

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

STATE OF ILLINOS
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

IN RE: Proposed Issuance of a)
Construction Permit/PSD Approval)
to Prairie State Generating)
Company LLC)

HEARING

The following is a transcript of a Hearing held
before Hearing Officer CHARLES E. MATOESIAN of the Illinois
Environmental Protection Agency regarding the Proposed
Issuance of a Construction Permit/PSD Approval to Prairie
State Generating Company, LLC, and held in accordance with the
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's Procedures for
Permit and Closure Plans, 35 IAC 166, Subpart A, and was taken
before Retha R. Meyerhoff, CSR, and a Notary Public in and for
Randolph County, Illinois, held at the Marissa High School,
same being located at 300 School View Drive, Marissa, Illinois,
on Monday, March 22, 2004, beginning at approximately 7:00 p.m.

RETHA R. MEYERHOFF, CSR #084-002901
P.O. Box 263
Percy, IL 62272

I N D E X

	PAGE
1	
2	
3	OPENING REMARKS BY HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN 4
4	PRESENTATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY . . 6
5	PUBLIC COMMENTS:
6	Roger Walcott 10
7	Steuart McClintock 18
8	Kappy Scates 19
9	Frank Miles 20
10	David Meyer 21
11	Willard McBride 22
12	Wilbur Franklin 22
13	Bruce Nilles 23
14	John Thompson 26
15	Jack Norman 31
16	Bradley Paul 32
17	Jerry Cross 36
18	John Blair 38
19	Tom Prost 40
20	Brian Urbaszewski 42
21	Terri Treacy 45
22	Kathy Andria 47
23	Kathleen Logan Smith 55
24	Phil Gonet 59
25	Robert Holloway 62
26	Daniel Klein 64
27	Dan Dodson 67
28	John Johnson 68
29	Rich Whitney 76
30	Charles Howe 80
31	Michael Sabo 83
32	Barbara McKasson 85
33	Kay Rippelmeyer 90
34	George Andres 94
35	Stephen Davis 95
36	Paula Bradshaw 98
37	Jill Miller 100
38	Diana Oleskevich 102
39	Dale Wojtowski 104
40	Keith Sturgis 105
41	Ed Cockrell 107
42	Jack Scheper 108
43	
44	CLOSING OF HEARING BY HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN . . 110

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

E X H I B I T S

Exhibit No.	Description	Page Identified
1	Letter dated 3/19/04	10
2	Proposed Construction Permit	10

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Illinois
Environmental Protection Agency:
Mr. Charles E. Matoesian, Hearing Officer
Mr. Shashi Shah, Environmental Protection Engineer
Mr. Chris Romaine, Manager, Utility Unit

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Good evening, ladies and
2 gentlemen, I am going to start the hearing now.

3 My name is Charles E. Matoesian, and I will be the
4 Hearing Officer tonight.

5 Could I please have silence, please?

6 This hearing is being held by the Illinois
7 Environmental Protection Agency as you're aware.

8 Prairie State Generating Company located at 701
9 Market Street, Suite 781, in St. Louis, Missouri, has requested
10 a permit from the Illinois EPA Bureau of Air to construct a new
11 coal-fired power plant on Marigold Road off of --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Turn it up louder, please.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can't hear you.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Off of Washington County
15 Highway 12 approximately five miles east northeast of Marissa.
16 The plant would have two coal-fired boilers for a total
17 capacity of about 1500 megawatts of electricity net output.
18 As a source of emissions, the plant is required to have a
19 permit from the Illinois EPA prior to beginning construction.
20 The plant would be a major source of emissions pursuant to the
21 federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration rules, found at
22 40 Code of Federal Regulations, 52.21.

23 Excuse me. In conjunction with this permit, the
24 Illinois EPA is also proposing to issue an acid rain permit and

1 a budget permit for the proposed plan to address requirements
2 under the federal Acid Rain Program and Illinois' NOx Trading
3 Program.

4 The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments
5 and answer questions from the public prior to making a final
6 decision concerning the permit application. This hearing is
7 being held under the Illinois EPA's Procedures for Permit and
8 Closure Plans regulations found at 35 Illinois Administrative
9 Code, Section 166, Subpart A.

10 Lengthy comments and questions should be submitted in
11 writing. Written comments may be submitted after the hearing,
12 but must be postmarked by midnight April 21, 2004. Written
13 comments need not be notarized. They should
14 be addressed to myself, Charles Matoesian, that's
15 M-A-T-O-E-S-I-A-N, Hearing Officer, regarding the Prairie State
16 Generating at Illinois EPA, 1021 North Grand Avenue East,
17 P.O. Box 19276, Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276.

18 I would also note that that information is all in the
19 public hearing notice which was placed in the national news and
20 the Sparta New Athens paper on the dates of February 4,
21 February 11, and February 18, all of 2004.

22 On behalf of Renee Cipriano, Director of the Illinois
23 Environmental Protection Agency, myself and the agency, I thank
24 you all for coming.

1 We will start now with a presentation by Mr. Shashi
2 Shah, an environmental protection engineer at the agency.

3 SHASHI SHAH: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My
4 name is Shashi Shah. I am a permit engineer in the Bureau of
5 Air. I would like to give you a brief description of the
6 project.

7 Prairie State Generating Company, LLC, has requested
8 an air pollution control permit from the Illinois EPA to build
9 a new coal-fired power plant on Marigold Road off of Washington
10 County Highway 12, approximately five miles east northeast of
11 Marissa.

12 The plant would have two identical pulverized
13 coal-fired boilers. The boilers would burn coal as their
14 primary solid fuel, with natural gas used as the start-up
15 fuel. The boilers would serve steam turbines with a total
16 maximum generating capacity of about 1500 megawatts of
17 electricity net output.

18 The plant would be a major source of nitrogen oxides,
19 carbon monoxide, volatile organic material, sulfur dioxide and
20 particulate matter. For these pollutants and other Prevention
21 of Significant Deterioration pollutants emitted in significant
22 amounts, the plant must use Best Available Control Technology.

23 Best Available Control Technology for the coal
24 boilers has been proposed as low-nitrogen oxides combustors and

1 good combustion practices, accompanied by add-on selective
2 catalytic reduction, electrostatic precipitation, flue gas
3 desulfurization, which is kind of scrubbing, and wet
4 electrostatic precipitation. As USEPA has only proposed
5 applicable rules for Maximum Achievable Control Technology, the
6 plant is also subject to a case-by-case determination of
7 Maximum Achievable Control Technology for emissions of
8 hazardous air pollutants, including mercury. The above
9 measures would also provide effective control of the emissions
10 of hazardous air pollutants from the boilers.

11 Prairie State submitted air quality analyses for the
12 proposed plant. These analyses show that the proposed plant
13 would not violate National Ambient Air Quality or Prevention of
14 Significant Deterioration increments. National Ambient Air
15 Quality Standards are standards for pollutant concentration in
16 the air established by USEPA to be protective of public health
17 and welfare. Increments are additional standards under the
18 Prevention of Significant Deterioration rules that protect air
19 quality from significant deterioration. The analyses show that
20 the plant would not have significant impacts for carbon
21 monoxide and nitrogen oxides. For the sulfur dioxide and
22 particulate matter the results of the increment analyses are
23 well within limits. The analyses also show that the proposed
24 plant not cause or significantly contribute to violations of

1 the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

2 The proposed plant is about one hundred miles from
3 the Mingo Wildlife Refuge in southeastern Missouri. This
4 wildlife refuge, which is administered by the U.S. Fish and
5 Wildlife Service, includes a wilderness that is designated
6 Class I under the PSD program. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife
7 Service has submitted information to the Illinois EPA about the
8 proposed plant's potential impacts on the Mingo Wilderness
9 Area, including an analysis of the visibility modeling
10 submitted by Prairie State. The Illinois EPA is working with
11 the Fish and Wildlife Service to answer their concerns.

12 In summary, the Agency has reviewed the application
13 submitted by Prairie State, and has determined that it complies
14 with applicable state and federal standards. The Agency has
15 prepared a draft of construction permit that sets out the
16 conditions, that we propose to place on the plant. In
17 particular, continuous sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and
18 opacity monitors would be installed in stacks of the boilers.
19 As a power plant, these monitors must be operated in accordance
20 with the protocols of the Federal Acid Rain Program. The
21 permit would also require continuous monitoring for carbon
22 monoxide and particulate matter.

23 In closing, the Agency is proposing to grant a
24 construction permit for the proposed plant, and we welcome any

1 comments you might have.

2 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Shah.

3 Mr. Shah and Mr. Chris Romaine, both with the Agency, will be
4 available to answer questions later.

5 Before we go to the public, I would like to read into
6 the record a letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife
7 Service dated March 19, 2004, and addressed to myself as
8 Hearing Officer.

9 "Dear sir, This is in regards to the construction
10 permit application from the Prairie State Generating Company
11 for the proposed Prairie State Generating station to be located
12 in Washington County, Illinois. The facility would be
13 approximately 140 kilometers north-northeast of the Mingo
14 National Wilderness Area, a Class I air quality area,
15 administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

16 "The Fish and Wildlife Service has received and
17 reviewed Prevention of Significant Deterioration information
18 provided by Prairie State Generating Company and the State of
19 Illinois. Our review was specific to evaluating potential
20 impacts to visibility and other air quality related values in
21 the Mingo National Wildlife Refuge and its associated federally
22 protected Class I wilderness area, as authorized by the Clean
23 Air Act.

24 "The Refuge in cooperation with the Air Quality

1 Branch of the Fish and Wildlife Service is concerned that
2 construction of the proposed facility as described will cause
3 an adverse impact to the Mingo Wilderness Area. Our concern is
4 based on submitted air quality dispersion modeling methods and
5 predicted impacts, engineering controls and emission levels,
6 and existing, elevated values of impairing pollutants measured
7 at the Refuge. We would like to continue discussions with the
8 State of Illinois and the Prairie State Generating Company
9 prior to the end of the public comment period. These
10 discussions would give us an opportunity to learn more about
11 the proposal and to explore additional options to reduce
12 potential impacts before we provide a conclusion for the
13 record." Signed by Miss Kathleen Maycroft, Refuge Manager.

14 I will submit this into the record as Exhibit 1.

15 Now, second I will submit as Exhibit 2 a copy of the
16 proposed Construction Permit.

17 We will turn to the public comments. And we, I have
18 to note, we have to be out of the building by 10 p.m. tonight
19 because the janitor is leaving. Therefore, please try to keep
20 your comments to five or six minutes apiece.

21 We will start with a representative from Peabody
22 Energy, Mr. Roger Walcott.

23 ROGER WALCOTT: Thank you. Good evening, everyone.

24 It is good to be here tonight and to see such a high level of

1 interest in the Prairie State Energy Campus. This is a project
2 I would like to introduce. It's a project that will deliver
3 clean, low-cost electricity using Illinois' abundant coal
4 reserves.

5 Prairie State is the largest capital project planned
6 for Southern Illinois in the history of the state. It's a
7 project that will promote an improved environment, create
8 hundreds of high-paying local jobs and help revitalize the
9 Illinois economy by generating nearly one hundred million
10 dollars in direct community benefits each year. With natural
11 gas prices having more than doubled in the past year, and with
12 constraints on other fuels, Prairie State is particularly
13 important for providing new, clean baseload generation that
14 could be online yet this decade.

15 Many of you were with us when we announced the
16 Prairie State project in Nashville in the fall of 2001. At
17 that time, I pledged, on behalf of Peabody, to do this project
18 right. I pointed out that Peabody's actions have been guided
19 by a longstanding commitment to stewardship and sustainability,
20 and that we would approach the development of Prairie State
21 using the same high standards.

22 I pledge to use the best technology to allow Prairie
23 State to achieve rigorous emission controls while achieving all
24 known future air requirements. I am proud to say that we are

1 meeting those objectives.

2 Peabody has been a good neighbor and a partner with
3 Illinois for more than a century, and Prairie State will
4 provide opportunities for the state for another half century.

5 Prairie State is using a suite of advanced emission
6 control technologies that will make it the cleanest coal plant
7 in Illinois and among the cleanest plants in the nation.

8 It's a project that enjoys strong non-partisan local
9 and statewide support at a variety of levels. And I understand
10 that more than a dozen communities have passed resolutions
11 supporting the project.

12 From the very beginning, we have sought to bring out
13 public participation in the development of the project, and we
14 look forward to the comments from you all tonight. We also
15 welcome the opportunity to candidly address questions this
16 evening. For instance, Does our plant meet federal Clean Air
17 Act emission levels? Does it use the Best Available Control
18 Technology to minimize emissions? Will it protect the
19 attainment standards here and in neighboring St. Louis?
20 I am pleased to report that the answer to all of these
21 questions are a sounding "yes."

22 Let's take them one at time.

23 First of all, the Clean Air Act sets a variety of
24 health-based emission standards that are established on a

1 plant-by-plant basis. Prairie State's permitted emissions of
2 SO2 must not exceed .182 pounds per million Btu. Nitrogen
3 oxide emissions are also modeled not to exceed .08 pounds per
4 million Btu. That's about one-fifth of the national average
5 for existing coal plants.

6 Prairie State will reach these strict levels using
7 twenty-first century technologies that represent the best
8 proven and available controls. In designing Prairie State we
9 also focused on technology options that provide the best
10 environmental performance given the use of Illinois' high
11 sulfur coal.

12 In this case, as was mentioned before, we will use a
13 scrubber to capture 98 percent of the sulfur dioxide which
14 allows us to set a new Best Available Control Technology
15 standard for coal plants in Illinois. We will do this without
16 washing the coal, which allows us to forgo the environmental
17 effects of coal washing and its byproducts.

18 We will use low-NOx burners and selective catalytic
19 reduction to reduce more than 70 percent of the nitrogen
20 oxides. We use a dry electrostatic precipitator to capture
21 99.9 percent of the particulate matter. And we will also use a
22 wet ESP to catch fine particulates and more than 98 percent of
23 sulfuric acid mist, a technology application that will also be
24 a first for Illinois.

1 Together, the suite of technologies will capture
2 about 80 percent the mercury emissions. We also fully intend
3 to continue researching additional mercury capture technologies
4 to ensure that we use the most effective removal techniques for
5 this type of coal.

6 The bottom line, the Best Available Control
7 Technology will be used at Prairie State resulting in very
8 low emissions. And, remember, Prairie State's average
9 performance must be better than each of these permit limits
10 that are approved by the state.

11 I would like to directly address one other technology
12 issue you may hear about. There are some who may argue that
13 Prairie State should have employed experimental IGCC
14 technology. That's a process for gasifying coal and running it
15 through a combined cycle unit. One day that may be a viable
16 alternative to consider. Unfortunately, industry needs to
17 further develop this technology so that IGCC may be
18 commercially available in another decade or so.

19 There are only two IGCC coal units generating
20 electricity in the United States. Two other plants were built,
21 but they are currently not operated. The operating plants are
22 each less than one-sixth the capacity of Prairie State and each
23 have wrestled with inconsistent operating performance. Since
24 this technology still lacks vendor guarantees and can't be

1 commercially financed on its own, all four were developed with
2 funding that was based on significant government subsidies.
3 All of that set aside, Prairie State's emissions are comparable
4 to both of the operating plants.

5 Another issue you may hear is that Illinois is
6 developing too many coal-fueled power plants which will reduce
7 air quality here and exacerbate non-attainment areas around
8 St. Louis. The Illinois EPA has conducted a study of ozone
9 levels in the greater metro area and determined that based on
10 the development of eight proposed power plants in Illinois, the
11 findings demonstrated air quality will be maintained. Further,
12 the USEPA ozone reduction plan will reduce emission rates by
13 70 percent, and it projects to bring all areas, including
14 St. Louis, into attainment before Prairie State is likely to
15 come online. The charts before you demonstrate that expanded
16 coal use and declining emissions can occur simultaneously.

