask for a moratorium to give you the time you need to get proper regulations and to address your mission statement that was read

earlier tonight to protect the health, safety and welfare of the people and the environment of the State of Illinois. Thank you.

(A round of applause.)

HEARING OFFICER ORLINSKY: Do we have anyone else who wants to make a statement tonight?

Well, seeing none, we will just about adjourn this hearing tonight. If anyone still does have some questions afterwards, the gentlemen at the table will be willing to stay for a few minutes if you want to ask some questions. But at this point, I will call the meeting adjourned.

* * *

(Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled cause.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

I, JANICE H. HEINEMANN, RDR, CRR, do hereby certify that I am a court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois, that I reported in shorthand the testimony given at the hearing of said cause, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

Janice H. Heinemann, RDR, CRR
CSR License No. 084-001391