



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF  
CLEAN AIR ACT PERMIT PROGRAM (CAAPP) PERMIT

PUBLIC HEARING  
Belleville City Hall  
101 South Illinois  
Belleville, Illinois 62220

August 13, 2003

REPORTER: Sara E. Tipton, CSR  
ILLINOIS NO: 084-003397

---

RIVER BEND REPORTING  
Certified Shorthand Reporters

P.O. Box 577  
Godfrey, Illinois 62035  
(618) 466-8558



1		INDEX	
2			
3	Charles Matoesian		Page 3
4	Chris Romaine		4
5	Kunj Patel		12
6	Rick Diericx		14
7	Kathy Andria		18
8	Laia Vicens-Fuste		33
9	Jennifer Hensley		35
10	Deanna Wagner-Brice		36
11	Jim Bensman		37
12	Christine Favilla		41
13	John Peipert		44
14	Wayne Politsch		46
15	Delwin Johnson		50
16	Ms. Williams		51
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			



1                   MR. MATOESIAN: We might as well start then  
2                   tonight. Welcome, ladies and gentlemen. Let the record  
3                   show this is a public hearing before the Illinois  
4                   Environmental Protection Agency in the matter of Proposed  
5                   Issuance of Clean Air Act Permit Program Permits to  
6                   Dynergy Midwest Generations for their Wood River and  
7                   Baldwin coal-fired power plant. Dynergy is located at  
8                   2828 North Monroe Street in Decatur, Illinois, has  
9                   requested Clean Air Act Permit Program or CAAPP permit  
10                  from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for the  
11                  aforementioned power plants. The Wood River power plant  
12                  is located at One Chesson Lane in Alton and has five  
13                  coal-fired boilers and other related emission units. The  
14                  Baldwin power plant is located at 10901 Baldwin Road in  
15                  Baldwin and has three coal-fired boilers and other  
16                  related emission units.

17                  The CAAPP is the other permit program for major  
18                  sources of emissions, as required by Title V of the Clean  
19                  Air Act. The conditions of CAAPP permits are enforceable  
20                  by the public, as well as by the USEPA and Illinois.  
21                  CAAPP permits may contain new and revised conditions  
22                  established under permit programs for new and modified  
23                  emission units, pursuant to Title I of the Federal Clean  
24                  Air Act, thereby making them combined Title V and Title I  
25                  permits.



1           This hearing is being held by the Illinois EPA  
2 Bureau of Air for the purpose of receiving comments and  
3 data and to answer questions from the public prior to  
4 making a final decision concerning these two  
5 applications. Lengthy comments and questions should be  
6 submitted to the Illinois EPA in writing. Written  
7 comments must be postmarked by midnight, September 28th,  
8 2003. Comments need not be notarized but should be sent  
9 to myself, Charles Matoesian, Illinois EPA Hearing  
10 Officer, regarding the Wood River/Baldwin CAAPP at 1021  
11 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276, Springfield,  
12 Illinois 62794-9276. And that information is available  
13 as a handout at the registration table.

14           Finally, this hearing is being held under the  
15 provisions of Subpart A of the Illinois EPA Procedures  
16 for Permit and Closure Plans, regulations found at 35  
17 Illinois Administrative Code 166.

18           Now we'll start with the presentation by Chris  
19 Romaine.

20           MR. ROMAINE: Good evening. My name is Chris  
21 Romaine. Thank you again for coming to tonight's  
22 hearing. I will provide some general background  
23 information that is relevant to the hearing; but, first,  
24 again, I express the invitation we have ten seats down  
25 front that have swivel chairs and nice big tables. Don't



1 be bashful. Take advantage of them. This may be your  
2 only chance.

3 By way of initial background, Title V of the Federal  
4 Clean Air Act created a federal operating permit for  
5 major sources of emissions. This program is known as  
6 Title V Permit Program. In Illinois we do things  
7 slightly differently. We call it the Clean Air Permit  
8 Program, and the acronym we use for that is C-A-A-P-P for  
9 Clean Air Act Permit Program, which, conveniently enough,  
10 comes out CAAPP. So when you hear the term CAAPP and  
11 Title V, those terms are synonymous in Illinois, and  
12 they're referring to the Title V permit program.

13 I want to share with you what the USEPA says about  
14 these permits. Quote, the purpose of Title V permits is  
15 to reduce violations of air-pollution laws and improve  
16 enforcement of those laws, unquote. Title V permits do  
17 this in a number of ways. First, Title V permits are to  
18 be complete and encompassing permits that address all the  
19 units and activities at a single source. Before this  
20 program, a source could have several operating permits  
21 covering different aspects of a complex. Separating  
22 those permits might not have been -- were not as detailed  
23 as these Title V permits must now be. It is widely  
24 accepted that that is a single, all-inclusive permit that  
25 simplifies compliance for everybody. It makes it clear



1 to the source what its obligations are. When I say the  
2 source, I mean not only environmental personnel but also  
3 operating and maintenance personnel who now have the  
4 ability to much more readily go to a specific permit and  
5 see what their obligations are. For the agency, it  
6 facilitates compliance because there is one document that  
7 summarizes requirements. A field person doesn't need to  
8 sift through complex regulations. He should be able to  
9 use the Title V permit as his initial reference to find  
10 out what the source should be doing, and certainly for  
11 the public it is definitely of benefit as it allows,  
12 again, a person who may not be familiar with air-control  
13 regulations to find their way through very complex  
14 overlapping federal and state rules that apply for air  
15 control. Certainly, these sources at the compliance  
16 checks the oversight surveillance that is placed on  
17 source emissions. As such, we believe the public should  
18 generally endorse the issuance of these permits,  
19 especially sources for which they have concerns about  
20 emissions. The environment and air quality is protected  
21 if they have the permits than if they don't have the  
22 permits. In terms of highlighting, these permits can  
23 fill in gaps of compliance procedures in existing rules.  
24 Depending on the age of the rule, there may be a  
25 limitation on emission standards. It may not be



1 accompanied by any record keeping or specific testing  
2 provisions to address that requirement. The Title V  
3 program -- the Title V permit can develop appropriate  
4 record keeping and compliance procedures to assure  
5 compliance with such rules. Permit also adds additional  
6 reporting on compliance increasing the accountability of  
7 the source. First, Title V program requires a storage-  
8 report deviation, and that includes deviation from  
9 applicable requirements and other types of requirements.  
10 Depending on the nature and significance of the  
11 deviation, reporting can be required essentially by the  
12 quickest possible means: telephone call, fax within  
13 twenty-four hours. Within two days it could be a more  
14 routine nature. Reporting deviations may be addressed in  
15 a quarterly report or a semi-annual report. The other  
16 significant obligation that the Title V permit creates is  
17 an annual compliance certification. This is, again, a  
18 very important tool for showing source compliance because  
19 it requires the source once a year to conduct a review of  
20 its operations and make a formal statement whether or not  
21 it's in compliance, and, obviously, if it has incidents  
22 of noncompliance, it is to itemize them, list them and  
23 explain what actions have been taken to correct those  
24 noncompliance events.

25 What doesn't the permit do? It's also important, I



1 think as I said, this is an operating permit. The  
2 purpose of this permit is not to allow increases in  
3 emission above previously-allowed emission levels. This  
4 permit is also not intended to allow the construction of  
5 new generating units or pull out the modification of  
6 existing units. Those sorts of activities are still  
7 subject to separate construction permit requirements.  
8 So, in general, we look at the issuance of these permits  
9 as a good thing. Permits will help sources fully comply  
10 with the existing limits and regulatory requirements that  
11 restrict its emissions.