17 Before I close my remarks, I would like to point out
18 a couple of other issues about Prairie State which should be
19 kept in mind as you assess the comments being made.

20 Recent headlines have pointed out energy shocks
21 around the country. Developing a new project like Prairie
22 State, which will use a secure and abundant domestic source of
23 coal, is especially important at a time when other fuels face
24 depletion, supply, and security issues.

1 Over the past three decades, coal has fueled a strong
2 U.S. economy, with coal use tripling even as emissions have
3 been dramatically reduced. Studies continue to show that
4 access to inexpensive electricity from coal helps families live
5 longer and better lives while creating twice the economic
6 benefits of natural gas. Consider that Prairie State's
7 delivered fuel costs to be at least 80 percent lower than
8 current natural gas prices.

9 You can see from the map on the right that states
10 choosing electricity from coal benefit from the lowest
11 electricity cost in the nation. Illinois, which derives less
12 than half of its electricity from coal, pays rates that are more
13 than 60 percent higher than its Kentucky neighbors who derive
14 almost all of their electricity from coal. Prairie State will
15 help reduce energy costs by providing low-cost, baseload
16 capacity that will be needed by the time the plant can come
17 on-stream in 2008 or '09.

18 At the same time Prairie State will revitalize local
19 communities. I said earlier that Prairie State is the largest
20 capital project planned for Southern Illinois in the state's
21 history. Recent economic estimates show that the plant will
22 create 450 permanent jobs with wages that are about 40 percent
23 higher than the state's average. Construction will create as
24 many as 2,500 jobs at the peak of a four-year process. And

1 Prairie State will inject one point five billion dollars in new
2 spending in the four county area, Washington, Perry, Randolph,
3 and St. Clair Counties, and about one hundred million dollars
4 each year for the ongoing economic benefits.

5 We applaud the State of Illinois for developing
6 legislation that encourages the use of the state's abundant
7 resources, and we pledge our commitment to a project that
8 balances our energy needs with the need for a clean environment
9 and strong economy.

10 We are seeing a lot of interest in Prairie State, and
11 Peabody is engaged in due diligence discussions with potential
12 partners as well as discussions with electricity generators
13 interested in purchasing the output of the plant. We are
14 continuing to progress with other facets of the permitting and
15 project development and will move forward with the construction
16 once we obtain final permits, select a partner and ensure the
17 majority of the electricity is sold. If all goes well,
18 construction should begin within fifteen to eighteen months.
19 Let me underscore, this means we could celebrate groundbreaking
20 for this exciting project as early as next summer.

21 In conclusion, we like to say that Prairie State
22 offers energy for the next generation, and that's true at all
23 levels.

24 I thank you for the opportunity to talk to you again

1 this evening. I welcome the comments from everyone here
2 tonight. At the end of the day, I believe a focus on the facts
3 tells a story that Peabody and the community can be proud to
4 move forward with.

5 Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, sir. I would ask,
7 when you approach the podium, please state and spell your name
8 for the record.

9 The next speaker is Mr. Steuart McClintock.

10 STEUART McCLINTOCK: S-T-E-U-A-R-T, M-C-C-L-I-N-T-O-C-K.
11 As mayor of Marissa, I would like to welcome everybody to the
12 town of Marissa. Marissa really appreciates the community's
13 interest in the Prairie State Energy Campus, a project that
14 will provide a clean, low-cost electricity using our abundant
15 supply of Illinois coal. The project will also promote and
16 improve environment, create hundreds of local jobs, which we
17 need, infuse millions of dollars in direct economic benefits
18 into our economy each year. For St. Clair, Washington, Perry,
19 and Randolph Counties, the project means one point five billion
20 in economic benefits in new spending alone plus creation of
21 about four hundred fifty permanent jobs.

22 Also, Peabody has been around a long time. And the
23 plans to develop the Prairie State project along with the
24 nearby waterside residential development, the company continues

1 to engage in the projects that are helping to revitalize our
2 economy and improve the environment.

3 The town of Marissa supports Prairie State
4 wholeheartedly. And we want to let you know Marissa
5 has passed a resolution that formally expresses our support.

6 And thank you everyone for coming tonight.

7 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. McClintock.
8 The next speaker, I believe, is Kappy Scates.

9 KAPPY SCATES: Kappy Scates, K-A-P-P-Y, S-C-A-T-E-S, and
10 I work for U.S. Senator Richard Durbin. His letter is
11 addressed to Mr. Roger Walcott tonight.

12 "I am writing to lend my wholehearted support to the
13 Peabody Energy's Praire State Energy Campus in Washington
14 County, Illinois, as it is currently planned and proposed. I
15 understand that Prairie State proposes a 1500 hundred megawatt
16 electric generating plant that would be fueled by sixty million
17 tons of coal produced each year from an adjacent mine. I have
18 long been a proponent of clean coal technology. And Prairie
19 State's use of advanced emission control technologies will
20 enable it to operate cleaner than the existing average is for
21 U.S. coal-fueled plants, Illinois coal plants, and proposed
22 future emission limits. Prairie State will be a magnet for
23 businesses and economic development and will provide
24 electricity for more than one million families. Projections by

1 Southern Illinois University show that 93 million, show a 93
2 million annual injection into the Illinois economy and the
3 creation of fifteen hundred construction jobs and four hundred
4 fifty well-paying permanent jobs. In order to strengthen our
5 energy security, we must look to new ways to utilize coal, an
6 abundant domestic energy source. Clean coal technology has
7 offered the promise of low cost electricity and will lower
8 emissions. I, therefore, join with Governor Blagojevich and
9 Congressman Costello in their support of the proposed Prairie
10 State Energy campus in Washington County. Yours very truly,
11 Dick Durbin."

12 Thank you.

13 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, ma'am. The next
14 speaker is Mr. Frank Miles.

15 FRANK MILES: Frank Miles, F-R-A-N-K, M-I-L-E-S.
16 Thank you. I am Frank Miles, District Manager for U.S.
17 Congressman Jerry Costello. Congressman Costello couldn't be
18 here this evening as he is returning to Washington, but as he
19 has stated before and during a public meeting held in Sparta,
20 Illinois, for area officials in the fall regarding Prairie
21 State, Congressman Costello supports this project which will
22 have great benefits for Illinois coal and our regional and
23 state economy.

24 Burning Illinois coal cleanly here will show the

1 benefits of developing clean coal technology and also provide
2 the needed fifteen hundred construction jobs and the four
3 hundred fifty permanent jobs and the economic development that
4 will come with this plant.

5 He also hopes that at the appropriate time the
6 proper labor agreement will be put in place for the plant's
7 construction and the operation of the facility.

8 Thank you.

9 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Than you, Mr. Miles. The
10 next speaker is Mr. David Meyer, Washington County Board.

11 DAVID MEYER: My name is David Meyer. I presently serve
12 as the Washington County Board Chairman. My name is spelled
13 D-A-V-I-D, M-E-Y-E-R.

14 Also, I would like to introduce some of the board
15 members we have from the Washington County Board. Will they
16 please stand? Thank you very much. From our Washington County
17 Board, we have a letter of support referring to the Prairie
18 State Energy Campus.

19 "Peabody has proposed the development of the Prairie
20 State Energy Campus in order to develop a new power plant and
21 new coal mine facility in Washington County, Illinois, which
22 will provide employment opportunities and other economic
23 benefits to the surrounding area.

24 "The Washington County Board supports the

1 development of the Prairie State Energy Campus in Washington
2 County, Illinois, and it believes said development will provide
3 jobs and economic development opportunities that will benefit
4 our county and surrounding areas.

5 "Washington County is supportive of and strongly
6 encourages this development proposal."

7 Thank you very much. I will give you this letter of
8 support.

9 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. Thank you. The next
10 speaker is, I believe, Willard McBride, is it?

11 WILLARD McBRIDE: W-I-L-L-A-R-D, M-C-B-R-I-D-E, mayor of
12 Tilden.

13 As a member of city administration, I support the
14 Prairie State project and will offer my assistance that may be
15 be required. Southern Illinois needs a project that benefits
16 the state, the surrounding towns, and cities.

17 And I thank you very much.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. McBride. The
19 next speaker is Wilbur Franklin.

20 WILBUR FRANKLIN: My name is Wilbur Franklin.
21 W-I-L-B-U-R, F-R-A-N-K-L-I-N. I am on the board of the village
22 trustees of the Village of Tilden. I am also on the school
23 board of District 140, Sparta. And our municipality is going
24 to be a mile or two from this plant. It's the closest

1 municipality. I support it one hundred percent.

2 I have been in the coal mining industry all of my
3 life. I was born and raised in that part of the country, just
4 about a mile and a half from where the plant is going in at.

5 We have one of the largest coal reserves in the
6 United States. And I retired in 1997, and I am tired of seeing
7 western coal go through our town when we could burn good
8 Illinois coal which has the highest Btu in probably the United
9 States.

10 For about ten years I inspected in Washington,
11 Randolph, and St. Clair County coal mines. I spent twenty-four
12 years as a coal miner inspector. I had twenty-two hundred coal
13 miners in my district that I looked after their safety. And
14 many of them are here tonight. They're not working in the
15 mines today. We are bringing in coal from out in Wyoming and
16 Utah and every place else when we've got some of the best coal
17 in the United States right by where that plant is over there in
18 Washington County. And I support it one hundred percent
19 because it will bring jobs to this area and we need them.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Franklin. And
21 the next speaker is Mr. Bruce Nilles.

22 BRUCE NILLES: My name is Bruce Nilles, and I represent
23 the Sierra Club, a statewide organization with over twenty-six
24 thousand members throughout the State of Illinois.

1 We emphatically oppose the project as it is presently
2 proposed. Illinois deserves so much better than this dirty
3 coal plant proposal. Let's look at the facts. Just because
4 you call something clean, doesn't mean it's clean. This coal
5 plant is five times dirtier than a proposal under consideration
6 up in Wisconsin. If Wisconsin can do it, so can Illinois.

7 This coal plant will put out 270 pounds of additional
8 mercury. Mercury is a neurotoxin. It causes brain damage in
9 young children. Today there are six hundred thousand woman in
10 the United States with dangerous levels of mercury in their
11 body. Eighty percent of that mercury comes from coal. But we
12 can take that mercury out before we burn it. Peabody refuses
13 to take it out, up to ninety-nine percent of that mercury
14 before it is burned. They refuse to wash the coal. That is a
15 nineteenth century practice to make the process cleaner. If
16 they burn, wash coal throughout Illinois, why can't Peabody
17 wash their coal, too? It takes out a tremendous amount of the
18 unnecessary pollution before it goes up in the air.

19 The Kaskaskia River, it will take out twenty million
20 gallons of water out of the Kaskaskia River. We have
21 technology today in western United States in place that cuts
22 that water consumption base to zero without any impact on the
23 fish.

24 And look at the area of impact in terms of who is

1 going to be breathing twenty-five thousand tons of air
2 pollution that is going to come out of Peabody's plant every
3 single year. This is not just an issue for St. Clair and
4 Washington. This is not just an issue for Randolph County.
5 You will have people impacted from St. Louis. You will have
6 impacted people from Indiana. This is going to have
7 widespread, even Chicago. This pollution is dramatically and
8 unnecessary five times more than we need to have.

9 Let's look at their benefits. Interestingly, they
10 didn't talk about healthcare cost of building a giant dirty
11 coal plant. Let's look at the benefits and the downside and
12 then make an informative decision whether this makes sense.

13 You are going to get testimony from the American Lung
14 Association saying there are a million people in Illinois with
15 asthma. Those million people with asthma are going to have
16 more difficulty breathing. There are going to be more
17 emergency room visits because of Peabody's dirty coal plant.
18 Anyone who has taken a loved one to the emergency room knows
19 that those are real costs. Peabody, tell us how much the air
20 pollution costs are going to be and healthcare costs from the
21 air pollution. We deserve better.

22 And so you are going to hear a lot of questions
23 tonight that Peabody has yet to answer. Why won't they use
24 best control technology? Why do they have to suck so much

1 water out of the Kaskaskia River? Why won't they tell us the
2 true costs that this means to healthcare? And the other piece
3 is economic development. There is a cap on federal law of how
4 much air pollution can happen in certain areas. They are going
5 to use up 98, approximately 98 percent of the cap of air
6 pollution available in the immediate area of the power plant.
7 That means that no new businesses are going to be able to
8 locate in that part of Washington and St. Clair Counties unless
9 they undertake expensive pollution control measures. If that's
10 a decision we are going to make, let's have an honest
11 accounting of what it means for other businesses who want to
12 expand or new businesses that want to locate in this area.

13 So the bottom line is, we don't need this power
14 plant. We have already too much power in Illinois. The last
15 thing we need is another dirty plant. And Peabody's permit
16 should be rejected until they are willing to step up to the
17 plate and offer us a clean, state-of-the-art, modern pollution
18 control power plant that doesn't threaten our families or our
19 future.

20 Thank you.

21 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Nilles. The
22 next to speak is Mr. John Thompson.

23 JOHN THOMPSON: John Thompson. Good evening. My name is
24 John Thompson, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N. I am the advocacy coordinator

1 for the Clean Air Task Force which is a national environmental
2 group based out of Boston. My office is in Carbondale at 231
3 West Main Street. And for those of who are familiar with
4 Carbondale, that would be the Schwartz Building.

5 My purpose tonight is to ask for two things. First,
6 is to request of the Agency a sixty-day extension for the
7 public comment period. We need more time to evaluate and
8 prepare comments on many detailed aspects of this proposal.
9 Second, is to outline in broad strokes what we think would be a
10 better proposal for using this site and Illinois coal. And
11 that's for the Agency to deny this application in favor of coal
12 gasification, integrated gasification. And basically three
13 reasons for that, one, is looking at this in terms of the
14 emission impacts on public health. We know that through USEPA
15 studies, and others, that coal plant emissions are linked to
16 some thirty thousand premature deaths in the United States each
17 and every year. Most of that is due to the aging hopefully,
18 but even a new plant using so-called state-of-the-art
19 technology such as what Peabody proposes, has a significant
20 impact on public health.

21 In Wisconsin, a proposal by Wisconsin Energies for a
22 similar pulverized coal plant was studied by experts from the
23 Harvard School of Public Health. And they estimated some, for
24 a six hundred megawatt power plant, about eleven premature

1 deaths each year. If you scale that up to a plant the size of
2 Peabody, you're looking at maybe twenty to thirty deaths each
3 year. That number is consistent with what the Department of
4 Justice alleges in our suits against Baldwin. They estimate
5 approximately fifty premature deaths each year from the Baldwin
6 plant as it's burning western coal, approximately thirty-five
7 of which could be avoided with best available control
8 technology.

9 I am disappointed in the permit levels that the
10 Agency has authorized in this permit. Sulfur dioxide,
11 which is .12 is about ten percent higher than what Wisconsin
12 Department of Natural Resources permitted in January in
13 Wisconsin. It is approximately thirty percent higher than what
14 West Virginia authorized last month in the permit at the
15 Longview plant. That level, .12, is about fifty percent higher
16 than what the Department of Justice and USEPA allege would be
17 best available control technology at the Baldwin plant if their
18 suit is granted in federal court. By any standard, the
19 emissions levels that are in Baldwin or in the Peabody
20 application are simply too high when judged against comparable
21 new plants in the nation.

22 Why are these emissions so high? One is the failure
23 to wash coal. That drives up the sulfur dioxide emissions. It
24 makes it harder to put on fabric filters for mercury control.

1 And while the agency came to the conclusion that coal washing
2 wasn't BACT, we respectfully disagree. If it can be done in
3 power plants and mines across the state, it can be done here.

4 Second issue, mercury control. This plant is
5 permitted for two pounds per trillion Btu in mercury
6 emissions. That's about twenty-five percent higher than what
7 Elm Road in Wisconsin was permitted for two months ago. It is
8 much, much higher than the .6 pound per trillion Btu MACT level
9 that we believe is possible with bituminous coal. Again, the
10 problem is the failure to wash the coal so that we can put on a
11 fabric filter.

12 What really needs to be happen here is even with
13 pulverized coal technology which we consider to be outmoded,
14 this application could be written more stringent, and the lives
15 saved with the impacts on mercury are significant.

16 I remind you what Renee Cipriano, Director of the
17 EPA, testified to in the mercury hearings last month. Illinois
18 received twenty-five percent increase in the mercury emissions
19 as a result of the last few years of switching to western
20 coal. Now, most of those plants that switched to western
21 control aren't distributed equally statewide. They are here in
22 Southern Illinois. We are bearing the brunt of that. And to
23 add an extra 280 tons per year from this facility when those
24 levels could be avoided, we can and must do better. The way to

1 do better is through coal gasification. It is an advanced
2 technology that limits sulfur dioxide to one-fifth the level we
3 see here in this application.

4 And to my friends, I hope I can call you my friends
5 in Marissa, I would say that this technology is what you need
6 instead of pulverized coal that's being brought to you
7 tonight. The reason is simple. You understand better than
8 most folks what it is like to go through the changes in
9 technology and economic dislocation when companies change coals
10 when regulations change. Carbon dioxide regulations are coming
11 over the life of this plant. And pulverized coal technology
12 simply can't adapt to lower CO2 emissions. Coal gasification
13 can. It is in your long-term interest to do this technology
14 and to do it right. It is fool's gold that this plant would be
15 built and then would be closed in fifteen years because of
16 carbon dioxide regulations have gotten much stricter.

17 To my friends, and I hope I can call you my friends
18 in Peabody, I would encourage you to adopt coal gasification
19 for similar reasons.

20 Mr. Walcott, I understand when you said you believe
21 this technology is a stearn one. We have heard that in the
22 1980's and the 1990's in a different setting over struggles.
23 Power companies refuse to put scrubbers on their power plants.
24 And we know what happened in Marissa with the failure of

1 Baldwin to put that technology to use at that point. The mine
2 closed. The economic hardships caused to miners and to the
3 communities were profound. We don't need to do that. We don't
4 have to repeat that mistake by relying on the wrong technology
5 today. It's 1980 and 1990 all over again. If you really want
6 to do this project right, then let's join together and promote
7 coal gasification. Surely as the world's largest coal company
8 coupled with environmental groups and community leaders and
9 state officials, we can find a better way to do this project.

10 Thank you for your kind attention.

11 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. The
12 next speaker is Mr. Jack Norman.

13 JACK NORMAN: Good evening. My name is Jack Norman,
14 J-A-C-K, N-O-R-M-A-N. I am a volunteer officer of the local
15 group of Sierra Club. Our basic approach to issues involving
16 around this proposed permit are that we strongly support
17 healthy people and healthy communities and a healthy
18 environment. Those are the standards by which we will be
19 looking at this proposal.

20 The project is to be put forward as having a number
21 of benefits, needing power resources, using abundant productive
22 Illinois resources, lessening our dependence on foreign oil
23 sources, providing employment, and stimulating economic
24 regional activity. All of this may be true. To the extent

1 that it is relevant to the permitting decision, however, needs
2 not merely to be asserted, but demonstrated, examined, and
3 confirmed. Any such demonstration would be evaluated, I
4 suppose, in terms of the strict requirements of law.

5 It will also be evaluated in terms of the project's
6 impact on the health of the people of this neighborhood, this
7 region, this continent, this earth, on the health of
8 communities of this neighborhood and region and on the health
9 of all parts of the eco system of this region.

10 The size and complexity of this important project
11 suggests there be a thorough evaluation and sufficient time to
12 do that. We request an extension period be allowed for
13 sufficient evaluation and comment preparation for an additional
14 sixty days. Thank you.

15 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
16 is Dr. Bradley Paul.

17 DR. BRADLEY PAUL: Bradley Paul spelled P-A-U-L.

18 First off, I would like to commend the EPA and the
19 Prairie State Generating Station for seeking a permit to build
20 a power plant in this area. Any time man does something, there
21 is going to be environmental impacts, but there are also
22 impacts of people not having good jobs, not having good health
23 benefits, communities not having the proper resources to be
24 able to maintain a clean social and environmental

1 infrastructure.

2 Overall this power plant will be a net benefit to the
3 communities in which it is located and should be approved with
4 a few repairs to some rather glaring deficiencies. One of
5 those glaring deficiencies deals with the findings on coal
6 washing. 1B of the EPA findings indicate that the benefits
7 from a sulfur reduction are offset by the cost and
8 environmental consequences. Coal washing is a well proven
9 standard technology. It's been undertaken for over the last
10 half a century because it removes ash and rock from the coal
11 before it is ever put into the power plant. These benefits in
12 and of themselves, we have almost every power, almost every
13 pulverized coal power plant in the eastern half of this country
14 is a testament to the fact that the economics pay to wash
15 coal.

16 None of the analysis that has been submitted along
17 with the permit application considered any of the benefits from
18 removing ash and rock before it was burned. Unburned rock cuts
19 your boiler efficiency, and melting rock takes away energy that
20 could be used to generate electricity. When you throw melted
21 rock out the bottom, you throw the energy away with it. There
22 is no way to get around that. The rock wears out equipment,
23 slags inside the boilers. None of these things have been
24 considered.

1 If you look at the economics and benefits, that
2 practically all of the power plants in the eastern United
3 States testify that they are there, then getting that last
4 twenty percent reduction in sulfur plus some of the other
5 pollutants could be removed by coal washing is essentially a
6 freebie. Free is not too expensive. And it can't be best
7 available control technology and ignore a free resource and
8 free benefit.

9 There seems to be an assumption, too, in terms of the
10 environmental consequences of not washing the coal. If you
11 don't take the rock out from the coal before you burn it, you
12 do indeed avoid a pile of rock forming on the ground, but the
13 idea that, if you throw that rock into a boiler that it's
14 somehow going to disappear, just isn't going to happen. That
15 rock will eventually become fly ash and bottom ash, and it
16 isn't going to go away. If you take a look at the two
17 materials, coal gob for preparation plant waste has well
18 established procedures for managing it in an environmental
19 fashion in the Surface Mining Reclamation Control Act.

20 I am sure that you are probably only all too aware
21 from talking to other divisions in the state EPA that deal with
22 fly ash and bottom ash regulations that in terms of disposing
23 of or handling this type of material, you are taking a material
24 with a well-established safe procedure from handling and

1 converting it into one that is still a hot button issue and a
2 big controversy.

3 If I take a pound of sulfur and I remove it from the
4 coal before I burn the coal, that pound of sulfur weighs one
5 pound. If I combine it with oxygen and reagents and capture it
6 in the scrubber, by the time I am through, that pound of sulfur
7 is going to weigh about five pounds.

8 If you look at the overall amount of the solid waste
9 generated from this power plant with and without coal washing,
10 you are going to find that you will wind up with approximately
11 an extra half million tons of solid byproduct due to failure to
12 wash the coal previously.

13 In short, the argument that we don't need coal
14 washing because it's too costly and because it has adverse
15 environmental impacts, the arguments don't wash either.

16 The last issue, the permit put together for Prairie
17 State talks about being able to use alternate coal during a
18 temporary mine disruption. The only really well-established
19 technology that we have proven and seen in action for control
20 of mercury right now is to cocapture using scrubbers and SCR
21 which indeed are on this power plant.

22 Midwestern bituminous coal such as they're proposing
23 to burn here has the overall lowest mercury content of any of
24 the coals in the country, and that mercury is of a form that it

1 can be effectively cocaptured using SCR and scrubber
2 technology.

3 In the interest of protecting these communities and
4 ensuring that we do indeed have maximum available control
5 technology for mercury, it would be my suggestion to you
6 that the draft permit should be modified to allow midwestern
7 bituminous coal substitution, rather than simply coal
8 substitution, and particularly care should be taken to prevent
9 bringing in any of the mercury latent sub-bituminous or
10 lignitic coals that have a major problem being able to capture
11 that mercury using SCR and scrubber technology.

12 In short, this is overall a good project and good for
13 the community. The modifications that I suggested in terms of
14 coal washing are well within the perimeters of proven
15 technology. They are not excessively costly. They are simple
16 modifications. I would encourage you to modify the permit
17 before finalizing it. Thank you.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Dr. Paul. The
19 next speaker is Jerry Cross.

20 JERRY CROSS: Thank you. My name is Jerry Cross,
21 J-E-R-R-Y, C-R-O-S-S. I would like to thank the Illinois EPA
22 for giving me the opportunity to speak here tonight.

23 I am here representing brothers and sisters of the
24 United Mine Workers of America. In addition, I am a life-long

1 resident of the Village of Marissa.

2 The UMWA has been following this project as well as
3 the Peabody Energy Thoroughbred project in Kentucky with a
4 great deal of interest. We are concerned with the
5 environmental issues, community issues, and entitlements
6 involved with these two projects. We have concerns that should
7 be answered precisely.

8 First, Peabody Energy has not announced publicly yet
9 whether or not they have financial partners to build the power
10 plant. When they are asked, if they will build it without a
11 partner, they fail to answer that.

12 Peabody is also proposing building the same type of
13 plant in Kentucky at another cost of two point six billion
14 dollars. Does Peabody have a plan to have a partner on all of
15 these projects?

16 Second, how would Peabody or some operating partner
17 plan to deliver water or obtain water, where and how would it
18 be stored?

19 Third, washing coal is the best available air
20 pollution control technology, in our opinion, and should be
21 used. What is Peabody's plan with regards to pollution
22 controls, and, specifically, will the coal feedstock for the
23 plant be washed?

24 Fourth, there are provisions in the permit that allow

1 Peabody Energy to use coal in case of temporary interruption
2 without requiring additional permitting or requiring placement
3 coal meeting the same specifications as the original coal. One
4 won't know if additional pollutants are being emitted.

5 And, finally, Mr. Walcott, there are a lot of union
6 people in this hall tonight. And I think everyone would like
7 to stand up in support of the Peabody project, but this
8 community and surrounding community around where you're
9 proposing to build this has always been unionized, and we want
10 it to stay unionized. Therefore, the plant that you build has
11 to be built with union labor. The plant, the power plant after
12 it's built has to be run with members of the IBEW. And
13 finally, the mine must, must be manned with UMWA members.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Cross. The
15 next speaker is John Blair.

16 JOHN BLAIR: My name is John Blair, B-L-A-I-R. I am here
17 representing the group Valley Watch out of Evansville,
18 Indiana. Our purpose is to protect the public health and
19 environment of the lower Ohio valley.

20 A couple of things I want to point out. I am not
21 exactly sure where it stands in Illinois, but in Indiana a
22 hundred percent of our streams and lakes carry fish consumption
23 advisories warning women of child-bearing age and children not
24 to eat more than one four-ounce meal of Indiana caught fish per

1 month. I understand that there are a number of fish
2 consumption advisories in Illinois, too. And I can understand
3 why.

4 Certainly the power plants are the number one
5 unregulated source of mercury emissions in the United States.
6 Plants are being canceled all over the nation right now because
7 of energy levels. A lot of those are gas plants. There is a
8 number of coal-fired plants that are being proposed. With that
9 in mind, I would like to propose some questions which actually
10 Mr. Cross kind of posed them, too, to Mr. Walcott. I would
11 like to know who the partners are. I would like to know who
12 has a couple of extra billion dollars to throw in this thing
13 with so many unanswered questions, unanswered questions like,
14 where are they going to get the NOx credits? How much are they
15 going to buy whenever we go down this trading system with NOx?
16 Certainly they are going to have buy NOx credits. Where are we
17 going to sell the power? That's a big unanswered question. It
18 is unanswered in the Thoroughbred plant in Kentucky. It is
19 unanswered here.

20 And I would like to also ask, whose land are they
21 going to condemn to put the power lines across? You know, I
22 think that the issue of land use and whose land will have to be
23 condemned for the power lines is a significant issue if your
24 land is going to be chosen for the towers and the lines.

1 And I would like to ask, and kind of dove-tailing on
2 Mr. Cross' comments, Mr. Walcott, would you commit tonight to
3 using UMWA to mine the coal? And will you commit to using the
4 local building trades to build the plant and to use the IBEW to
5 operate the plant if it's built?

6 I think I know the answer to that. Of course, they
7 won't commit to that because the answer is it's not going to
8 happen.

9 Thank you.

10 HEARING OFFICER MATEOSIAN: Thank you, Mr. Blair. The
11 next speaker is Tom Prost.

12 TOM PROST: My name is Tom Prost, P-R-O-S-T. I live in
13 Monroe County, a volunteer for the Sierra Club. A lot of
14 points I was going to touch on have already been made before.
15 Quick questions, Peabody's chart here shows sulfur dioxide,
16 nitrogen oxides emissions, but they don't show anything about
17 the mercury. I hear it may be somewhere around two hundred
18 sixty, two hundred seventy pounds of mercury emitted per year.
19 That's over a half a pound, almost a pound per day.

20 As John was saying, Illinois does have a fish
21 advisory. And it takes one tablespoon of mercury to
22 contaminate a twenty-five acre lake. We don't need that
23 additional mercury in Illinois.

24 There was talk in the introductory by your people

1 about modeling results of Prairie State. My question is, why
2 does that modeling differ from the Fish and Wildlife Refuge
3 letter that was sent to you?

4 My third point is also on the union labor. Before
5 this meeting, Peabody held a presentation outside the gymnasium
6 here. When asked about whether they would use labor
7 construction, they said, "Well, this is a bidding process.
8 There will be other things besides just union. There will be
9 quality, etc." As the construction managers, they can make a
10 requirement that all of their bidders use union, if they so
11 chose. One benefit, another benefit besides just union wages
12 would be, would be benefits that would be guaranteed, and
13 finally, whistle-blower protections. If it is a non-union
14 plant and somebody sees something that shouldn't be going on,
15 very likely, if they bring it to anybody's attention, there
16 would be a high probability that they would be fired. If they
17 have a union, they will have some protections to resist that.

18 And finally, on the twenty million gallon water
19 withdrawal from the Kaskaskia River, again, in the presentation
20 before this meeting, there was talk about that they would have
21 on-site storage for periods when there was low flow in the
22 Kaskaskia. I believe it was mentioned they would have a
23 fifteen to twenty day supply, which at twenty million gallons
24 per day is going to be a huge area, but beyond that, a drought

1 could easily go for more than fifteen or twenty days. And what
2 kind of effect would that have on that part of the use?

3 Thank you.

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Prost. The
5 next speaker is Brian Urbaszewski.

6 BRIAN URBASZEWSKI: Thank you. My name is Brian
7 Urbaszewski, U-R-B-A-S-Z-E-W-S-K-I. I am the Director of
8 Environmental Health Programs for the American Lung
9 Association.