12 We're certainly interested in any suggestions that  
13 you have that would approve the permit in this regard.  
14 At the same time, in terms of coal-fired power plants in  
15 particular, like the sources that were given here  
16 tonight, these are already some of the most closely-  
17 monitored sources in the state with continuous emissions  
18 monitors already in place for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen  
19 oxide and opacity. They're already pretty well closely  
20 tracked.

21 Moving beyond the permit itself, this permit is not  
22 a means to generally set new requirements to control  
23 emissions from these sources. The Illinois EPA does not  
24 have broad legal authority in clean air to establish new  
25 requirements to further control emissions from existing



1 sources. Instead, the development of control  
2 requirements for existing sources like these power plants  
3 generally occurs with adoption of new laws and rules.  
4 This ensures that all sources in a particular category  
5 are considered and treated fairly, and overall  
6 environmental goals are achieved. The coal-fired power  
7 plants, this big picture approach, is very important.  
8 This is because an individual power plant generally has a  
9 small effect on the air quality in the immediate  
10 surroundings where it is located, given the emission  
11 control requirements that apply to coal-fired power  
12 plants. However, the effects of a single plant extends  
13 over a very large area so that power plants as a group do  
14 contribute significantly to background levels of  
15 pollution throughout the state, throughout the Midwest.  
16 In other words, to effectively further reduce the impact  
17 of the coal-fired power plants on air quality many power  
18 plants must be further controlled ideally on a regional  
19 or national basis. This is what has occurred and should  
20 continue for coal-fired power plants in Illinois separate  
21 from the Clean Air Act Permits proposed for these  
22 particular power plants.

23 In particular, in 1995, the national Acid Rain  
24 program began requiring reductions in annual emissions of  
25 sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide from coal-fired power



1 plants. In May of this year, a state-based rule became  
2 effective in Illinois, which requires electrical-  
3 generating units to further reduce nitrogen oxide  
4 emissions. We estimate that this rule is going to reduce  
5 emissions by over fifty percent during the summer  
6 months. Next year in 2004 the Regional Trading Program  
7 will require further reductions in nitrogen oxide  
8 emissions during summer months from over twenty eastern  
9 states, including Illinois. These regulatory programs  
10 have and will substantially reduce the emissions of two  
11 key pollutants emitted from existing coal-fired power  
12 plants. There are other actions that are also going to  
13 reduce emissions from coal-fired power plants. As many  
14 people may be aware, the USEPA has important action  
15 against coal power plants for violation of the new source  
16 review program and settlement of those programs.  
17 Enforcement actions of USEPA will also develop results in  
18 emissions from existing coal-fired power plants. There  
19 are also further regulatory programs planned to reduce  
20 emissions from coal-fired power plants. At the national  
21 level President Bush, with support from the USEPA, is  
22 recommending that congress adopt a law called Clear Skies  
23 to further control emissions of sulfur dioxide and  
24 nitrogen oxide from coal-fired power plants. This  
25 program would also again control emissions of mercury



1 from coal-fired power plants on a national basis. The  
2 future levels of power plant emissions under the Clear  
3 Skies program and the form and schedule for the  
4 reductions in emissions are subjects that are currently  
5 being debated at the national level. At the state level,  
6 the Illinois legislature has already adopted a law  
7 requiring the Illinois EPA to evaluate further emission  
8 control for power plants in Illinois. The Illinois EPA  
9 must submit its report back to the legislature by  
10 September 2004 and may then proceed to propose rules for  
11 further control of emissions consistent with our  
12 findings. As with the national proposal for a Clear  
13 Skies program, the Illinois EPA expects its report and  
14 subsequent rule making to be the subject of much public  
15 debate.

16 In any event, when the next new program is adopted  
17 to control emissions from existing power plants, the  
18 Clean Air Act permits will, again, be one of the tools  
19 that are used to assure that the source complies with the  
20 newly-adopted requirements.

21 As a related point, I assume you are all fully aware  
22 coal-fired power plants are not the only sources of  
23 emissions. In particular, cars, trucks and buses  
24 represent the largest sources of nitrogen oxide and  
25 volatile organic compounds along with the largest source



1 of all compound emissions and manufacturing plants also  
2 contribute significantly to air quality. Regulatory  
3 programs are in place and continue to be developed to  
4 reduce the emissions from sources in addition to power  
5 plants. These emission reductions also contribute to the  
6 steady year-by-year improvement in air quality in  
7 Illinois, especially in urban areas like the Metro-East  
8 area.

9 Now, with respect to tonight's hearing, we're,  
10 obviously, trying to provide information to you; but,  
11 more importantly, we are really here to listen to your  
12 comments and concerns. Your comments can and usually do  
13 affect the content of the permits that were issued. So  
14 please make your concerns known to us, and it's also  
15 important that you state your concerns either tonight at  
16 this hearing or in written comments to establish your  
17 rights, if you think you may be wishing to object or  
18 appeal this permit. Accordingly, it's very important  
19 that you state your concerns on the record in writing so  
20 we have a clear documentation of what those concerns  
21 are. With that said, I will turn it over to Kunj Patel  
22 to provide you some very specific details of the power  
23 plants that we're here to address tonight. Kunj.

24 MR. PATEL: Thank you. Good evening, ladies  
25 and gentlemen. My name is Kunj Patel and I am an



1 engineer with the Illinois Environmental Protection  
2 Agency. My duties include reviewing air-pollution permit  
3 applications for various types of stationary sources.

4 I would like to thank everybody for coming here to  
5 express interest in the Draft Clean Air Act Permit that  
6 the Illinois EPA has prepared for Dynegy Midwest  
7 Generation's Baldwin and Wood River power generating  
8 stations.

9 The Baldwin and Wood River stations are existing  
10 power-generating plants. The principal emission units at  
11 the Baldwin Station are three coal-fired boilers. The  
12 principal emission units at the Wood River station are  
13 two coal-fired boilers and three natural gas and oil-  
14 fired boilers.

15 The emissions of the five coal-fired boilers are  
16 controlled by a combination of operating practices,  
17 boiler features, and add-on control equipment. Dynegy  
18 complies with requirements for sulfur dioxide by burning  
19 low-sulfur coal. Nitrogen oxide emissions are minimized  
20 by the burner overfired air. In addition to this, the  
21 two older boilers at Baldwin also use add-on selective  
22 catalytic reduction system on an as-needed basis to  
23 further control nitrogen oxide emissions. Particulate  
24 matter emission are controlled by add-on electrostatic  
25 precipitators that use electrical attraction to remove



1 dust from exhaust.

2 The two power stations are required to obtain Clean  
3 Air Act Permits because they are major source of  
4 emissions. The Clean Air Act Permit specifies applicable  
5 state and federal regulations that apply to the plants  
6 including emission limitations, monitoring requirements,  
7 and record-keeping requirements. This includes  
8 requirements for the new regional trading program that  
9 becomes effective in 2004.

10 One of the key requirements applying to these plants  
11 is that Dynegy must operate and maintain continuous  
12 emission monitors to measure the nitrogen oxide and  
13 sulfur dioxide emissions of all the five coal-fired  
14 boilers and the gas and oil-fired boiler and the opacity  
15 from their stacks. Dynegy must operate these systems in  
16 accordance with the protocols under the Federal Acid Rain  
17 Program. These monitors provide very reliable  
18 information to verify compliance with control  
19 requirements for emissions.

20 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, gentlemen. We will  
21 have a presentation by a representative from Dynegy.  
22 Please state and spell your name.

23 MR. DIERICX: My name is Rick Diericx. I am  
24 the manager of environmental policy --

25 MR. MATOSIAN: Could you spell that?



1                   MR. DIERICX: D-I-E-R-I-C-X. I am the manager  
2 of environmental policy for Dynegy. First, I'd like to  
3 thank you for the opportunity to offer these opening  
4 statements regarding the draft CAAPP permits for Dynegy  
5 Midwest Generations Baldwin Energy Complex and Wood River  
6 Power Station.