10 In 2003 Illinois had nineteen days where air quality
11 was deemed unhealthy for sensitive groups. Sensitive groups
12 include children, the elderly, and those who suffer from heart
13 and lung disease. Eleven of those days were due to unhealthy
14 air quality in the Metro East area. Many are due to high
15 summertime ozones, and others were due to high levels of
16 dangerous fine particulate matter in the air. The Metro East
17 area also fails to meet annual air quality health standards for
18 fine particle pollution.

19 Ozone is a respiratory irritant that chemically burns
20 lung tissue. Exposure may head to shortness of breath, chest
21 pain when inhaling deeply, and wheezing and coughing.
22 Long-term exposure may lead to large reductions in lung
23 function, inflammation of the lung lining, and asthma attacks.

24 Fine particles less than one-fortieth the width

1 of human hair contribute to many of the same symptoms.
2 Particulate matter is formed in the atmosphere from coal
3 combustion byproducts such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen
4 oxides. These particles are easily inhaled deep into the lungs
5 where they can be absorbed into the bloodstream. Particulate
6 matter air pollution is especially harmful to people with lung
7 disease such as asthma, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema, as
8 well as people with heart disease. Exposure to particulate air
9 pollution can trigger asthma attacks just like the ozone.
10 Recent research has also linked exposure to relatively low
11 concentrations of particulate matter with premature death and
12 heart attacks. Again, those at greatest risk are the elderly
13 and those with pre-existing respiratory or heart disease.

14 Published medical research in March, 2002, indicated
15 that breathing ambient levels of fine particulate matter in a
16 large urban area like Chicago presented a risk of death similar
17 to living with a smoker. Despite being largely a rural area,
18 the air quality monitor in nearby northern Randolph County
19 still measures fine particle pollution levels about two-thirds
20 as high as those measured in metropolitan Chicago and
21 East St. Louis. The vast majority of this is from power plant
22 derived sulfate particles.

23 In 2002 scientists at Harvard University calculated
24 the health risk from fine particle exposure from nine coal

1 plants in northern Illinois. What they found was that the
2 emissions from these plants contributed to an estimated
3 320 premature deaths a year. Numbers provided by the
4 researchers from this analysis also indicate that over 21,500
5 asthma attacks and 4,100 emergency room visits are expected
6 given the emissions from those nine power plants.

7 The Peabody proposal is expected to put 13,000 tons
8 of ozone forming pollution into the air, over 12,500 tons of
9 fine particle forming pollution into the air. This will make
10 the air quality in Chicago and the Metro East and Washington
11 County and the entire State of Illinois worse.

12 Over a million adults and children in Illinois suffer
13 from asthma. Over 44,000 of these live in the Metro East
14 alone. Even in Washington County, asthma afflicts over 1,200
15 people. The Peabody plant, if built as proposed, will harm the
16 health of downwind residents, again, especially children, the
17 elderly, and those who suffer from lung and heart disease. At
18 a time when cleaner, healthier and affordable ways to produce
19 electricity are available, even from coal, and when medical
20 science is clearly pointing out the scope of the deadly risk
21 from ozone and fine particle pollution, granting a permit to
22 build this plant as proposed would be irresponsible.

23 There is even a plant proposed in the Chicago area, a
24 new coal plant, that has emission rates that are cleaner than

1 what is being proposed by the Peabody plant. The Peabody plant
2 should be held to the best and cleanest standard. Pollution
3 limits should be those achievable by IGCC technology.

4 Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
6 is Terri Treacy.

7 TERRI TREACY: My name is Terry Treacy, T-E-R-R-I,
8 T-R-E-A-C-Y. I was born and raised in northern Illinois, but
9 fifteen years ago in 1987, I had the good fortune to be able to
10 move to Southern Illinois. I figured I must have done
11 something right to find myself in paradise where the skies are
12 deep blue and the air was always clean, I thought.

13 My husband taught me to fish. He took me to all of
14 the area lakes. And we fished our pond and our neighbor's
15 ponds. We caught mostly large mouth bass and bluegill. I fell
16 in love with fishing. And I really fell in love with eating
17 the fish. I liked it so much that I felt like I could eat it
18 everyday.

19 But then in 1990, I learned that I couldn't eat the
20 fish everyday because the fish were contaminated with mercury.
21 Eating too much could cause nerve damage, neurologic damage,
22 kidney or liver damage. And my little great-nephew who we
23 taught to fish at the age of four, also was at great risk from
24 eating even a small amount of fish that he caught.

1 I was stunned. What happened to paradise? I started
2 doing some research on my own, and I learned what European
3 countries had known for years, that mercury pollution from
4 burning coal had contaminated their fish and their dairy
5 products.

6 So I called the Illinois EPA office in Marion. And I
7 asked them what they knew about the mercury advisories in our
8 fish. The man I spoke with told me that Illinois Environmental
9 Protection Agency just really didn't know where the pollution
10 was coming from. And when I suggested that it might be
11 fall-out from all of the coal burning in our region, he claimed
12 he had never heard of such a correlation, but it was an
13 interesting theory. That was nearly fifteen years ago.

14 And I suppose it is possible that the Illinois
15 Environmental Protection Agency was ignorant of mercury
16 pollution from coal burning. But today it's not a secret any
17 more. Every Illinois lake, stream, and river and probably
18 every pond, if you took the time to look, has an advisory
19 against eating fish because of mercury contamination.

20 And we also know that the largest source of mercury
21 is from coal burning power plants. So I ask you, Illinois
22 Environmental Protection Agency, to get your head out of the
23 smog and start protecting the environment for the people of
24 this state.

1 I ask you not to grant Peabody Coal Company a permit
2 as they have requested for its proposed coal-burning power
3 plant. And I would also like to ask that you extend the
4 comment period an additional sixty days.

5 Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. Our next speaker
7 is Kathy Andria.

8 KATHY ANDRIA: My name is Kathy Andira, Kathy with a K,
9 Andria with an I. I am president of American Bottom
10 Concervancy in East St. Louis and a member of the Metro East
11 Asthma Coalition.

12 Scientific studies show that air pollution can cause
13 or exacerbate asthma and heart or lung disease. We have too
14 many children in East St. Louis, Granite City, Madison, and
15 even Troy who have asthma. They have trouble breathing and
16 frequently are forced to stay inside instead of playing
17 outdoors in the sunshine.

18 One of our members has three of her four children on
19 inhalers since moving to the Metro East. Another has a
20 daughter, a four-year-old daughter, Rebecca. She asks her
21 mother -- she has asthma, Rebecca. And she asks her mother,
22 "Mommy, when am I going to get fixed?"

23 We in the Metro East are bombarded with pollutants
24 from refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, smelters, other

1 dirty coal-fired power plants, and a hazardous waste
2 incinerator. No matter which way the wind blows, we get
3 pollution.

4 Last week the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of
5 America named the St. Louis region as the third worse region in
6 the country for asthma. We got the highest score in the risk
7 factors category that includes outdoor air quality, a whopping
8 one hundred.

9 The lakes at our two state parks, Frank Holten and
10 Horseshoe Lake, in the Metro East are contaminated and have
11 fish advisories for mercury. As you heard, this plant will
12 emit two hundred eighty pounds of mercury. And as you heard
13 also, that less than a teaspoon can contaminate a whole lake.

14 Illinois Department of Public Health warns against
15 children and pregnant women eating fish from the lakes. EPA
16 and the FDA has just extended the mercury warning to include
17 all women of child-bearing age. That can cover some thirty
18 years of a woman's life.

19 We have a lot of poor folks in the Metro East who
20 rely on fish from those lakes as their main source of protein.
21 How are they being protected?

22 Two weeks ago IEPA held a public hearing on a
23 refinery expansion. IEPA is not requiring them to put on
24 additional controls.

1 Next week Missouri DNR will hold a hearing of the
2 largest cement kiln in North America which will send enormous
3 amounts of pollution to Illinois and the Metro East. Missouri
4 DNR did not require available controls that could have reduced
5 the pollution by 90 percent.

6 The Baldwin power plant is applying for expansion.
7 That will bring thousand more tons of additional pollution to
8 the area.

9 And now we have this application. Peabody is a
10 St. Louis company. They could have used available clean coal
11 technology to protect the citizens in this region. They chose
12 not to.

13 The Illinois EPA is the Environmental Protection
14 Agency. It seems, too, to have forgotten its mission of
15 protection. Why? We know there is a need for jobs, but are
16 there fewer jobs if state-of-the-art control technology is
17 used? And what about the impact to existing jobs at existing
18 plants when our air quality deteriorates even further and
19 businesses are forced to cut back?

20 The cumulative impacts on those of us living here are
21 unacceptable. They haven't even been studied. We continue to
22 ask for a cumulative impact study and an environmental justice
23 analysis. We ask you to deny this permit and to require
24 Peabody to submit another one requiring clean technology. If

1 you do not, you are telling all the Rebeccas in the region,
2 indeed, all of our children, that they will never be fixed.

3 We also ask for a sixty-day extension to the public
4 comment.

5 And we have got a couple of questions since they have
6 been so, so graciously agreed to answer questions.

7 I have been working on the Holcim cement kiln for
8 several years. And when the company came to them, they told
9 the local folks not to worry about the pollution because the
10 smoke stacks would carry the pollution over their heads into
11 Illinois. I would like to know where the pollution, in the
12 modeling that you have done, where are the greatest impacts for
13 this plant? You're only one point eight miles away from our
14 proposed non-attainment area.

15 CHRIS ROMAINE: Which pollutant are you concerned about?

16 KATHY ANDRIA: I am concerned about all of them. I am
17 concerned about the pollution that causes asthma, the
18 pollutants, you have got high NOx, you've got BOC's that are
19 going into ozone. There's modeling that is usually done for
20 ozone. I would like to know what that is. I haven't seen the
21 simple chart showing the pollution blooms. Is that available?

22 CHRIS ROMAINE: Well, in terms of ozone, the Illinois EPA
23 did announce of this project for impacts on ozone air quality.
24 We also were concerned that it might have an effect on the

1 Metro East area, more generally on the St. Louis area. And
2 efforts coming into attainment with the ozone air quality
3 standard, that is the one hour ozone air quality standard, the
4 model that was done, shows that this plant would not interfere
5 with attainment with the one hour ozone standard. And it
6 doesn't show impacts in the immediate vicinity of the plant. I
7 don't have --

8 KATHY ANDRIA: Are you counting all the other plants that
9 are being proposed? Did that include the Holcim plant because
10 together they will, the two plants together will give over like
11 fifty thousand tons more pollutants?

12 CHRIS ROMAINE: That was looking at the existing plants
13 and the number of other proposed plants in the area. I don't
14 believe that it looked at the Holcim plant because that, again,
15 is something in Missouri. That's going to have to go through
16 its separate permitting procedure as well. In that regard, we
17 believe Prairie State is ahead of it, and it's appropriate for
18 Holcim to address Prairie State.

19 KATHY ANDRIA: They have their, the thirty-day comment
20 period is next Monday. And they will, they have issued their
21 draft permit, Missouri DNR has. What about fine particulates?
22 I don't think that's even been addressed. There is nothing
23 listed on, in the list of criteria pollutants.

24 CHRIS ROMAINE: Well, it is correct because fine

1 particulates are not the criteria pollutant at this time.

2 KATHY ANDRIA: They will soon be.

3 CHRIS ROMAINE: And the concern for fine particulate
4 matters, as mentioned by some of the other speakers, is the
5 reaction in the atmosphere that form fine particulate matter,
6 nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide emissions. In that regard
7 our concern for this plant is its addition to loading of those
8 pollutants. And there are programs that are being developed
9 that achieve questions asked about, where will this plant get
10 its allowances? What is required under the regulations is that
11 this plant obtain allowances for sulfur dioxide emissions and
12 nitrogen oxide emissions, effectively require there will be
13 reductions from other power plants to make room for this power
14 plant. What that means is that we are getting continuous
15 maintenance of the overall loading of pollutants or reductions
16 in loading of pollutants of power plants. That is a concern,
17 again, not particularly for the air quality in this rea, but as
18 power plants, Baldwin power plant, this proposed power plant,
19 contribute to air quality impacts in the St. Louis area, the
20 Chicago area, Indianapolis --

21 KATHY ANDRIA: So you're saying that, if you give this
22 permit as it is currently proposed, that there could be
23 cutbacks at the Baldwin plant?

24 CHRIS ROMAINE: They already --

1 KATHY ANDRIA: Affecting existing jobs at an existing
2 plant?

3 CHRIS ROMAINE: As people already know, there have been
4 cutbacks in terms of emissions in Baldwin power plant because
5 it has switched to western coal.

6 KATHY ANDRIA: But they are, they have an application in
7 for expansion. Was that considered in this, in your -- and,
8 also, Chris, one other thing, you have, you said that because
9 PM, fine particulates, are not yet, the standard is not yet in
10 place or it's not being enforced. I mean, this plant said that
11 they are going to go the eighteen months, start construction.
12 Won't the fine particulate standard be in effect before then?

13 CHRIS ROMAINE: You're distinguishing between standards
14 for emissions and standards for an air pollutant.

15 KATHY ANDRIA: Don't they kind of go together?

16 CHRIS ROMAINE: No. We are addressing the precursive of
17 fine particulate matter at this facility by requiring nitrogen
18 oxide emissions and sulfur emissions and particulate matter and
19 sulfuric acid mist. Those are the emissions from this plant
20 that contribute to formation of fine particulate matter in the
21 atmosphere.

22 In terms of the Baldwin power plant, as we have
23 commented on, the power plant switched from local coal with
24 certain economic consequences to the community in terms of

1 environmental consequences that result in an emission decrease
2 of approximately two hundred thousand tons for that particular
3 year which is far in excess of the additional emissions this
4 power plant put back into the atmosphere.

5 KATHY ANDRIA: I have one more, two more questions very
6 briefly.

7 CHRIS ROMAINE: No. You asked the question concerning
8 the Dynegy proposal. That project will come after this one.
9 That would have to address this project and other projects. At
10 this point Dynegy has proposed in their current application to
11 rely on some of those decreases that they have mentioned to
12 allow that project to go forward without having to --

13 KATHY ANDRIA: Can this plant then turn around and use
14 western coal also? I mean, if they don't meet the standards,
15 can they turn around and do this? And then the coal benefit of
16 the mining here and all of that will be lost.

17 CHRIS ROMAINE: This permit has not been prepared to
18 allow the burning of western coal. It's a question that's been
19 raised about what would be allowed in terms of interruption of
20 the mine. And those certainly are valid questions in terms of
21 making sure that it would be comparable coal and certainly not
22 allow the plant to rapidly switch to western coal if there was
23 some sort of interruption in the local mines.

24 KATHY ANDRIA: One question, and I want a "yes" or "no"

1 answer, because I don't have time. I don't want to take up
2 other people's time. Did IEPA do any of it's own modeling for
3 the visibility at Mingo or did you rely on Peabody's?

4 CHRIS ROMAINE: We relied on Peabody's.

5 KATHY ANDRIA: And then one question, last question, and
6 I suppose it's a rhetorical question, to Peabody, why won't you
7 wash your coal? And to IEPA, why won't you require them to
8 wash it?

9 Thank you.

10 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker is Kathleen
11 Logan Smith, K-A-T-H-L-E-E-N, L-O-G-A-N, Smith. I am Kathleen
12 Logan Smith. I am Katheleen Logan Smith with the Health and
13 Environmental Justice of St. Louis. We're a St. Louis based
14 organization. We are very aware that St. Louis has some of the
15 worse air quality in the country. We have some of the highest
16 asthma rates in the country. Many of our members suffer from
17 the facts of power air quality that we endure.

18 Times are tough in Southern Illinois. Times are
19 tough across this country. People are excited about the
20 opportunity for jobs. And we understand that.

21 I just couldn't help but noticing that Peabody Coal
22 has gone out of their way tonight to support the economy of
23 China when folks in this country have been out of work.

24 The gentleman from Mr. Peabody pledged that he would

1 do this plant right. And we're here to echo the sentiments
2 that say that that is, indeed, what we would hope for. He told
3 us that the air quality would be maintained in St. Louis. And
4 since we're at the bottom, and we have some of the worse air
5 quality there is, I have no doubt that this plant will keep us
6 there. And I have no doubt that more children will gasp for
7 air and not be able to breath, and parents will panic and cry
8 and scream, and school nurses will have file cabinets full of
9 inhalers as they do in city schools because children cannot
10 breath.

11 The questions that have been raised here tonight
12 about who are the partners and where is the money coming from?
13 Why is the best technology not being used? Where is the
14 customers? Where are the customers for this? Where is the
15 market? What is going to be the life span of this facility if
16 you use 20th century technology in a 21st environment? Where
17 are the NOx emission credits going to come from? These are
18 very good questions that I think the shareholders of Peabody
19 probably would like to have answers too as well.

20 I echo the sentiments for a sixty-day extension.
21 This project requires scrutiny and careful scrutiny.

22 Whenever standards are set for acceptable levels of
23 pollution, what that means from the regulatory environment is
24 some risk assessors are saying that this many additional deaths

1 from cancer and this many additional illnesses have been deemed
2 acceptable. The problem with that approach is it does not take
3 into effect the cumulative impact when you start adding. And
4 in my book, one plus one is still more than one. And unless
5 you're doing math like Enron, it adds up that way. And your
6 body doesn't realize that you're only supposed to count the
7 pollution from this plant in one place and not another.

8 So when we see the chart here about how fabulous coal
9 is, and we all understand the need for power, we don't realize
10 that similar charts in this country model asthma rates that
11 also have climbed over the last thirty years that childhood
12 brain tumors have also climbed over the years. And we forget
13 to ask the questions, what happens when we admit 26 tons of
14 chemicals into our environment? These are chemicals that cause
15 cancer, that interfere with our ability to breathe oxygen,
16 which is a pretty basic function. They cause birth defects.
17 They interfere with people's ability to reproduce the way God
18 made it. They cause learning disabilities. They interfere
19 with normal growth and development.

20 The people who will bear the cost of this facility
21 are not just the investors of Peabody. It is the parents and
22 the teachers and the doctors who will pay an additional price
23 for dirty coal because they're not going, they're not willing
24 to invest, from what they said here tonight, in genuine 21st

1 century technology.

2 If the Holcim plant is being built across the river
3 in Missouri is going to dump an equal amount of pollution onto
4 us, between the two of them, we will have over 400 additional
5 pounds of mercury in this region. We might as well eliminate
6 fishing altogether and all of the industries that are related
7 to that. And we might as well tell the Bass Pro shops to close
8 because there's no point. It's a ridiculous idea that we
9 should have to trade one for the other when we have the
10 technology.

11 I am so ashamed that in this country when we can come
12 up with technology that allows us to send messages across the
13 country, across the world in seconds, that allows us to shoot
14 signals to satellites and get messages to places in remote
15 areas of the world like Afghanistan, that allow technologies
16 that sends to the moon and back and beyond, when we have the
17 technology to build smart bombs and tell them where to go, it
18 just shames me that we can't come up with a better way to do
19 something like create power. And what's worse about this
20 proposal is that we do have technology. And they said they're
21 going to do it right, but when we look at the actions, they're
22 not backed up.

23 I moved to St. Louis in 1996 and became a member of
24 the Show-me state. And I would encourage everyone here to not

1 take their word for it because if you're looking at long-term
2 economic development, it is worth asking whether this facility
3 is going to be a write-off in fifteen years or they're going to
4 shut it. It is worth asking if they're going to have to close
5 several other power plants or cut production at other power
6 plants in order to keep this one alive. And it is worth
7 asking, if we're going to put one dime in public money into a
8 project, then why not the best? Why not the cleanest? Why not
9 something that you really, really deserve? This is a shame.

10 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
11 is Phil Gonet.

12 PHIL GONET: Good evening. My name is Phil Gonet,
13 P-H-I-L, G-O-N-E-T. And I am the president of the Illinois
14 Coal Association that represents the coal industry in this
15 state including Peabody Coal Company.

16 I am here to speak in support of this important
17 project.

18 If we leave here with one thing tonight, I would like
19 us to leave -- I think one of the previous speakers kind of
20 alluded to this, but I want to make a statement. We have more
21 coal beneath the borders of the State of Illinois than there is
22 oil in Saudi Arabia, more energy here in this state, and we are
23 getting better at burning it cleaner, more efficient, and
24 mining it more efficiently. And the industry in this state has

1 been in sharp decline for several years.

2 Let me quote some statistics. Just ten years ago,
3 our companies mined over 62 million tons of bituminous coal in
4 Illinois. Last year that number was 31 million tons. Our coal
5 production has been cut in half primarily due to the fact that
6 most of our utilities, instead of putting scrubbers on their
7 power plants in response to the Clean Air Act amendments of
8 1990, decided to switch to western coal.

9 It is interesting the mercury issue that has come up
10 recently because of the rules that the USEPA has put forward,
11 has come up tonight. That switching to western coal has
12 increased mercury emissions in this state by over 25 percent in
13 the last several years because western coal has a higher
14 mercury content than bituminous Illinois coal. I am digressing
15 from the statistics.

16 Ten years ago our industry employed ten thousand
17 workers. Today it's five thousand. I don't have to tell
18 anyone in this room or anyone from the southern part of this
19 state the devastating impact that air emission standards have
20 had on the industry. But we are working to improve. And
21 Peabody Coal Company should be commended for working diligently
22 to come up with the clean coal technology, best available
23 control technology, at this point to provide energy for our
24 nation.

1 There are several facts here. Fact one, new baseload
2 power plants are needed. There are several aging coal-burning
3 plants in this state and in this region that are coming to the
4 end of their useful use.

5 There are nuclear plants that will be decommissioned
6 soon. And although some speakers have alluded to a glut in
7 power in the Midwest right now, that glut has been caused by
8 power plants that use natural gas for their generation, prices
9 that are today three times what natural gas prices were just
10 two years ago which creates an economic hardship for our
11 citizens.

12 Fact two, this plant will meet, excuse me, will
13 exceed all existing emission plants. And that is not a point
14 in question tonight; and point three, significant economic
15 impact to this area which has been depressed due to the
16 switching of western coal over the past ten years.

17 Your task, EPA, tonight is to determine, based on the
18 comments, if this proposed project will meet all air quality
19 standards. I submit to you that you have heard nothing tonight
20 to change your response that you made in the draft permit which
21 is "yes." There is no information offered tonight that would
22 conclude anything differently.

23 On behalf of the Illinois coal industry, I ask you to
24 approve the final permit for this project so this project can

1 go forward and revitalize the coal industry in Illinois. Thank
2 you for your time.

3 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
4 is Mr. Robert Holloway.

5 ROBERT HOLLOWAY: Robert, R-O-B-E-R-T, Holloway,
6 H-O-L-L-O-W-A-Y. Good evening.

7 My name is Robert W. Holloway, and I live in the
8 rural area of Sparta, Illinois. Prior to my retirement, I
9 worked for a national competing coal company as Director of
10 Environmental and Governmental Affairs. And, also, I am a past
11 chairman of the board of the Illinois Coal Association.

12 I and my staff were responsible to attain county and
13 state and federal mining and reclamation permits. I am here
14 this evening to speak in support of the Peabody Coal Company's
15 Prairie State Energy coal-fired power plant and mine-to-mouth
16 coal mine.

17 Coal is our nation's most abundant fuel, and vast
18 reserves are located at the proposed Peabody construction
19 site.

20 The generation of the electricity from coal is cost
21 effective, and these savings are passed onto the consumers in
22 reduced electrical bills. And the production of clean coal
23 generation means good paying jobs for our local people.

24 Southern Illinois has a rich history of men and women

1 working in the coal mines as well as electrical generation
2 plants. And we need to put these skilled workers back to work
3 and stop the exporting of jobs from Southern Illinois.

4 By using clean coal generation technology, Peabody
5 can, and I submit will, generate electrical energy with air
6 emission standards that will be acceptable to the Illinois
7 Environmental Protection Agency.

8 The clean coal generation of electrical energy is not
9 a new concept in Southern Illinois. Over forty years ago,
10 Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois, dedicated the Southern
11 Illinois power generation plant on Lake Egypt near Marion,
12 Illinois. Scrubbers were used to remove the harmful emissions
13 from the high sulfur Illinois coal.

14 Southern Illinois Power has one of the lowest
15 electrical rates of any power plant in Illinois. And there are
16 million dollar homes that have been built within sight of the
17 generation plant on Lake Egypt. And Lake Egypt is one of the
18 best fishing sports lakes in all of Illinois.

19 Southern Illinois Power has proven that there can be
20 compatibility, over 40 years of compatibility between
21 coal-fired generation plants, the environment, and consumers,
22 and I submit that Peabody would be just as successful.

23 Thank you for giving me this opportunity to support
24 the construction of the Peabody coal-fired power plant.

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Holloway. The
2 next speaker is Daniel Klein.

3 DANIEL KLIEN: My name is Dan Klein, K-L-E-I-N. My
4 company is Twenty-First Strategies. And I am an energy
5 environmental consultant based in McLean, Virginia.

6 I have come here tonight to comment on some of the
7 benefits to health safety and mortality that result from the
8 use of low cost coal-firing power.

9 My participation here tonight is made possible by the
10 Center for Energy and Economic Development, but the research
11 findings and comments I am making are solely my own.

12 In December of 2002 I completed a report titled
13 Mortality Reductions from Use of Low Cost Coal-Fueled Power.
14 My co-author was Dr. Ralph L. Keeney of Duke University
15 Business School, and the report was peer reviewed by two
16 national experts and decision scientists in public health.

17 This is a study about trade-offs. When we enact
18 environmental state requirements, we expect to to see benefits
19 in the form of safer, healthier, and longer lives. That's your
20 job. However, these requirements typically have costs. And
21 these costs are ultimately passed onto consumers. Costs
22 matter.

23 My study showed how the economic cost requirements by
24 reducing household income can increase other individuals and,

1 hence, sometimes shorten life times. So the key issue is, do
2 these opposing forces, the benefits of requirements on one hand
3 and the cost of meeting them on the other, create net benefits
4 or net losses? Well intended requirements, if they are too
5 costly, can result in harming more people than they help.

6 Let me describe the connection between income and
7 mortality. Widely recognized, on average, higher income
8 promote a safer, healthier, and longer lives. This has been
9 shown to be true both in this country's population as well as
10 among countries around the world.

11 With more income, individuals can spend more on
12 healthcare for themselves and their children, and more safety
13 equipment, even more nutritious diet, and take other actions
14 with the intent to decrease the likelihood of premature death.
15 Conversely when household income is reduced, health and safety
16 risks go up. Mortality rates can increase. Lower income
17 households are especially vulnerable.

18 What does this have to do with higher power costs?
19 The low cost of the U.S. coal-fired power is a world class
20 asset. When coal is not used, other generation sources are
21 needed to meet the needs of the nation. Most of our recent
22 capacity additions have been combined cycle power plants fueled
23 by more expensive natural gas. Higher fuel costs make for
24 higher electricity. As a result, electricity consumers paying

1 these higher rates have less household income available to meet
2 other household needs. In this sense, the higher cost of
3 electricity compete with and eliminate other household
4 expenditures that could also have been used for health and
5 safety.

6 Our study examined this important trade-off issue and
7 estimated the number of adult deaths which would be induced by
8 the additional cost by replacing coal-fired power to higher
9 cost energy sources. We used mortality data collected by the
10 National Institute of Health to relate household income to
11 adult mortality. The analysis showed that when household
12 income is reduced because of higher cost of electricity, on
13 average every eight point nine million dollars induces one
14 additional adult death.

15 Let me put this cost for mortality in perspective.
16 I recently examined in Southern California the Mohave
17 Generating Station which is a comparable size plant to the
18 Prairie State project. For Mohave, replacing it's coal-fired
19 power with the new natural gas combined cycle unit was
20 estimated to cost an additional two hundred thirty-six million
21 dollars per year. If each eight point nine million dollar loss
22 in household income induces an adult death, the foregoing low
23 coal-fired power in Mohave could impact household income by
24 inducing more than twenty-six adult deaths per year. And that

1 was at last year's gas prices. With current gas prices, the
2 impact would be larger.

3 These mortality impacts are highly concentrated in
4 lower income groups and as such also disproportionately affect
5 minority groups. We consider these mortality estimates to be
6 conservative. There would also be mortality impacts among
7 children particularly in lower income households and similarly
8 increases in unemployment mortality rate consequently. There
9 is indication that the mortality effects from these other two
10 poles, may collectively and in similar magnitude or even larger
11 than the adult deaths resulting in loss of household income.

12 So to summarize, the benefits of low cost coal-fired
13 power are more than simply economic. By having lower cost
14 power have, consumers will have more household income available
15 for other activities and will lead to safer, healthier, and
16 longer lives.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Klein. The
19 next speaker is Dan Dodson.

20 DAN DODSON: My name is Dan Dodson, D-A-N, D-O-D-S-O-N.
21 I have lived in Marissa for forty years, and there's been some
22 good times and not so good. I, like many of you here, was laid
23 off when most of the mines in this area had to close due to the
24 conditions of the Clean Air Act.

1 While the proposed generating plant and coal mine
2 won't replace all the lost jobs, it will go a long way to
3 replacing some of them. I am positive it will boost the
4 economy in southwestern Illinois and especially Marissa in
5 which I have a great interest.

6 I am also confident that with the technology to
7 cleanly burn Illinois coal, that more mine-mouth generated
8 plants will be built in the future creating even more jobs.

9 Illinois shouldn't be relying on out-of-state or
10 even foreign fuel sources when there is a great amount of
11 recoverable coal reserves available in our own back yard.

12 Therefore, I fully support the proposed generating
13 plant and coal mine. Thank you.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Dodson. The
15 next speaker is John Johnson.

16 JOHN JOHNSON: Unfortunately, some of the folks took my
17 thunder away with some of the things they already had to say.
18 Dan and I graduated from high school together, so I got to put
19 the glasses on, too.

20 My name is John Johnson, J-O-H-N, J-O-H-N-S-O-N.
21 I've been a resident of Marissa for over 40 years. I am a
22 former employee of Illinois Power at the Baldwin plant. I now
23 work for Local 51 International Brotherhood of Electrical
24 Workers.

1 Our local union represents over three thousand
2 workers in the utility industry including Dynegy Midwest
3 Generation, Ameren CILCO, Exelon at the Clinton nuclear
4 facility, line builder contractors in central Illinois, and
5 tree trimming contractors in central Illinois.

6 Included in the DMG Company are the Baldwin plant,
7 Havana plant, Woodriver plant, Vermilion plant, Hennepin plant,
8 all coal-fired power plants.

9 The proposed Peabody Prairie State Energy Campus
10 project, if completed, should be an economic boom for our
11 area. I sincerely hope the project does just that. Jobs
12 provided by this project will immensely benefit this area.
13 With this opportunity presenting itself, we should all attempt
14 to maximize the possible benefits to this area and region. To
15 accomplish that, this project should be planned and completed
16 in the right way. If possible, it should cause little as
17 possible negative effect on existing employment and businesses
18 in the area.

19 We support new construction and environmentally sound
20 Illinois coal-fired plants in this state, but we want the
21 best.