7                   Dynegy has been working cooperatively with the  
8 Illinois EPA since 1995 towards the successful issuance  
9 of those permits. We view these permits as a key tool to  
10 provide the plant operators, the Illinois EPA and the  
11 public with clarity regarding the compliance requirements  
12 that apply to these plants and their air-pollution  
13 control systems. Dynegy will continue its efforts to  
14 work with the Agency to ensure these permits accomplish  
15 these objectives.

16                  As the Agency has stated, these permits are needed  
17 to allow for the continued operation of these  
18 facilities. And these facilities are needed for the  
19 safe and reliable operation of electrical systems in this  
20 region. Combined, these two facilities provide more than  
21 twenty-three hundred megawatts of safe, clean and  
22 reliable electric-generating capacity. Dynegy Midwest  
23 Generation is one of the largest taxpayers in Randolph  
24 and Madison Counties. Through purchases and use of local  
25 vendors and merchants for services provided to these



1 sites, Dynegy plays an integral role in maintaining the  
2 health of the local economy. Over two hundred fifty  
3 local residents are employed at our power plants. Our  
4 employees are dedicated to both supporting power plant  
5 operations and their respective communities.

6 Collectively, they contribute valuable personal time  
7 towards numerous community volunteer groups.

8 In addition to these investments in the local  
9 communities and economy, Dynegy has invested heavily in  
10 new pollution-control systems at both plants. Through  
11 fuel switching, combustion improvements and the latest  
12 NOx control technologies, emissions from Baldwin have  
13 been cut drastically. In the past few years, SO2  
14 emissions have been reduced by ninety percent. As a  
15 result, Baldwin's emission rates are among the lowest for  
16 coal-fired plants in the region. During the ozone  
17 season, Baldwin's catalyst systems reduce NOx emissions  
18 by eighty percent. These NOx emission rates are expected  
19 to drop even further as more catalyst is eventually  
20 loaded into these devices. Baldwin's particulate  
21 emissions are being controlled more reliably as the  
22 result of enhancement to their precipitators. Of the ash  
23 and slag collected at Baldwin, over one hundred thousand  
24 tons so far this year has been reused in other products  
25 and processes. Altogether Dynegy has spent more than two



1       hundred million dollars in air-pollution controls at  
2       Baldwin recently.

3               At Wood River, approximately seventy million has  
4       been spent in the past few years to reduce its  
5       emissions. These expenditures have been for lower sulfur  
6       coal, low NOx burners, upgraded dust-collection systems  
7       and a brand new precipitator. These efforts have reduced  
8       Wood River's SO2 emissions by sixty percent and its NOx  
9       emission rate by seventy-five percent.

10              In addition to reducing emission from these plants,  
11       we are also working hard to improve the environment in  
12       other areas. For example, we work with the U.S. Fish and  
13       Wildlife Service to spearhead one of the country's  
14       largest reforestation programs by a non-timber company.  
15       Our projects target the restoration of thousands of acres  
16       of hardwood forest on National Wildlife Refuges in the  
17       Lower Mississippi Valley. As Illinova and Dynegy, we  
18       have worked with the Illinois Department of Natural  
19       Resources since 1994 to plant over ten million trees in  
20       Illinois. These projects are designed to sequester  
21       carbon dioxide while re-growing forests and enhancing  
22       overall environmental quality.

23              The Baldwin and Wood River plants have been part of  
24       the local communities for many years. We believe the  
25       Illinois EPA's issuance of these proposed CAAPP permits



1 will allow Dynegy to fulfill its economic, environmental  
2 and electrical commitments to this region while providing  
3 assurance that the plants and their control systems are  
4 operated and maintained properly.

5 We are committed to working with the Illinois EPA  
6 toward the issuance of these permits. To that end, we  
7 will be providing written comments to the Agency within  
8 the public comment period. We thank the Agency for the  
9 hearing and thank the members of the public for taking  
10 time to participate in this process.

11 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you. Now, before we  
12 proceed to the public comments, I just want to enter a  
13 copy of the Clean Air Act Permit Program for the Baldwin  
14 Plant into the record as Exhibit 1 and also a copy of the  
15 Clean Air Act Permit Program Permit for the Wood River  
16 facility as Exhibit 2. And then the first public speaker  
17 we have is Kathy Andria. If you could, when you approach  
18 the microphone, state and spell your name for the  
19 record.

20 MS. ANDRIA: My name is Kathy Andria,  
21 K-A-T-H-Y, A-N-D-R-I-A. I'm with The American Bottom  
22 Conservancy. Our office is located in East St. Louis.  
23 First, I want to thank you for having this hearing  
24 tonight so that we can comment -- that the public can  
25 comment, and we understand that it's a public enforceable



1 permit. We are saddened, though, by the location because  
2 it's not in the Wood River community for the people who  
3 live closest to the plant. It's quite a drive for them  
4 and it's not in Randolph County in Baldwin for those  
5 people. So I understand that the Agency is under  
6 financial constrictions, shall we say, and we appreciate  
7 you're putting these together, and it's appropriate that  
8 we take them together because it is the same company, and  
9 you can look at one, which is a huge plant, against  
10 another, which is a small plant, and make comparisons,  
11 which we might not have done had these not been combined,  
12 but it does cut down on the public, who is the most  
13 effected public in order for them to ask questions. I  
14 was asked also to convey the message from residents in  
15 St. Louis, the St. Louis area with whom we share the air  
16 shed. There is no vent up in the river between the two  
17 states. Most of them are at a public hearing tonight,  
18 which was scheduled for the Weldon Springs contamination  
19 of ground water radioactivity. I was -- I'm glad Mr.  
20 Diericx is here, and I hope that he can help us. I hope  
21 he can supply us with his statement because it had some  
22 statistics that we didn't see other places, and we'd like  
23 to use those and make comments on those when we put our  
24 public comment in.

25 I don't have a prepared statement. I have some



1 things that I'd like to share and perhaps ask questions.  
2 It's not organized in any specific manner so you'll have  
3 to bear with me if I repeat myself. Together the two  
4 plants, Baldwin and Wood River, emit nearly five billion  
5 pounds -- five billion pounds of TRI chemicals to the  
6 environment, mostly air. Dynegy at Wood River is 3.4  
7 million. I'm sorry. 3.4 billion -- million. I'm  
8 nervous. I don't believe this. And I went to the score  
9 card. These are all from toxic release inventory on the  
10 environmental defense site, and they're from EPA --  
11 USEPA's own toxic release inventory. The Dynegy plant,  
12 which I called the local EPA office today to ask how it  
13 would be considered, is this a big plant, a small plant,  
14 a medium size plant and John Justice, who's the air --  
15 the head of -- the air person locally here said that it --  
16 Wood River is considered a small plant. Nevertheless,  
17 the Dynegy plant in Wood River emits forty-seven thousand  
18 pounds of suspected immunotoxicants into the air. It's  
19 more than twice as much as the second highest number in  
20 the state. Small plant. Baldwin, by contrast, only  
21 emits three thousand pounds. Suspected gastrointestinal  
22 or liver toxicants to the air the Dynegy Wood River plant  
23 3.3 million pounds. Baldwin three hundred sixty-two,  
24 four hundred fifty-seven. The Baldwin plant emits a  
25 thousand pounds into the air. These are all air