22 With that I had a bunch of questions, I wanted to ask
23 the Illinois EPA, but some of them have already been asked and
24 answered. So I just pared them down here.

1 My understanding earlier about the effects on this
2 plant and the Dynegy Midwestern permit for Baldwin, if I
3 understand correctly, if Peabody builds this plant, what are
4 the chances, without any changes, of Dynegy getting their
5 permit without any changes to the permitted application?

6 CHRIS ROMAINE: I guess I am not prepared to comment on
7 the Dynegy process, project because we have not prepared a
8 draft permit yet. It's quite possible there will be
9 requirements for Dynegy when we get their application.

10 JOHN JOHNSON: So, if I guess, I would propose a
11 theoretical then. If Peabody would, after this process,
12 determine that they would wash their coal, could that have an
13 effect on the Dynegy permitting process?

14 CHRIS ROMAINE: I don't think that effect would exist,
15 no. The issue of coal washing is a question that goes to
16 circumstances in which coal washing is typically used. Coal
17 washing is certainly a very common technique when you're
18 shipping coal hundreds, if not, as in the case of the power
19 plant in Wisconsin, it's being hauled from West Virginia, a
20 thousand miles. There is a savings because you're transporting
21 a more concentrated fuel. But there is a downside in terms of
22 the fact that you do lose a substantial amount of the energy
23 value in coal waste.

24 One of the advantages for the cost efficiency of the

1 plant is certainly being a mine-mouth plant. There are certain
2 environmental advantages that we believe exist because you do
3 not have to worry about disposal of the liquid or managed
4 liquid slurry and deal with gob. That doesn't say it can't be
5 done. It is done routinely at facilities where they are
6 shipping their coal to customers that are some distance from
7 the plant.

8 At this point Dynegy, my recollection, has not
9 proposed a mine-mouth facility, therefore, it would be
10 reasonable to expect that, since they are transporting coal by
11 rail, that that coal would, in fact, be washed. But that's a
12 different question for the Peabody Prairie State proposal which
13 is proposed as a mine-mouth --

14 JOHN JOHNSON: I guess, is there any way you can get to
15 an answer, either a "yes" or "no," on whether or not both these
16 permits could be approved the way they are today? Both these
17 applications?

18 CHRIS ROMAINE: Is the question whether there is enough
19 resource, air quality resource to have both plants developed?

20 JOHN JOHNSON: Yes.

21 CHRIS ROMAINE: Yes.

22 JOHN JOHNSON: Thank you.

23 CHRIS ROMAINE: In that regard, the plants are separated
24 by a fair distance. Given the nature of the way dispersion of

1 air quality modeling works, there wouldn't be a difficulty in
2 having both plants developed. Whether they would both be
3 developed, given other constraints, I can't speak to that.
4 Whether, in fact, there would be further evolution of
5 technology, this is a draft permit, even for Prairie State, I
6 can't say tonight if there will not be enhancements based on
7 some of the comments we've received and some of the comments we
8 will receive in writing before the closing comment period.

9 JOHN JOHNSON: I got a yes. Yes or no, that was the
10 question. This permit that, this construction permit, how long
11 is it good for? These questions I have should be short answers
12 hopefully. How long is this permit good for?

13 CHRIS ROMAINE: Under the regulations, once the permit is
14 issued and effective, Peabody, Prairie State would have
15 eighteen months to commence development of the plant.

16 JOHN JOHNSON: What developments are required in those
17 eighteen months? I mean, are we talking dirt moving, concrete
18 work, structure work?

19 CHRIS ROMAINE: Basically Prairie State would have to
20 start a continuous program of construction. That can either be
21 a continuous program of on-site construction with appropriate
22 schedule in developing the plant or, alternatively, they can
23 enter a contract for such activity with appropriate
24 cancellation clause that would indicate that they are serious

1 about moving forward. Either a contract with a construction
2 firm or actual on-site construction would be sufficient to
3 commence construction.

4 JOHN JOHNSON: But even the contract would require some
5 action at the site prior to the end of eighteen months?

6 CHRIS ROMAINE: No, it would not. Under the contractual
7 approach, the commencement of construction, the question would
8 be whether there is a binding contract, whether, in fact, there
9 is a significant penalty if Prairie State abandons the project.

10 JOHN JOHNSON: Are there other extensions from IEPA if
11 there is -- at the end of the eighteen months can the permit
12 holder request an extension?

13 CHRIS ROMAINE: There is certainly a provision for the
14 permit holder to request an extension. Applicable USEPA
15 guidelines to these type of permit provides that when they
16 don't commence construction within the eighteen months, they
17 basically have to start back through the permitting process to
18 verify that there have not been significant developments with
19 regard to best available control technology or with regard to
20 air quality impacts. So that assures that, if in that
21 eighteen-month period, Peabody had not commenced construction
22 or significant developments with regard to evolving technology,
23 that those could be factored into the extended permit.

24 JOHN JOHNSON: How many -- is there just one extension

1 period available to them for changes like that?

2 CHRIS ROMAINE: No. Because the extension would involve
3 a re-evaluation of control technology, it's effectively like
4 getting a new permit. They can come back as many times as they
5 want to get this extension, slash, new permit.

6 JOHN JOHNSON: But that would only be due to technology
7 changes or requirements that you're talking about there versus
8 construction? No activity on construction?

9 CHRIS ROMAINE: That's correct.

10 JOHN JOHNSON: Does the IEPA take into consideration the
11 overall liability of the completion of construction of a plant
12 when issuing a final construction permit?

13 CHRIS ROMAINE: We want to make sure that there is a
14 serious commitment to a project. We do not want to issue
15 permits for projects that have no potential for being completed
16 and for some reason just got in the permit process. We wanted
17 it carried to conclusion. On the other hand, we would not be
18 examining the adequacy of the financing, would not be doing
19 independent economic review of the proposal. We wouldn't be
20 standing behind the liability in the project in the sense
21 you're asking for.

22 JOHN JOHNSON: Do you consider the impact on other permit
23 holders or those with permit applications prior to issuing the
24 permit? In other words, Dynegy or Ameren or anybody who would

1 have another permit pending or they have already got a permit
2 in this attainment area, do you analyze the impact on those
3 applications or present permits?

4 CHRIS ROMAINE: Certainly we have looked at proposed
5 plants in light of existing sources and existing air quality of
6 the area. And in that sense, we have looked at emissions from
7 existing sources. We have not factored in the Dynegy
8 proposal. That project follows in sequence after the project.
9 We can't look, require Prairie State to address a project that
10 hasn't received a draft permit yet where there is not any
11 indication of what the applicable emission rates might be
12 allowed for. On the other hand, Dynegy,, we would be assuming,
13 would be coming after Prairie State, assuming the permit is
14 issued, there would be specific emission limitations that
15 Dynegy will have to evaluate when it goes forward to evaluate
16 the impact on existing permitted sources.

17 JOHN JOHNSON: So what you're kind of saying, and I know
18 you can't speak for Dynegy, it will be difficult for them to
19 say what they're going to do at this time based on, pending the
20 process for this permit because they may readjust their draft
21 permit request because of what happens here?

22 CHRIS ROMAINE: They might have to do that.

23 JOHN JOHNSON: Okay. We hope the mine plant becomes more
24 than an idea. The positive effects of this area will be

1 substantial. We hope that when the project is completed, this
2 area realizes only a gain in employment and creation of
3 excellent paying job and good benefits similar to those at all
4 the other Illinois coal plants of this type.

5 We do not desire a net loss in pay, benefits,
6 while maintaining an equal number of jobs. Like the
7 environmentalists, all we want is the best.

8 Thank for your time.

9 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. The
10 next speaker is Bryce J. Cooley.

11 BRYCE COOLEY: I respectfully decline to speak at
12 this time.

13 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. The next speaker is
14 Mr. Rich Whitney.

15 RICH WHITNEY: Good evening. My name is Rich Whitney
16 spelled W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. I am a member of the Green Party and
17 the Green Party's candidate for state representative, 115th
18 District, and the sole challenger to the incumbent, Mike Bost,
19 in that district which encompasses Washington County among
20 others.

21 Even though this is an environmental hearing, it's
22 pretty self-evident that what's driving much of this is not
23 environmental concerns, but the economic. And I would like to
24 make a few comments about that.

1 What I am about to say may be something that may cost
2 me some votes, may gain me some. I don't know about that. But
3 I hope that even those who disagree with me, will respect the
4 fact that I am going to tell you what I actually think and not
5 what you want to hear.

6 It is obvious that we need good industrial jobs in
7 Southern Illinois. But does that mean that we should just roll
8 over and accept any job-creating project on the corporation's
9 terms no matter what the price in human life and human health?
10 Are we so desperate for jobs in Southern Illinois that we are
11 willing to die for them and we are just going to accept the
12 first offer coming from Peabody coal, a company that is not
13 exactly known for being a friend of workers or their unions or
14 operating their mine safely? And if you don't believe me about
15 that, I would like to suggest listeners maybe talk to the
16 members of Local 1924 of the UMWA out of Peabody's Black Mesa
17 Mine in Navajo country out in Arizona where among others
18 things, they are encountering problems with contamination of
19 their water supply and an epidemic of silicosis and black
20 lung.

21 It's not necessary to accept this plant to address
22 this region and our state's concerns for jobs. For one thing,
23 and several other speakers have already pointed out, we can
24 insist on what is truly the best available technology available

1 today, integrated gasification combined cycle process, and even
2 other processes that are still in research and development that
3 ought to be considered.

4 But there are other ways that the State of Illinois
5 can meet its energy needs and create jobs in a manner that is
6 good for the environment and would be good for our farmers in
7 the region. Currently Illinois generates less than one percent
8 of its power from renewable energy, wind power, solar power,
9 geothermal, and bio-energy sources.

10 But the state has a technical potential to generate
11 all its current electricity needs from renewable energy, enough
12 to power fifteen million homes, according to a report that was
13 released two years ago by the Illinois Public Interest Research
14 Group. That report advocated the State of Illinois embark on a
15 program called the twenty-twenty program of getting the state
16 to meet twenty percent of its energy needs from renewable
17 energy sources by year 2020. And if we simply adopted that
18 modest plan, doesn't mean going away from coal, we can still
19 use the best available technology here, but there are other
20 alternatives.

21 If we adopt that simple plan which is something that
22 this state could meet, Illinois consumers would save three
23 point six billion dollars in lower energy bills which would be
24 good for the economy. Illinois farmers could earn eight

1 million dollars from lease payments just for wind energy
2 development rights as well as additional revenue from solar and
3 clean bio-energy sources, bio-energy means using crops designed
4 to create energy.

5 And if we adopted the twenty-twenty plan in Illinois,
6 those investments in renewable energy could create thirty-one
7 thousand jobs in this state by the year 2010, and fifty-six
8 thousand four hundred jobs by the year 2020. And this is a
9 plan, by the way, that is supported by the IBEW statewide.

10 It is not necessary to accept this plan. I
11 understand we have a very polished presentation that's been
12 made in our favor. We've even heard some speakers say, "Well,
13 this plant will actually improve the environment," which no
14 matter how clean it is, it is obvious it's not going to improve
15 the environment unless there is some kind of a related plan to
16 retire some of the dinosaur plants operated by Com-Ed up north,
17 but that is not part of this plan.

18 The bottom line is, at a time when our state is
19 struggling to maintain state jobs and services, it is planning
20 to spend millions of dollars in tax incentives for a project
21 that will contaminate surrounding communities, is not necessary
22 for job creation, and it is not the best way for creating
23 jobs.

24 So my advice to you, and my final comment on this

1 score is, that I would like to suggest that the communities and
2 the people in this region that are so hungry for jobs should
3 take a lesson from the UMWA. Don't accept the first offer that
4 comes down the pipe from the corporation.

5 As it stands now, I would have to say, let's send
6 this project, this plan as it stands now, back to the drawing
7 board.

8 Thank you.

9 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker is, I am not
10 sure I can read this. Is it William Winkleman? From 306
11 Randall in Steeleville, Illinois? Okay. We will come back to
12 them later. The next speaker then is Charles Howe.

13 CHARLES HOWE: Thank you. My name is Charlie, with an
14 L-I-E, Howe, H-O-W-E. I grew up here in Southern Illinois.
15 Down in Carbondale when I was a boy, the steam engines came
16 through blowing black soot up in the air. Mother put out a
17 white sheet and it was covered with soot.

18 I cut my first teeth on a real good paying job
19 working for the Illinois Central Railroad on the extra gang out
20 here in strip mine pits of New Athens with the Illinois Central
21 Railroad building a railroad. And believe me, I got an
22 introduction of what work really was like. And it paid doggone
23 good, too, \$18 a day back in 1964.

24 We do need good jobs all over this country. That's

1 an election issue this year.

2 I don't know about the energy issue though. Granted
3 we are growing. We are going to be a half a billion people
4 here by the end of this century. So we are going to have to
5 have more and more energy. At the same time Americans use
6 twice as much energy as Europeans do. Why is it that we're
7 such gluttons? Now, over there they've got their train system
8 completely electrified. Now, why can't we do that in this
9 country?

10 As far as the oil issue goes, if you read Richard
11 Heinberg, whose book is, "The Party is Over," we are on the
12 downside of the oil in this world. That means as we go down
13 that slide of less and less oil, Shell's already seen it in low
14 reserves, it's going to cost us more to drive our cars, to heat
15 our homes, to do all of that kind of stuff. This is the kind
16 of cost that is being left out of this particular project which
17 uses natural gas, which uses the feedstock to make ammonia.
18 All of those things are going to have an effect on the future
19 of this world and our children, not to mention the pollution
20 that comes out all that oil.

21 There are other factors, too, and we can never truly
22 gauge the true cost of what a project is going to cost. We
23 never know because, regardless of how much we know and how
24 smart we think we are, believe me, I have been in the Army,

1 worked for Boeing, worked for Halliburton, the oil field, the
2 air craft industry, no matter how many smart engineers and
3 corporate people we get out there, they never know all of the
4 parts of the equation, and you end up paying more. That's why
5 military projects always run over budget. That's why we end up
6 with pollution problems, emphysema bronchitis, because this is
7 not a cost. If you add in this cost, profits minus costs,
8 revenues minus costs equals your profits. Revenues minus
9 expenses equals your profits.

10 Corporations always want to maximize that figure so
11 they can get on the right side of the stockholders and
12 everybody, because the fewer costs they count, the bigger the
13 profits they have, the longer they stay in business, the bigger
14 they get, and the more they give to the political parties,
15 democracts and republicans, and that's why things never
16 change.

17 I am for jobs in this area, but I think we need to go
18 a better route, go the better way of using this technology.

19 There are other ways to get energy, like Mr. Whitney
20 mentioned, there is geo-thermal out there. There's solar.
21 There's wind energy. These have a proven track record of not
22 hurting people. Come on.

23 Another thing that was mentioned tonight, and I will
24 end on this, and that, is the power plant down on Lake of

1 Egypt. I retired from Boeing and I moved back here. I buy my
2 power or get it from Egyptian Electric Coop which gets its
3 power from Lake of Egypt, Southern Illinois Power.

4 My heating bill last January, using only electricity,
5 my electric furnace, was a hundred eighty. I went out in my
6 woods and I cut wood. And this year my heating bill was
7 eighty-four dollars.

8 Folks, that's the route I am going to go. I am going
9 to connect myself off the grid some of these days. Next year
10 it's going to be solar power. I got a solar shower. I use
11 wood for heat. I am going to make my expenses less. And I am
12 going to make a better world.