1 emissions releases. One thousand ninety-eight pounds of  
2 recognized carcinogens. Forty-two thousand pounds of  
3 suspected carcinogens. One hundred and eighty-three  
4 point five thousand pounds of suspected cardiovascular or  
5 blood toxicants. Four hundred fifty pounds of recognized  
6 developmental toxicants. Suspected developmental  
7 toxicants, one hundred and eighty-one thousand pounds.  
8 Suspected immunotoxicants, like I said, three thousand  
9 pounds. Suspected kidney toxicants, one thousand five  
10 hundred forty-eight. Suspected gastrointestinal or liver  
11 toxicants, three hundred sixty-two thousand pounds.  
12 Suspected musculoskeletal toxicants, two hundred nineteen  
13 thousand. Suspected neurotoxicants, a hundred and  
14 eighty-three thousand pounds. Suspected reproductive  
15 toxicants, a hundred and eighty-one thousand pounds.  
16 Suspected respiratory toxicants, four hundred and six  
17 thousand pounds. Suspected skin or sense organs  
18 toxicants, three hundred sixty-five thousand pounds per  
19 year. The Dynege Wood River plant, a small plant, emits  
20 forty-seven thousand pounds of recognized carcinogens to  
21 air. This is forty-seven times higher than any -- than  
22 the next highest plant. Presumably everything that -- I  
23 don't know. I didn't categorize all of them, but there  
24 are a lot of them on here that I recognize as being  
25 large, very large plants. It's forty-seven times as much



1 as the Baldwin plant. Wood River releases forty-seven  
2 thousand one hundred fifty pounds of suspected  
3 immunotoxicants into the air. It's a small plant. That,  
4 again, is twice as much as the next highest. Baldwin and  
5 Wood River together submit together more than any other  
6 plant in the whole state of suspected developmental  
7 toxicants to the air. Dynegy, small plant, is the second  
8 highest emitting of TRI chemicals to air in the whole  
9 state, small plant.

10 I believe Mr. Romaine talked about that there are  
11 other kinds of things going on in the air, other plants,  
12 other -- the area. We're not attainment for particulate  
13 matter. We're not attainment for ozone. Our lakes,  
14 Horseshoe Lake, Frank Holten State Park are both -- all  
15 of our lakes around are contaminated with mercury. There  
16 are fish advisories. Mercury -- most of them -- mercury  
17 is deposition from air from coal-burning power plants.  
18 We have -- I mean, the whole area is besieged. We just  
19 had a hearing a few weeks ago on the hazardous-waste  
20 incinerator. This is a huge amount of toxins going into  
21 our air. Too many of our children in East St. Louis,  
22 Granite City and throughout the whole entire Metro East  
23 have asthma. Too many of our citizens have heart and  
24 lung disease which are caused or exacerbated by the  
25 burning of coal. The Wood River plant was built in 1948,



1 and although it's considered a small plant, it emits more  
2 than three million pounds of air pollution a year.  
3 Baldwin in 2001 emitted more than twenty-three thousand  
4 tons of sulfur dioxide, twenty-eight thousand tons of  
5 NOx, two hundred seventy-one pounds of mercury. These  
6 are incredibly high figures, and we are in nonattainment  
7 with the eight hour standard. That affects our economy.  
8 If we go into serious nonattainment, the weather has been  
9 cool and we haven't had as many bumps in the violation  
10 exceedances of ozone, but it's an anomaly. It's not  
11 going to be this cool forevermore, especially if we keep  
12 emitting all of the sulfur dioxide and the carbon  
13 dioxide, rather. I remember reading not too long ago  
14 that a little teaspoon of mercury can contaminate a whole  
15 lake. We've got a lot of people in this area who count  
16 on the fish in those lakes for their protein. They don't  
17 have the money to go to the store and buy all the things  
18 for their families that they need to, and fishing is free  
19 at the state parks, but these lakes have fish advisories  
20 on them, but there are no signs posted for them so we  
21 presume an awful lot of families -- if you go out on a  
22 weekend to Frank Holten State Park, an awful lot of  
23 families are eating fish with mercury unknowingly. We  
24 understand that there are cleaner technologies. We met  
25 last night with John Thompson of the Clean Air Task



1 Force, and he was talking to us about ways that these  
2 plants could be cleaned up using natural gas or cleaner  
3 coal technology, ICCG, the clean coal gasification. If  
4 they repower these plants not -- and we're not saying,  
5 you know, put people out of work. We're not saying to  
6 close down all of the coal, but there are cleaner ways.  
7 There are cleaner technologies. Our citizens would have  
8 cleaner air. We would have a cleaner environment and the  
9 gentleman talked about his contribution -- his company's  
10 contribution to the economy. Actually, reconstructing,  
11 constructing new plants would give an awful lot of people  
12 in this economy jobs. If you went to a different kind of  
13 plant and constructed a new plant, they would need a  
14 different permit. We understand that. I'm going to be  
15 putting extensive comments in and a number of reports.  
16 One I'd like to call your attention to is the air of  
17 injustice which discusses how African-Americans are at a  
18 greater -- are at greater risk for power plant  
19 pollution. Our community is the -- most of the African-  
20 American community is in the American bottom, and they  
21 are right in the middle of the Metro-East nonattainment  
22 zone. They get hit with the pollution from Wood River  
23 when the wind is going south. They get hit from Baldwin  
24 and Rush Island, which is in Missouri, when the wind is  
25 coming north. They get all of the transport of the air



1 problems from Missouri, and there's no wall.

2 I have some questions, if I could. Are they  
3 permitted to -- my understanding is they -- in 2001 they  
4 released forty-seven hundred pounds of formaldehyde into  
5 the air, this is Wood River. American Bottom Conservancy  
6 belongs to the St. Louis Regional Clean Air Partnership,  
7 and at some meetings they are establishing some in  
8 Missouri. They establish monitors and they were -- kept  
9 bumping up on formaldehyde and they couldn't understand,  
10 and Missouri DNR said it must be the oak trees from the  
11 Ozarks. No one looked across the river that forty-seven  
12 thousand pounds of formaldehyde are coming, and I  
13 wondered is that permitted. Is that in the permit they  
14 can release that much?

15 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, it is. Formaldehyde is  
16 present in trace amounts in the organic combustion  
17 products from any combustion process.

18 MS. ANDRIA: That forty-seven thousand pounds  
19 is what they report -- are reporting -- is the company's  
20 own reporting. So it could, presumably, be higher. Is  
21 there like some kind of continuous monitor on those  
22 things?

23 MR. ROMAINE: No, there isn't. What number  
24 were you quoting? Forty-seven hundred or forty-seven  
25 thousand?



1 MS. ANDRIA: Sounds like an awfully high amount  
2 to me. It's forty-seven times more than any other.

3 MR. ROMAINE: I'm very curious whenever you say  
4 the emissions are forty-seven times higher for a range of  
5 pollutants. There might be a systemic error in the data  
6 that you're reporting because I agree it seems strange  
7 that Wood River emissions are so much higher than in a  
8 plant like Baldwin that is, in order of magnitude,  
9 larger.

10 MS. ANDRIA: When I saw this a month or so ago,  
11 I called John Justice and asked if he or it was two  
12 months ago, and I said where is that -- does that sound  
13 logical, and he said no. I said, well, would that be  
14 correct, and he looked at it and he went and he looked  
15 into some things, and then I talked to him and it never  
16 was corrected. It's still on the sign. It's been there  
17 for several months. If it's incorrect, then it should be  
18 fixed. If it is correct and they're permitted to do  
19 that, that's absolutely unacceptable to the public.

20 MR. ROMAINE: I agree. If the Web site is  
21 incorrect, it should be corrected. Now, what I thought  
22 the Web site was --

23 MS. ANDRIA: EPA's figures, USEPA.

24 MR. ROMAINE: We'll investigate that and pursue  
25 it with the USEPA.



1 MS. ANDRIA: I wondered is thirty percent  
2 opacity the correct figure?

3 MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

4 MS. ANDRIA: Why is it that high?

5 MR. ROMAINE: That is the applicable regulation  
6 that applies to opacity of these plants.

7 MS. ANDRIA: Do all plants in the area do  
8 thirty percent?

9 MR. ROMAINE: There is a small number of newer  
10 plants that are subject to twenty percent opacity  
11 limitation.

12 MS. ANDRIA: What are industries subject to?  
13 I'm sorry, Chris. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

14 MR. ROMAINE: Industries are subject to thirty  
15 percent opacity limitation. Now, in terms of what is  
16 expected from these facilities, we do not expect them to  
17 be emitting at thirty percent opacity unless something's  
18 gone drastically wrong with the electrostatic  
19 precipitators. We expect the opacity normally well below  
20 thirty percent.

21 MS. ANDRIA: How often is it audited, the  
22 plants?

23 MR. ROMAINE: For major sources of this type  
24 they are visited once a year. They're visited more  
25 frequently if there are specific events that occur at the



1 plants or specific reasons to pursue follow-up visits.

2 MS. ANDRIA: How often are they inspected?

3 MR. ROMAINE: At least once a year.

4 MS. ANDRIA: And are inspections announced?

5 MR. ROMAINE: They may. Routine inspections  
6 will be announced that assures that the relevant  
7 individuals are there and aware they need to have records  
8 available to be inspected. Other inspections may not be  
9 announced.

10 MS. ANDRIA: Given that this is a Title V  
11 permit, which is enforceable by the public, are we then  
12 going to be allowed to see the records and have access to  
13 the raw data?

14 MR. ROMAINE: We can make access to records  
15 available. When you say access to raw data, I'd have to  
16 investigate with my attorneys whether we'd be able to  
17 facilitate that or not.

18 MS. ANDRIA: How often does the company -- how  
19 often are they required to do checks on the equipment and  
20 how often do you check those records?

21 MR. ROMAINE: Well, because these sources are  
22 subject to the acid-rain program and require to operate  
23 on continuous monitors, there are daily checks that have  
24 to be performed. There are quality checks that are  
25 performed. There are more rigorous reliability accuracy



1 test assessments that have to be conducted on an annual  
2 basis. USEPA conducts the audit under the Acid Rain  
3 Program, and, unfortunately, I don't know what frequency  
4 they are conducting those audits at this time, whether  
5 it's annual or semiannual or less frequently than that.  
6 The data from these emission monitors is posted on the  
7 Internet on USEPA Clean Air Web site.

8 MS. ANDRIA: In the permit it has a couple of  
9 places where it says using standard test methods.  
10 They're not defined as to what test methods are. Could  
11 you tell us what you mean by using standard test  
12 methods?

13 MR. PATEL: USEPA.

14 MS. ANDRIA: And they're different for  
15 different -- testing different perimeters?

16 MR. PATEL: Right.

17 MS. ANDRIA: I wondered why in Wood River why  
18 unit five is allowed so much more SO<sub>2</sub> than the other  
19 units?

20 MR. ROMAINE: What are you specifically  
21 referring to?

22 MS. ANDRIA: The boiler unit. I guess there's  
23 four and five. The other three are natural gas and fuel  
24 oil. I don't know the page. I don't have the  
25 reference.



1                   MR. PATEL: Number five is -- size is bigger  
2 than boiler number four.

3                   MS. ANDRIA: Do the three boilers that are the  
4 fuel oil, are they on one stack and the four and five are  
5 on another?

6                   MR. PATEL: Yes.

7                   MS. ANDRIA: Could you tell us what the dust  
8 collection system is?

9                   MR. PATEL: As I said, they have an ESP  
10 precipitator.

11                  MS. ANDRIA: Is there a bat house on this?

12                  MR. PATEL: There may be on the coal -- coal  
13 supply coal burners.

14                  MS. ANDRIA: There's no emission controls on  
15 one, two and three, the natural gas and the oil -- oil  
16 burners. Are there no emissions that come when it burns  
17 oil other than the natural gas?

18                  MR. PATEL: Are you talking about -- what's the  
19 specific -- you're looking, is it like emission  
20 difference between natural gas and oil fire?

21                  MS. ANDRIA: I wondered if there are criteria  
22 pollutants -- if there are any particulates when you burn  
23 the oil rather than the natural gas. The natural gas  
24 burns clean is my understanding. Does the oil have  
25 something in it that would require when they're using oil



1           that they use that? Is that going to be burned not as  
2           clean as natural gas?

3                   MR. PATEL: No.

4                   MS. ANDRIA: No, it doesn't burn as clean as  
5           natural gas?

6                   MR. PATEL: It does. There's no requirements  
7           for having that.

8                   MS. ANDRIA: I know there's no requirement, but  
9           does it burn dirtier. That's what I'm asking.

10                  MR. ROMAINE: Yes. It does have more emissions  
11           than burning natural gas.

12                  MS. ANDRIA: Okay. And are they precluded by  
13           permit from using Illinois coal or by the -- just the  
14           amount of sulfur dioxide they emit?

15                  MR. ROMAINE: They are not precluded from using  
16           Illinois coal. They are limited in terms of sulfur  
17           dioxide emissions that result from burning coal. If they  
18           find low enough sulfur content in Illinois coal that will  
19           comply with regulations, they can burn that coal.

20                  MS. ANDRIA: Is it true that -- and I haven't  
21           been following the papers. I just remember reading  
22           something that the Baldwin plant is involved in a lawsuit  
23           over some violations of the Under Source Review or  
24           something.

25                  MR. ROMAINE: That's correct. USEPA has



1 enforcement action against the Baldwin facility for  
2 alleged violations of the new source. In particular, the  
3 federal prevention of significant deterioration  
4 regulations.

5 MS. ANDRIA: I understand there's a document  
6 that reports on health effects -- health impact and that  
7 was exchanged between EPA and the company, and I wondered  
8 if the company would provide those to us.

9 MR. ROMAINE: I guess if it was in the context  
10 of an enforcement action, I think it would be appropriate  
11 to direct that question directly to either Dynegy or to  
12 the USEPA.

13 MS. ANDRIA: Would Mr. Diericx care to answer?

14 MR. DIERICX: I don't know what study you're  
15 referring to.

16 MS. ANDRIA: The health studies that discussed --  
17 discuss the impact on health, on deaths caused by your  
18 plant.

19 MR. DIERICX: I don't think that was a company  
20 health study.

21 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. I don't know when it's  
22 going to be resolved. It will be a public document.  
23 It's not a public document now. I would ask that we have  
24 an extension until that's resolved. I think it's going  
25 to be resolved, and Mr. Diericx could correct me, but



1       it's going to be resolved in the next couple of months.  
2       We'd kind of like to see that document. We think it's an  
3       important document.

4               MR. ROMAINE: I guess in terms of whatever  
5       comes out of the USEPA's lawsuit if there are changes  
6       that have to occur to the -- happen to the Baldwin  
7       facility, it's expected that issue permit would be  
8       reopened and revised to incorporate those new  
9       requirements. It isn't necessary to wait for that USEPA  
10      lawsuit to be concluded before we get the benefits of the  
11      Title V permit for Baldwin.

12             MS. ANDRIA: And I'm going to -- I've taken a  
13      lot of time, and I thank you for your patience. I may  
14      have questions after everyone else has had a chance.  
15      Thank you.

16             MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker is  
17      Laia Vicens-Fuste. Please state and spell your name.

18             MS. VICENS-FUSTE: My name is Laia  
19      Vicens-Fuste, L-A-I-A, V-I-C-E-N-S F-U-S-T-E. I'm an  
20      intern from Wash U working with Kathy Andria and studying  
21      to be a social worker, and I am a native from Catalonia,  
22      which is a region in Spain. I would like to start by  
23      thanking you for having the chance to speak here today.  
24      I don't have any big statement. I have been working for  
25      Kathy for the summer, and I observed some interesting



1       stuff. Coal gasification can produce electricity in a  
2       clean manner so that those that have to live near plants  
3       that burn coal do not have to suffer from the health  
4       consequences of it. Coal gasification is an option that  
5       has been adapted by many other countries before. As a  
6       report by the U.S. Department of Energy says, most of the  
7       gasification facilities can be encountered in Western  
8       Europe, the Pacific Rim, Africa and North America. More  
9       facilities with gasification techniques are expected to  
10      be developed in the world. In terms of this growth,  
11      Western Europe is supposed to be number two; however,  
12      North America's growth will be only half to that of  
13      Europe in general.