13 Thank you.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker is Michael
15 Sabo.

16 MICHAEL SABO: Hi. I am Mike Sabo of Marissa. It's
17 M-I-K-E, S-A-B-O. And I am just here, I guess, to speak on
18 behalf of the proposal.

19 I have relatives on both sides of my family that,
20 either side, that used to work in the mines, and they had to go
21 elsewhere. And I have seen the economy in the area really come
22 down. And if this thing goes as it's been sold, you know, it
23 will be a benefit for the community and for the miners and
24 obviously for the investors of Peabody.

1 Regarding this air permit, like I said, I am in favor
2 of you going forward with the permit. I do have one concern.
3 And I thank Mr. Walcott for the nice little presentation here
4 beforehand concerning the fly ash and the ash in general and
5 its disposal. They are talking about moving it either by rail
6 or, if economically better for them, to move it by truck.

7 And I would like to point out to the EPA that, since
8 it's a recovered pollutant, that some work down at the Oak
9 Ridge National Laboratory has shown that heavy metals and
10 isotope contamination that's captured in this ash can
11 concentrate in the environment and be a problem. It looks like
12 the proposal from Peabody would, you know, they're capturing at
13 the site, and they're disposing of it in a pit. I am sure
14 that's all going to be aligned properly and everything.

15 My concern is in transit here, if any of that gets
16 dumped. The research at Oak Ridge mentioned that the salts
17 that are used to capture this material is pretty attractive to
18 the deer population. They get some of their mineral sources
19 from it. And, of course, it becomes a way to amplify those
20 effects within the environment. And so in general what I would
21 like to ask the Illinois EPA is, number one, to look into that
22 and perhaps require some numbers and maybe just some control
23 like a deer fence around the storage area, or if it is being
24 moved by truck, throw a canvas over the top of it because

1 everybody here has been passed by Beelman trucks going from one
2 point to another, and the stuff is going to end up somewhere.
3 And if the deer population gets it, it will be, the
4 contaminants will be captured in the deer.

5 So basically that's all I have. Thank you. I prefer
6 to not have my deer glowing.

7 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker is Barbara
8 McKasson.

9 BARBARA MCKASSON: My name is Barbara McKasson,
10 B-A-R-B-A-R-A, M-C-K-A-S-S-O-N. And I live Makanda, Illinois,
11 which is just south of Carbondale, Illinois, and which also
12 happens to be downwind of this proposed plant whenever the wind
13 would blow from the northwest, and as we know, we have
14 prevailing westerly winds.

15 First of all, I would like to ask for a sixty-day
16 extension to allow further analysis of this proposal. When
17 given the choice of whether or not to require companies to use
18 the best available technology, IEPA has favored companies
19 instead of protecting the public. This pattern has to stop.

20 Mercury levels in our lakes are increasing. Just in
21 2002, IEPA declared a statewide advisory for mercury in all the
22 lakes in Illinois. All of a sudden, all of our lakes are
23 further away from the goal of fishable waterways.

24 Methyl mercury is extremely toxic and is a serious

1 threat to the health and welfare of everybody especially our
2 children and especially in Southern Illinois. IEPA should take
3 into account all of the sources of mercury pollution from all
4 other power plants in Southern Illinois that burn western coal
5 and thus spew unacceptable amounts of mercury into the air.

6 Other sources of mercury emissions should be taken
7 into consideration such as the cement kilns that are located on
8 the border of Missouri that pump most of their pollution into
9 Southern Illinois airborne by the prevailing west winds.

10 Other major sources in the area such as medical waste
11 incinerators, municipal waste incinerators, hazardous waste
12 incinerators, and smelters should also be taken into
13 consideration when considering the amount of mercury that is
14 being put into our air.

15 I am a retired teacher. I used to teach children
16 with learning disabilities and behavior disorders. So I am
17 aware that more and more children are displaying these
18 problems. Since mercury, and especially methyl mercury found
19 in fish, concentrated in the fish, is a potent neurotoxin, it
20 is one of the threats to our children.

21 Many studies have shown that mercury poisoning has
22 caused learning deficits, attention deficits, spacial
23 perception problems, and motor skill deficits.

24 Washing the coal and using a fabric filter is very

1 cost effective. Maybe Peabody coal does not want to spend this
2 reasonable cost to save our children. But I would hope that
3 IEPA would agree with me that our children's health and future
4 is worth it.

5 On February 26, 2004, Renee Cipriano, the Director of
6 IEPA, gave testimony on the USEPA's Proposal to Control
7 Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Utilities. And this
8 was right on the web site. In that testimony, Director
9 Cipriano urged the USEPA to amend, and this is a quote, amend
10 its proposed rules in a manner that will provide significant
11 and near-term regional reductions of mercury, nitrogen oxides,
12 and sulfur dioxide in order to protect and improve the public
13 health and welfare for decades to come.

14 And then she further stated that the Illinois
15 government has that, quote, greater reductions in transported
16 pollutants can and should be mandated, unquote.

17 In regards to federal mercury reduction rules,
18 Cipriano stated that Illinois is required to develop clean-up
19 plans for waters that are impaired for fish consumption and was
20 counting on a strong federal mercury reduction program to help
21 us achieve that goal. And this is another quote, however,
22 under USEPA's proposed rule, Illinois is unlikely to realize
23 sufficient reductions in a timely manner to protect our
24 citizens and to meet Clean Water Act requirements without

1 implementing additional measures to reduce mercury emissions,
2 unquote.

3 She further states, Illinois believes that Section
4 112 (d) of the Clean Air Act would require use of maximum
5 achievable control technology, not just best available, but
6 maximum achievable control technology for control of mercury
7 emissions.

8 Director Cipriano expressed doubt that the pollution
9 trade approach is appropriate for mercury. She says,
10 specifically we are concerned that local hot spots of elevated
11 mercury may result or worsen, especially if the required
12 reduction levels are not sufficiently strict.

13 The director is concerned that the Mercury Reduction
14 Rule has a bifurcated approach based on coal types. Power
15 plants bringing western or sub-bituminous coal or lignite coal
16 are not required to take any steps to reduce mercury emissions,
17 while power plants burning eastern bituminous coals, such as
18 Illinois coal, must have one or more control technologies to
19 meet the proposed emission limits. The result will be to push
20 more power plants to burn western coal or other fossil fuels.

21 I say to Director Cipriano that IEPA should be very
22 concerned about the hot spot region of Southern Illinois. It
23 is a fact that power plants in Southern Illinois have already
24 switched to western coal which contains less sulfur, but more

1 mercury.

2 Again quoting from Director Cipriano's testimony,
3 quote, furthermore, as I can attest, the impact of such an
4 ill-conceived strategy can be to increase mercury emissions.
5 Since 1999, Illinois has seen a 25 percent increase in power
6 plant mercury emissions due to the switch to sub-bituminous
7 coals in Illinois. This impact has not been reflected in any
8 of USEPA's analysis pertaining to its Mercury Reduction Rule,
9 unquote.

10 I say to Director Cipriano, almost all of this
11 mercury emissions has occurred in Southern Illinois such at the
12 Baldwin power plant in Randolph County, the coal-fired power
13 plant in Newton, Illinois, and the Woodriver power plant, which
14 have all switched to burning high mercury content western
15 coal. All of these are in Southern Illinois. This means that
16 Southern Illinois has disproportionately experienced an
17 increase of even more than 25 percent in mercury emissions than
18 the rest of the state. Rather than the hot spot that Cipriano
19 refers to, Southern Illinois is now a hot region. This is
20 where spikes of mercury contamination occur.

21 If, as Director Cipriano says, the federal EPA
22 proposed mercury regulations will not adequately protect the
23 people of Illinois, then it is up to the state government to do
24 all it can to protect Illinoisans from increasing methyl

1 mercury levels in our air and water.

2 The State of Illinois declared a mercury advisory for
3 lakes across the state in 2002. This advisory warned people,
4 especially young women and children, to avoid consumption of
5 predator fish in all Illinois bodies of water. However, years
6 before in the 1980's two lakes in Southern Illinois had mercury
7 advisories. These were Lake Kinkaid and Cedar Lake. This is
8 further evidence that Southern Illinois is a mercury pollution
9 hot region. This hot region is exactly the area where Peabody
10 coal company wants to spew 270 additional pounds of mercury per
11 year.

12 IEPA needs to walk the walk and not just talk the
13 talk. It needs to protect the people of Southern Illinois. So
14 do not grant this permit until Peabody coal changes its plans
15 and uses maximum available technology rather than just the best
16 available technology, and that is, washing coal and using a
17 filter. It is very cost effective.

18 Thank you.

19 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. Next speaker is
20 Kay Rippelmeyer.

21 KAY RIPPELMEYER: Hi. My name is Kay Rippelmeyer,
22 R-I-P-P-E-L-M-E-Y-E-R.

23 This is the number that scares me. I don't know a
24 lot about science. I don't know a lot about a lot of this, but

1 I have learned about mercury. This is 270 pounds of mercury
2 new that is going to be spewed into the air each year.

3 I grew up in Monroe County, but I now live between
4 Cedar and Kinkaid Lakes. I get my power from Egyptian
5 Electric, too. And they are great fishing lakes, but they're
6 not good to eat the fish you get out of the lakes.

7 Some of us, my whole family fishes. Some of us want
8 to eat what we catch. And we should not allow this to be an
9 acceptable limit of mercury.

10 Many people I know depend on the fish that they catch
11 for their livelihoods and to eat for meals. Because of mercury
12 pollutions, we have been told to limit the amount of fish we
13 eat because the fish have proven to be heavily laden with
14 methyl mercury. This is not an acceptable standard as the IEPA
15 has put it. And why IEPA doesn't demand better is shameful for
16 the technology exists to use this coal and these workers, but
17 it just won't make Peabody quite as much money.

18 Coal gasification technologies can reduce emissions
19 by 95 percent or more according to Martin Dean of the Clean Air
20 Task Force, using a fabric filter for particulate control also
21 captures 90 percent of the mercury pollution from bituminous
22 coal. Ultimately, a spray dryer absorbant plus fabric filter,
23 captures 98 percent of mercury from bituminous coal.

24 IEPA must insist that Peabody Coal Company provide

1 the best available control technology for this proposed
2 mine-mouth power plant. Peabody Coal Company would rather
3 enrich its bottom line instead of protect the health of the
4 people of Southern Illinois. They don't even want to wash the
5 coal which would reduce the level of mercury and other
6 pollutants.

7 The IEPA must not be driven by what Peabody Coal
8 wants. The EPA's primary responsibility is to protect the
9 health of the people of Illinois. This can be done at a
10 reasonable price. Washing coal and using a fabric filter would
11 eliminate about 90 percent of mercury emissions. This would be
12 a reasonable and cost effective requirement to protect the
13 health of the people of Southern Illinois.

14 Two hundred seventy pounds, it takes a half of
15 teaspoon to contaminate a fifty-acre lake.

16 New Science magazine reported that millions of
17 children across the world may have been mentally damaged after
18 being exposed to low levels of mercury before they were born.
19 They cited a study. This isn't things that people haven't been
20 researching. The study found that mothers who ate substantial
21 amounts of fish, at age seven their children showed deficits in
22 learning, attention, memory, spacial perception, and motor
23 skills.

24 A recent study from the Center for Disease Control

1 Prevention indicated that one of every twelve American women of
2 child-bearing age now have unsafe mercury levels in their
3 flesh, organs, blood, breast milk, putting more than six
4 hundred and thirty thousand American children born each year at
5 high risk for terrible diseases such as neurological damage,
6 kidney problems, liver failure, and fatal heart diseases. Even
7 tiny exposures to pregnant women can cause mental retardation
8 and permanent IQ loss in their children. Now, what kind of
9 economics do you put on that?

10 EPA's own data shows that most modern coal-fired
11 power plants can and do achieve greater than 98 percent control
12 of mercury and other toxic chemicals. Other industries like
13 hospital and city garbage incinerators have been required to
14 meet that 90 percent standard for over a decade. The EPA
15 should require power companies to do no less. There is no
16 reason all coal-fired power plants can't meet the same
17 standards everyone else does.

18 This proposal that is presented as it is now is a
19 short-term monetary gain for Peabody and some who are going to
20 get jobs, but it is a long, long-term loss in terms of health
21 and quality of life for everyone and all fish, too, downwind
22 from here. We must demand of IEPA and Peabody much better.

23 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker will be
24 George Andres. And we only have about 25 minutes left. So, if

1 you could keep it to just a few minutes per speaker, it would
2 be good because we have about a dozen people left to speak.

3 GEORGE ANDRES: Yes. My name is George Andres,
4 A-N-D-R-E-S. I am the general manager of Kaskaskia Regional
5 Port District.

6 The port district is a State of Illinois created
7 economic development organization representing Randolph,
8 Monroe, and the southern two-thirds of St. Clair County.

9 The energy campus will help attract economic
10 development to the Kaskaskia region.

11 The port district has adopted a resolution in support
12 of the Prairie State energy project. This resolution will be
13 placed on file.

14 We also strongly suggest that IEPA does not grant a
15 sixty-day extension. We need to keep this project on track and
16 move forward.

17 Also, I'm representing this evening, the Lower
18 Kaskaskia Stakeholders. It's a not-for-profit corporation
19 which represents a broad cross section of the people in the
20 Kaskaskia river region. At its last monthly meeting, the Lower
21 Kaskaskia Stakeholders also passed a resolution in support of
22 this project. And we would place that resolution on file as
23 well.

24 Thank you.

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you, sir. The next
2 speaker is Mike Murphy.

3 MIKE MURPHY: I respectfully decline to speak at this
4 time.

5 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: That's fine. The next
6 speaker is Stephen Davis.

7 STEPHEN DAVIS: Those bleachers are really hard. I spell
8 my name S-T-E-P-H-E-N, D-A-V-I-S.

9 Good evening. My name is Stephen Davis. I am the
10 Director of the Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management for
11 the Maine Department of Environmental Protection. An behalf of
12 Maine Governor John Baldacci and Commissioner Dawn Gallagher, I
13 would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the
14 proposed Title V Operating Permit for the Prairie State
15 Generating Station.

16 Air pollution transport has a major impact on air
17 quality in Maine and the northeast. Maine's geographic
18 location subjects it to transport of pollutants from a broad
19 geographic region. These traveling pollutants include ozone
20 and ozone precursors, particulate matter, acid aerosols, and
21 air toxics such as mercury.

22 Maine and other northeastern states have made major
23 strides in reducing emissions of these pollutants through a
24 wide range of methods such as area and mobile source emission

1 control strategies that go well beyond Clean Air Act
2 requirements. Despite these efforts, many of Maine's coastal
3 communities do not meet the ozone standards, and the entire
4 state is currently impacted by particle pollution, mercury and
5 regional haze. Clearly, local and regional measures are
6 insufficient to solve our air quality problems.

7 It was therefore with some concern that we noted the
8 proposal to license and construct a new coal-powered electric
9 generating site in Illinois. The resurgence of coal-fired
10 electric power generation could have major impacts on Maine's
11 ability to continue making improvements in our air quality.
12 Coal results in the greatest emissions of any major fuel source
13 on a per-megawatt basis. Even the strictest controls cannot
14 reduce emissions to levels comparable with cleaner technologies
15 such as combined cycle natural gas turbines.

16 The Maine Department of Environmental Protection's
17 review of both the Prairie State Generating Station and the
18 proposed Indeck-Elwood facility, shows that despite the
19 aggressive emissions controls by the Illinois EPA, these two
20 sites will still have the potential to emit thousands of tons
21 of nitrogen oxides, tens of tons of sulfur dioxide, a thousand
22 three hundred sixty-seven tons of particulate matter per year,
23 in addition, we are very distressed that these power plants
24 have the potential to emit nearly five hundred plus pounds of

1 mercury per year.