14             Why is America behind the world when it comes to the  
15      clean air for its people? Clean air is something that  
16      the citizens of Metro East St. Louis area are in urgent  
17      need. There are already elevated amounts of cases of  
18      asthma and other respiratory diseases in the Metro East  
19      area, that people should not have to suffer from when  
20      there are alternatives to produce cleaner air. We are  
21      asking today then, that the US joins the majority of the  
22      world countries to protect its citizens. That is it.

23      Thanks.

24             MR. MATOESIAN: The next speaker is Jennifer  
25      Hensley.



1                   MS. HENSLEY: Hi. Thanks for having us here  
2 and for taking the time to meet with us. I work for the  
3 Sierra Club.

4                   MR. MATOESIAN: Could you spell your name?

5                   MS. HENSLEY: H-E-N-S-L-E-Y. And as an  
6 organization, we believe in the public participation  
7 process so we're glad to have you all here to give us the  
8 opportunity to talk about these events and to address  
9 some of our concerns. I'm not sure if you're aware these  
10 two plants combined basically are the largest source of  
11 pollution for the Metro East area, which is second only  
12 to Chicago for having the worst air quality in the State  
13 of Illinois so we have a lot of concerns about these  
14 plants, in general, and we do recognize that these are  
15 old plants and so they aren't currently regulated and are  
16 able to use the grandfathered loophole, but we do have a  
17 lot of concerns; and we're fortunate that the Title V  
18 process is giving us the opportunity to tell you about  
19 some of these things.

20                   Wood River emitted over seventeen thousand tons of  
21 sulfur dioxide last year, six thousand tons of nitrogen  
22 oxide and 2.3 million tons of carbon dioxide. Baldwin is  
23 worse in that it emitted over twenty-three thousand tons  
24 of SO<sub>2</sub>, twenty-eight thousand tons of NO<sub>x</sub> and eleven  
25 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. Combined, these two plants



1 generated over four hundred pounds of mercury.

2 My specialty is in water, and as you may have  
3 realized last year, Illinois EPA basically designated  
4 every river, stream and lake in Illinois as being unsafe  
5 to fish in. And being a water advocate and growing up on  
6 the river, it's a large concern for me that we have so  
7 much mercury pollution, and we have no way to address the  
8 mercury pollution from these plants. So my plea to you  
9 as a water advocate to be that when these rules come out  
10 in 2004, that we have some strong regulations on mercury  
11 releases and things like that so we can start cleaning up  
12 Illinois so that we have a safe place for our kids and  
13 for our families, and I wanted to thank you very much for  
14 being here tonight and for giving us this chance.  
15 Thanks.

16 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Miss Hensley. Next  
17 speaker is Deanna Wagner-Brice.

18 MS. BRICE: My name is Deanna Wagner Price,  
19 D-E-A-N-N-A, W-A-G-N-E-R hyphen capital B-R-I-C-E. And  
20 I've worked with Kathy for several months now on  
21 different issues and I also live in this area. I live in  
22 Troy, which is very close to Wood River so I'm very  
23 grateful to have this opportunity to address this issue  
24 because I have a family, and I'm very concerned about the  
25 environmental impact. I understand that these two plants



1 are very old and so that causes a problem as far as the  
2 standards that are already in place for emissions and we  
3 need stricter -- some type of stricter control. I don't  
4 know if he can incorporate scrubbers or whatever it is.  
5 I don't know all the technology with this, but I'm very  
6 concerned about the asthma and other issues with water or  
7 air so, with that, I'm hoping that, you know, you can at  
8 least take into consideration all the people that live in  
9 this area and try really hard if we can work together so  
10 people don't lose jobs, or, you know, it's -- not impact  
11 our area in that manner, but we can clean it up. I'm  
12 very concerned about it. I have three out of four kids  
13 that use an inhaler, and I, you know, raised those kids  
14 in Germany and they didn't use them in Germany. They use  
15 them here so I'm very concerned about that, and I hope  
16 that we can address this and do it in a very  
17 compassionate manner really. Thank you.

18 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Miss Wagner-Brice.  
19 The next speaker is Jim Bensman.

20 MR. BENSMAN: Hello my name is Jim Bensman from  
21 Wood River. I'm the conservation chair of the Piasa  
22 Palisades Group of the Sierra Club. We have five hundred  
23 members in the Metro-East area. I personally live --

24 MR. MATOESIAN: Could you spell that last  
25 name?



1 MR. BENSMAN: B-E-N-S-M-A-N.

2 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you.

3 MR. BENSMAN: I personally live two and a  
4 quarter miles from the Wood River plant. My two sisters  
5 and mom have asthma. Last year my dad died from a  
6 respiratory illness. I also have several more relatives  
7 and friends that have respiratory illnesses or have died  
8 from one. So, obviously, this is a very important issue  
9 to me, and it is very clear we need to clean up our air.  
10 These power plants are the largest sources of air  
11 pollution in the Metro-East region. These older plants,  
12 which are exempt from most of the requirements of the  
13 Clean Air Act, are a major part of the problem. When the  
14 Clean Air Act was passed in the '70s, it was assumed  
15 these dirty plants would only operate for a short period  
16 of time; that is why they were exempted from the Clean  
17 Air Act, but they are still here and their pollution is  
18 killing residents of the Metro-East and causing lots of  
19 health problems. In the Metro-East approximately a  
20 hundred twenty-six people die from power-plant pollution  
21 each year. By comparison, about a hundred thirteen die  
22 in car crashes; about seventy-nine are murdered. So  
23 power plants account -- the pollution from the power  
24 plants kill more people than these things do. We have  
25 all these safety rules for cars. We have, you know, the



1 State Police out doing mandatory seat-belt checks and  
2 stuff like that, and when there is a murder, there's cops  
3 out tracking down who did it, and we have a justice  
4 system who puts them away. But by comparison, you know,  
5 there is very little being done to address the people  
6 that are getting sick and people who died prematurely  
7 from the pollution these plants put out. You know, we  
8 hear this talk about, you know, all the reductions  
9 they've done, but there are still -- since these are  
10 these old dirty power plants that don't have to comply  
11 with most of the requirements of the Clean Air Act, they  
12 are still putting out a lot more pollution than these --  
13 than the newer plants that have to comply with the Clean  
14 Air Act and that's wrong. You know, the governor's  
15 proposal to start regulating these plants and make them  
16 start cleaning up is a good first step for Illinois, but,  
17 you know, we hope. You know, there's a nationwide  
18 problem, and it's not just in Illinois that this problem  
19 is. We breathe the air from plants in other states and  
20 stuff, too, you know. Bush's Clear Sky Initiative was no  
21 where near enough. It's simply a sham. It should be  
22 called the Dirty Skies Initiative. One thing I found  
23 interesting I have relatives in Denver and last year -- I  
24 was out there last year and with the drought the  
25 residents had to start doing mandatory water



1 conservation, and I was out there, and I said, why  
2 wouldn't they to do this before there was a drought.  
3 Doesn't it make sense? And we look here, you know, why  
4 aren't we doing things -- having mandatory things or  
5 giving incentives to reduce the amount of electricity.  
6 We're doing more to force conservation and get people to  
7 use less because -- you know, 'cause it's not, you know,  
8 they're dirty plants, but if we use less, there's going  
9 to be less pollution and less people getting sick and  
10 less people dying. So, you know, that's another thing  
11 that needs to be thought about. Another thing we need to  
12 be encouraging conservation and renewable energy such as  
13 solar and wind; natural gas and coal gasification are  
14 also better than coal. These plants continue to burn  
15 coal. They need to clean up and use all the modern  
16 pollution controls. We also need to be concerned about  
17 acid rain and global warming. You know, I remember the  
18 last time I went to the Great Smoky Mountains National  
19 Park and other places in the Appalachian Mountains, and I  
20 heard them talking about all the trees that are planted,  
21 but you go out and see all the trees that the pollution  
22 is killing and they plant little seedlings. These trees  
23 that are dying are, you know, much older. They hold a  
24 lot more carbon than the trees -- these little seedlings  
25 and stuff, you know. You know, this acid rain is a very



1 serious problem and these power plants are a major source  
2 of this problem, and they need to stop, you know, killing  
3 the forests. I do got one quick question is the mercury --  
4 the amount of mercury they emit. Is there any monitoring  
5 on that?

6 MR. ROMAINE: No, there is no continuous  
7 monitoring for mercury.

8 MR. BENSMAN: Why not?

9 MR. ROMAINE: Because there are -- because  
10 there aren't any applicable regulations at this time to  
11 limit mercury. When programs that are adopted that will  
12 establish restrictions on the amount of mercury, they  
13 will need testing or monitoring requirements established  
14 at the same time to provide much more accurate  
15 information on mercury emissions.

16 MR. BENSMAN: That's an important thing for  
17 them to be monitoring for, you know. Just my closing  
18 comments. I thought it was interesting that you called  
19 your program the CAAPP program so I'll close with a plea  
20 to please put a cap on the pollution. Thank you.

21 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Bensman. The  
22 next speaker is Christine Favilla.

23 MS. FAVILLA: Hello. It's Christine,  
24 C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-E, Favilla, F-A-V-I-L-L-A. I am Sierra  
25 Club Staff in Alton, Illinois, and I reside in Alton,



1 Illinois, as well, and I want to thank you for the  
2 opportunity to learn more about the Dynegy Generation  
3 Corporation, Baldwin and Wood River permits. As Jen  
4 Hensley mentioned, these are the largest sources of air  
5 pollution in the entire Metro-East region. Combined,  
6 these two plants generated over four hundred pounds of  
7 mercury pollution. This is a detriment to our health,  
8 and it relates to the overall environmental degradation  
9 of our region.

10 The current United States administration is moving  
11 in the wrong direction by weakening power plants with  
12 their cleanup rules. Under these changes, the Wood River  
13 and Baldwin plants are likely to be exempt from pollution  
14 controls for the foreseeable future. While the most  
15 toxic chemical, mercury, the Bush Administration is  
16 pushing legislation to weaken existing laws and exempt  
17 coal-fired power plants from any mercury reductions for  
18 at least a decade.

19 You, along with the entire EPA as a whole and the  
20 Illinois EPA, have some flexibility of what you monitor.  
21 So I would like to see continued and increased  
22 particulate matter 2.5 monitoring placed in those Section  
23 910 Rules that are due out in 2004.

24 There are clean alternatives that I would like you  
25 to consider while those are being written. In using



1       these CAAPP permits as a method of control and monitoring  
2       and those include scrubbers and other pollution controls,  
3       coal gasification, using natural gas, renewable energy  
4       and conservation and efficiency out into the public. I  
5       don't see a lot of that coming out as pleas from the  
6       EPA.

7               While you are a regulatory agency, while this  
8       hearing is dealing with the Title V and CAAPP permits, I  
9       understand that a lot of what I'm going to say may or may  
10      not apply to that, but we have to do something about the  
11      poor quality plants in this region. The larger picture  
12      must be looked at. I live within ten miles of the Wood  
13      River plant, and I work within five miles of it, and I  
14      have a four-year old son and I worry about his health.  
15      It seems every two months he comes down with a  
16      respiratory infection.

17              So I request that, A, you clean up the two plants  
18      with scrubbers and/or, B, re-power the two plants by  
19      natural gasification. Both of these options would  
20      increase the job availability for our residents, as  
21      construction and operation would require more manpower.  
22      So this would be a plus not only with our health but the  
23      health of the environment and the health of our economy.  
24      The Wood River plant was built fifty-five years ago, and  
25      we do agree with what Mr. Romaine was saying; the



1 regional reduction of coal-fired power plants' emissions  
2 must be a priority. Thank you for making that a  
3 priority. We see them implemented not only with the  
4 permits but within the strong 910 rules. So I want to  
5 thank you, once again, for letting us learn more about it  
6 and be able to make comments as well.

7 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Miss Favilla. The  
8 next speaker is John Peipert. And please state and spell  
9 your name for the record.

10 MR. PEIPERT: John Peipert, P-E-I-P-E-R-T. I  
11 just have a short statement expressing my concern over  
12 the high tox emissions. As a young adult citizen of  
13 Alton, I feel compelled to voice my concern about the  
14 poor air quality of the Metro-East area. People my age  
15 are beginning to establish themselves as significant  
16 contributors to, and the future leaders of, our  
17 communities. In accepting our roles as members of the  
18 community, we are forced to make decisions about what  
19 kind of community we'd like to be a part of. We must  
20 consider what kind of opportunities and the level of  
21 safety an area can provide, not only for ourselves, but  
22 our future children. While I cannot speak for my entire  
23 age group, I speak for myself in saying that is  
24 unattractive for an area to host a power plant like the  
25 Dynegy Wood River coal-fired plant. I do not want to



1 raise children in an environment where they will have an  
2 accelerated chance of developing asthma, as tens of  
3 thousands of people in the Metro-East have had. I don't  
4 want to raise children in an environment where they are  
5 exposed to dangerous levels of mercury in the streams,  
6 rivers and lakes. I don't want to raise children in an  
7 environment such that the PM 2.5 emissions, which  
8 nationally contribute to more premature deaths than does  
9 homicide, are not up to state standards. I would feel  
10 irresponsible as a parent if I want to raise children in  
11 such an environment, and for these reasons the Metro-East  
12 is less attractive in my considerations for the future.  
13 I recently returned from South Africa where I was  
14 studying environmental justice. I visited industrial  
15 sites that irresponsibly polluted, exposing the citizens  
16 of Durban to what we determined was an unjust level of  
17 health risk. The environmental standards and emissions  
18 control is not nearly at the level of ours in the U.S.,  
19 so it disappoints me that we have to deal with the same  
20 type of problems with over SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and particulate  
21 emissions. I feel it is imperative to consider the  
22 inappropriate level of toxic emissions from the Wood  
23 River plant in making your decision on the Title V  
24 permit. Thank you for your time.

25 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Peipert. The



1 next speaker is Wayne Politsch.

2 MR. POLITSCH: Good evening. Wayne Politsch,  
3 P-O-L-I-T-S-C-H. I grew up near the Marissa, Lenzburg  
4 area and currently reside in Alton, Illinois. And I just  
5 have a few comments this evening. As I began looking  
6 into the technicalities trying to understand all the  
7 issues, I confess I'm in over my head much more technical  
8 than I can comprehend. We do live in difficult times  
9 with terrorism, unemployment, billions of dollars in  
10 deficit, and as a result of those big problems, quite  
11 often air pollution does not get on the front pages. It  
12 does show up in the television, and I'm a little  
13 disappointed we only have twenty-five people here, but I  
14 want to assure everybody here air pollution is vitally  
15 important to people who live in Sparta, Marissa,  
16 Waterloo. They run around the Baldwin power plant. In  
17 the morning when they get up, they look at the prevailing  
18 winds, and they look at the yellow haze. They're not  
19 scientists. They're hard-working people, many of them  
20 ex-coal miners that feed that power plant. They're  
21 concerned about this. In the short run, we, the  
22 breathing public, seem like we're becoming the canaries  
23 of the 21st Century. We cough. We sneeze. We get  
24 congestion and headaches, and we're not sure where that's  
25 coming from. Our real concern is are we paying for our



1 electricity not only with our monthly checks but also  
2 with our health. Once again, I'm trying to look at some  
3 of the data. I don't completely comprehend it. We're  
4 getting higher rates of asthma, higher rates of  
5 cardiovascular disease, higher rates of cancers, and I  
6 urge the EPA, as well as the corporation, to help us look  
7 at the connection. Is there a connection between the  
8 power plants, the electric we use and the diseases that  
9 we're dying from in Illinois? In addition to that, I  
10 particularly was brought here tonight, as a number of  
11 people brought out, it is, indeed, the Baldwin power  
12 plant and Wood River power plant that is the major  
13 culprit. When I try to look at the data, they seem like  
14 they produce more pollution than electricity. Eleven  
15 million tons of soot, smog and heavy metals. As you  
16 pointed out, they, apparently, are not in the electric  
17 business, but they're in the pollution business. This  
18 needs to stop now. In addition to this, I would urge all  
19 of us that we need clean air for our economy, for our  
20 ecological system, for our families and for our  
21 communities. It is as vital to national security as any  
22 other issue. Thank you very much, and I will follow this  
23 up with some written comments.

24 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Politsch. The  
25 next speaker is Tom Prost.



1                   MR. PROST: P-R-O-S-T. I want to thank you for  
2 holding the hearing tonight. I'm a volunteer with the  
3 Sierra Club. I live in Columbia, Illinois, twenty  
4 minutes from here. I grew up right here in Belleville.  
5 I have many relatives that still live in this area  
6 including my mother, sisters, brothers and lots of nieces  
7 and nephews. Between the two power plants that have been  
8 talked about here tonight, I'm most familiar with the  
9 Baldwin plant. We often go there to enjoy Baldwin Lake,  
10 trails, bicycle paths and fishing. And, I guess, I was  
11 very concerned to learn that the State of Illinois has a  
12 state-wide warning against eating fish caught in any  
13 Illinois lake, stream or river because of dangerous  
14 levels of mercury. Jim asked whether mercury was  
15 monitored, and I think the answer was no. I didn't catch  
16 that for sure.

17                   MR. ROMAINE: That's correct.

18                   MR. PROST: Somewhere I thought I saw a report  
19 that four hundred pounds of mercury were released by Wood  
20 River and Baldwin. Do you know if that would be accurate  
21 or not?

22                   MR. ROMAINE: That sounds like it's the correct  
23 range. That sounds correct, yes.

24                   MR. PROST: And if it's anything close to that,  
25 my understanding it only takes one seventieth of a



1       teaspoon of mercury to contaminate a one hundred  
2       twenty-five acre lake. So I can see why there's no  
3       surprise that Illinois had to issue a fish advisory.  
4       Besides living in this area, I'm also part owner of an  
5       engineering firm with twenty employees. I appreciate the  
6       importance of jobs and economic impacts. My  
7       understanding to make a significant improvement in the  
8       discharge of emissions from the power plants the cost is  
9       less than ten dollars a month for the average household.  
10      Mainly less than the cost of going to the movie for the  
11      person and a friend. It's also my understanding for  
12      every one dollar for pollution-control equipment there is  
13      up to ten dollars of savings in human health-cost  
14      savings. As a small-business owner, I can tell you I'd  
15      rather pay a small increase in the utility bill rather  
16      than continuing double-digit increases in the premiums  
17      the firm has to pay continuously from insurance  
18      companies. I know there's no time tonight to go into  
19      full detail. I do want to mention one idea being  
20      discussed between labor and environmentalists, a just  
21      transition. It's similar in construction to the GI Bill,  
22      which was adopted after World War II. It advocates  
23      financial support, health care and retraining for  
24      employees displaced by environmental regulation and would  
25      be funded by the tax on pollution and emissions. In 1997



1 the Oil Chemical Workers Union officially endorsed this  
2 concept. There are, obviously, many complex aspects to  
3 the idea, but I would call upon any workers at the plants  
4 to open up the debate about the whole issue of  
5 environment versus jobs. Too often I think corporations  
6 try to paint it as an either/or stance, and it doesn't  
7 have to be that way. In fact, installing modern  
8 technology on old plants like Wood River, which was  
9 originally built in 1948, and Baldwin, which was built  
10 over thirty years ago in 1970, will create jobs not  
11 decrease them.

12 In conclusion, it's my understanding our new  
13 Governor Blagojevich recently ordered the Illinois EPA to  
14 issue rulings to clean up the state's coal-fired plants.  
15 I find this encouraging and urge the EPA to help lead  
16 Illinois or to help make Illinois as a leader in clean,  
17 safe and affordable energy. Thank you.

18 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Prost. The next  
19 speaker is Delwin Johnson.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. Thank you for the  
21 opportunity to comment. The name is D-E-L-W-I-N,  
22 Johnson. I have these typed comments. I'll read about  
23 three sentences here about the seriousness of our  
24 region's air problems, and I'm here to emphasize -- I'm  
25 from the Missouri side. I live in St. Louis County -- to



1 emphasize what takes place on one side of the river  
2 affects the air on the other side and vice versa. I'll  
3 state the seriousness of air problems was brought out in  
4 September of last year when our region came within a hair  
5 of reaching ozone levels requiring impositions of  
6 penalties for nonattainment of federal standards. The  
7 governor of Missouri went so far to appeal to local  
8 industries, who could do so, to suspend operations for a  
9 brief period in a desperate attempt to keep our  
10 monitoring stations from registering values that would  
11 indicate nonattainment. While there was general relief  
12 when the readings did stay barely below the acceptable  
13 limits, what was really accomplished was to give us more  
14 time in which to make effective measures to correct the  
15 very real problems that do exist with our region's air.  
16 I thank you for your consideration.

17 MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. That  
18 concludes comments on the registration cards. Does  
19 anyone else have any further comments or questions?  
20 None? All right. Then I will adjourn this hearing  
21 then. Please state and spell your name.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S. Thank you for  
23 giving me the time to share my thoughts and concerns on  
24 these important issues. I come to this meeting as a  
25 citizen, teacher and member of Sierra Club. I worry



1       about the students I teach and watch as they breathe in  
2       these toxins emitted into the air. Asthma is prominent  
3       enough in the students that enter the school building  
4       where I teach that my building principal has provided  
5       training for all school personnel on the disease. I  
6       watch as many students carry medical inhalers to class  
7       and worry that an attack is imminent. Students make  
8       their way to the nurse's office throughout the day to  
9       receive their inhalers. Students sit on the sidelines in  
10      PE and other activities because of asthma. This past  
11      spring a fifth-grade student experienced an asthma attack  
12      so severe an ambulance was required to take the young boy  
13      to the hospital, but the numbers presented tonight I'm  
14      aware, and though my students are not aware, that down  
15      the road sets one the largest contributors to a disease  
16      that inhibits these children from the freedom of being  
17      kids. I make a plea that you clean up the air quality  
18      for the citizens and young children in this area.

19                   MR. MATOESIAN: Thank you, Miss Williams. Do  
20      we have any further questions or comments? All right.  
21      Thank you all for coming and I'll adjourn this hearing.  
22      Thank you.

23

24

25



## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

2 I, Sara E. Tipton, Certified Shorthand Reporter and  
3 Notary Public, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a  
4 true and correct transcript of the Public Hearing held in  
5 my presence in the above-captioned cause, and as same  
6 appears from my stenographic notes made during the  
7 progress of said proceedings.

8

9

---

Sara E. Tipton, CSR

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