2 We believe in Maine that the only way that new sites
3 such as these can be built without posing an additional threat
4 to the health and welfare of those that live in Maine and the
5 environment is through the establishment of stringent,
6 extremely stringent emission control requirements on all, and I
7 underscore all, electric generating units and major industrial
8 sources along with state-by-state caps on nitrogen oxides,
9 sulfur dioxide, mercury, and carbon dioxide.

10 I am going to skip to the end of this because I know
11 we are running out of time.

12 I would like to take this opportunity to thank you
13 for your attention to this issue, and invite you to participate
14 with us in the development of a cooperative multi-pollutant
15 control program.

16 I would like to leave you with one thing to think
17 about. For those that have been to Maine, come in on 295 from
18 the State of New Hampshire, and you will see a sign that says,
19 "Maine, a quality of life."

20 It is our feeling that the air emissions that we
21 receive from plants like this from the midwest are slowly
22 reducing our quality of life that we have in Maine.

23 And I highly recommend that you take a very hard look
24 at the emission standards proposed in the permit, and we would

1 like to talk with you in great detail on this.

2 I also would like to submit a letter from
3 Commissioner Dawn Gallagher to Renee Cipriano. These are
4 her comments. I would like to submit that for the record.

5 Thank you very much.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next Speaker
7 will be Peter Hertzling. Peter Hertzling, Sparta Community
8 Hospital? Okay. Next speaker is then will Paula Bradshaw.

9 PAULA BRADSHAW: Hello, I am Paula Bradshaw,
10 B-R-A-D-S-H-A-W.

11 Ordinarily I wouldn't get up in front of all these
12 people and talk, but most people left, so I am not as nervous.
13 But what happened was my mom sent me a post card from a coal
14 camp where my dad grew up. This is the beginning of the last
15 century. You can see this child mining coal. And I would like
16 to point out that at the beginning of the last century when
17 labor was weak and companies were strong, this is what
18 happened. Children had to go in the mine. And then the UMW
19 came along. And my grandpa and his brothers and my uncles and
20 their cousins got together with you all, I am sure, your
21 families, and they fought the companies for the good of all for
22 the common good.

23 And then the EPA came along in the sixties and was
24 supposed to be for the common good to protect us all.

1 I am an emergency room nurse. I am looking at my
2 fanny pack, and a drug company representative gave it to me,
3 Xopenex. It's a breathing treatment. And I work in the
4 emergency room in Carbondale and, you know, when the weather
5 changes or there's pollen out, we get people who come in. And
6 they have asthma. And they are struggling for breath like I am
7 now, you know, their ribs are showing. They are just
8 suffocating. But in Carbondale the air is pretty good. We
9 give them a breathing treatment, give them some steroids, and
10 they're good to go. They are out of there.

11 But I come from a big city in California where the
12 air is nasty. And the people that came in the ER, the struggle
13 was much worse. They couldn't breathe. They were suffocating.
14 It's like having a pillow on their face only on the inside no
15 matter how hard they try to breathe. And you feel for them. I
16 mean, I should say, "Hey, open up this coal mine because my job
17 will be secure. There will be a lot more people in the ER,"
18 but I couldn't do that. I couldn't like, take the lives of
19 little children and place it against my job. It's not right.
20 And I don't think that the UMW people who fought for the common
21 good would really be for that either.

22 I watched a man die in California. He came in and he
23 couldn't breathe. And nothing we would do, I mean, continuous
24 air treatments, nothing, we even took him to surgery and gave

1 him some gas, that I don't remember what the gas was, to try to
2 get him to breathe. He was so scared. His eyes -- he couldn't
3 even talk. His eyes were so full of fear. I don't think
4 anyone should have to die like that. And I don't think that
5 you can say, "Oh, well, you know, the mine workers, three
6 hundred of them have better jobs so it's monetarily worth it."
7 I find that outrageous, that you could put coal company profits
8 against human lives and human suffering like that.

9 So, you know, what I know from coming from a union
10 family, is that companies lie, and that it is us against them.
11 And to see all of the workers here, aligning themselves with
12 the company, boy, I wasn't brought up like that. I would go
13 for the common good and let Peabody Coal take a little bit less
14 profit or maybe they'll have one fewer private jets, maybe
15 they'll have one less luxury chalet in the Swiss Alps, but if
16 people here can breathe better, that's better, in my opinion.

17 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
18 Jill Miller.

19 JILL MILLER: Hello. I am Jill Miller, J-I-L-L,
20 M-I-L-L-E-R. And I am an energy global organizer for the
21 Sierra Club in St. Louis, Missouri.

22 Air pollution affects people around the region. It
23 doesn't respect natural borders like the Mississippi River.
24 And that's why St. Louis, especially those already suffering

1 from serious chronic medical problems associated with air
2 pollution such as asthma, heart disease, and stroke are very
3 concerned about having a new coal-burning facility that would
4 dump even more unhealthy soot into our air.

5 The Peabody coal plant here would create over
6 twenty-five thousand tons of air pollutants. And it doesn't
7 have to.

8 Asthma has become an epidemic in the St. Louis
9 metropolitan region. The Asthma and Allergy Foundation of
10 America recently rated St. Louis the third worse city in the
11 nation for asthma. Studies show that the number of children
12 with asthma in the St. Louis Metro Area is approximately three
13 times the national average. Fifteen to twenty percent of
14 children under the age eighteen have asthma in certain areas of
15 St. Louis as compared to the national average of six point
16 three percent.

17 And asthma has a huge price tag for communities.
18 Asthma costs eastern Missouri more than seventy-five million
19 dollars per year in lost school time, lost work time, medicine
20 and emergency room visits.

21 Mercury from coal-fired power plants also affects us
22 in Missouri. It especially affects pregnant women, babies, and
23 young children. And the Missouri Department of Health and
24 Senior Services in 2001 issued an advisory in all bodies of

1 water in Missouri warning against the consumption of fish
2 except for very limited amounts.

3 According to the American Heart Association,
4 long-term exposure to air pollution also increases the risk of
5 death from heart disease and stroke. Studies have shown that
6 air pollution provokes inflammation, accelerates hardening of
7 the arteries, and alters cardiac function.

8 Air pollution even at what is considered safe levels,
9 contributes to heart disease and increases the risk of
10 stroke. And that's a big concern for St. Louis because heart
11 disease is the leading cause of death for residents of the City
12 of St. Louis. According to a 2002 study by East/West Gateway
13 Coordinating Council, which compared St. Louis to thirty-four
14 similar metropolitan areas, heart disease is the leading cause
15 of death in our area with rates nearly thirty-eight percent
16 higher than comparable cities.

17 The bottom line is that for the sake of our health
18 and our children, we must do better. This much air pollution
19 is something our region can ill-afford.

20 And I also want to ask for an extension on the
21 comment period, a sixty-day extension. Thank you.

22 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
23 is Diana Oleskevich.

24 DIANA OLESKEVICH: Diana Oleskevich, D-I-A-N-A,

1 O-L-E-S-K-E-V-I-C-H.

2 The brain can only absorb what the butt can endure.
3 Both Paula and Jill just gave you some startling facts that we
4 have heard echoed over and over tonight. So I would like to
5 tell you about some of the people. And I think they're very
6 much like people you know.

7 Our daughter, Katy, has asthma. Her big sister was
8 so disturbed by her multiple trips to the emergency room and
9 her lack of being able to participate in school sports, that
10 she became a physician, and she became a pulmonologist. She
11 has echoed and dittoed in her patients all of what we have seen
12 and heard today.

13 It's not that we don't want this Peabody coal plant.
14 It's that we want the Peabody coal plant to be the very best,
15 as you started out this evening saying. Lower the mercury
16 emissions. Lower those emissions so that our children will be
17 safe.

18 I want to tell you about Tammy's daughter. Her name
19 is Brittney. She has asthma. She is six years old. She has
20 been to the emergency room sixty times. Her sister, Meredith,
21 is four years old. She has asthma. She cannot go outside
22 without coming in and doing an inhaler treatment.

23 And it's not only one plant. It is the cumulative
24 effect of the many, many plants that are on both the east side

1 and the west side of the river.

2 I drove here from St. Louis tonight to talk to you
3 about this and to support the economic development of Southern
4 Illinois and to plead with you to please keep our children
5 safe, to think about their future.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
7 is Dale Wojtkowski.

8 DALE WOJTKOWSKI: Hi. My name is Dale, D-A-L-E,
9 Wojtkowski, W-O-J-T-K-O-W-S-K-I. I thought I would have to
10 spend my whole five minutes just spelling my name.

11 Also, I was started to think that everyone in the
12 United States was going to get to talk except for the people
13 that live, will be living right next to this plant.

14 I am submitting my comments about this construction
15 of the Prairie State Energy Campus. I would like to make it
16 clear that I am objecting to the construction of the permit of
17 this facility based on the following three points, and I will
18 not elaborate because they have been elaborated on over and
19 over.

20 The plant will be a major source of emissions. And
21 this area is already subjected to a source of emissions from
22 the operation of the Baldwin power plant. This along with the
23 fact that the State of Illinois has a surplus of generating
24 capacity would indicate it's not necessary to build this

1 pollution generating facility.

2 My second point is the use of the best available
3 control technology, and I think it has been pointed out clearly
4 tonight that this is not the, that more consideration should be
5 given for this.

6 The third point -- I would like to think that the
7 first two points are the strongest points. But my third point
8 is a more selfish point. For residents living in the two- to
9 three-mile radius of the plant, a significant reduction in the
10 visual quality of the landscape and natural beauty of the night
11 skies will be a tragic reality, not to mention the noise
12 pollution of the plant. The beauty of this area is the primary
13 reason why many of the residents, including myself, have chosen
14 this area to live where we do. In short, I did not move out to
15 where I live now to look at the side of a power plant every
16 morning when I wake up. And I ask that before this permit is
17 considered, that Peabody makes it clear to the residents what
18 they're going to do for us because it's clear this plant will
19 be beneficial to them. We want to know what it is going to do
20 for us. And that's all I have.

21 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. Next speaker is
22 J. Chancy. No? J. Chancy? No. How about Keith Sturgis?

23 KEITH STURGIS: Good evening. My name is Keith Sturgis,
24 K-E-I-T-H, Sturgis, S-T-U-R-G-I-S.

1 I would like to thank the Illinois EPA for showing
2 up. I was at Belleville when we didn't have nearly this
3 crowd. And it was an informative and it's informative
4 tonight. How you compile all of your data beats me.

5 I am an ex-coal miner. I live in Belleville. I
6 would encourage Peabody, since their name is on the power
7 company's agenda, to do the best job they can because their
8 name will go down with the community. And it is the community
9 that we live in. I was surprised to hear a gentleman from
10 Maine here.

11 We all have concerns about environment. The Sierra
12 Club is quite profound in their statements. I don't know what
13 a sixty-day waiver would gather you other than sixty days.

14 I, of course, would encourage the best for the area
15 because the area deserves the best. We are fortunate to have
16 Peabody. We are fortunate to have many industry qualifiers in
17 the area to work at, but the coal mining field is a resource
18 that we have a lot in Illinois. As a taxpayer, I would like to
19 see the State of Illinois benefit from this energy source,
20 burning it efficiently and economically, so Peabody can make
21 money, we can have power, and we can also have clean health
22 which is very important to all of us.

23 And I would encourage Peabody to do as great of a job
24 as they can because we will be here and you will also. But we

1 need to be partners on this with the EPA and the power company,
2 Peabody Coal, and the community.

3 And I support this. And I don't think I want a
4 sixty-day delay.

5 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker is Ed
6 Cockrell.

7 ED COCKRELL: Thank you. It's C-O-C-K-R-E-L-L, first
8 name is Ed. I represent about thirty percent of southeastern
9 St. Clair County as its county board member.

10 I am here in support of the Prairie State Energy
11 complex. As resolution was passed by the full St. Clair County
12 Board unanimously on December 29, 2003. We submit this as part
13 of the record.

14 I saw the devastation to people in the early '90s
15 from the Clean Air Act, its emission standard. Quality of life
16 was affected. Families were destroyed. People had to leave
17 the area. It was very unfortunate. In all of my thirty-five
18 years of living in this area, I don't think I have seen that
19 kind of devastation that that has caused and hope to see it
20 never again.

21 It's not that we aren't for clean air. It's not that
22 we aren't for clean water, edible fish, anything else that
23 comes in to do with nature. However, the economic reality is
24 that good head-of-household, medium-income jobs will come to

1 this area. That's the reason I am here in support of it. As
2 an economic development person, I am in support of it.

3 I ask the EPA to close the hearing, do not grant the
4 sixty-day extension, and get on with the project.

5 Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The next speaker
7 is Jack Scheper.

8 JACK SCHEPER: I apologize for keeping you one minute
9 longer. You have done a wonderful job this evening. My name
10 is Jack Scheper, S-C-H-E-P-E-R. I have been in radio and TV
11 for forty-five years over several states interviewing thousands
12 of people for the last forty-four years, forty-three years. I
13 beg your pardon.

14 I am here tonight with common sense. Some thirty
15 years ago, give or take, Heartland USA appeared. Heartland USA
16 was because of the fact that we had here the best burning coal
17 you could find. Missouri had the iron. They were going to be
18 bringing over iron to Illinois and smelting it here. When
19 they drew the map and to show the heartland of this area, this
20 was the center of the heart.

21 Then just as things were beginning to start perking,
22 just as we were getting more and more people jobs, and jobs
23 RAD, that's the engine for research and development, so they
24 started working on scrubbers. They started working on coal

1 gasification. They started getting grants for the colleges.
2 And they started looking also to areas to improve and enhance
3 better the whole process of the work force and the health of
4 the people.

5 Then the bureaucratic Washington machine came along
6 with this idea, "Oh, we have some people out east complaining
7 about the fumes, the pollution. It must be Pennsylvania and
8 Illinois. It must be." They set up some laws immediately and
9 got this whole political nonsense in a bureaucratic trap.

10 Then they found out after all of these regulations
11 came about and thousands of coal miners were put out of work
12 just in this area, that the belching of cows put out more
13 pollution. That's a fact. Then they found out that, in
14 addition to that, that the carbon from all of these trucks put
15 out a stronger more severe type of pollution than any other.
16 Then they found out that, not only scrubbers, excuse me, were
17 helping, but we also had the air. We also had all of the
18 water, the forest overseas which then they started cutting
19 down. As they cut more of this away, pollution got worse.

20 I have heard from a number of very sincere people
21 tonight in talking about the various types of illnesses, but
22 they have no proof of where that came from. It has been
23 twenty-five to thirty years ago we were told to stop eating our
24 most favorite fish out of the ocean because of mercury. There

1 are no coal mines out there. The reasons for are something
2 that we don't actually have totally pinpointed down.

3 We cannot run from these things. We have to use our
4 engine. That is jobs. Give us the opportunity for research
5 and development, and out of that you have continual
6 improvement.

7 I hear people here this evening very, very sincere,
8 but they are talking as if this is not America. This is not
9 the country that has spent all these centuries improving upon
10 itself developing enhancements. We have the greatest of
11 everything until we started with the outsourcing. I have heard
12 some people say and even talk about suggesting, in my mind
13 they're saying, "Well, let's outsource our coal, our power, and
14 then let the Japanese send it back to us." We have got to
15 stand up. And we have to fight. And we have to work for what
16 we have and what we need. And the only way we can do that is
17 to put the jobs here and get our people back to where they are
18 working.

19 Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. That was our last
21 scheduled speaker. We are completely out of time. We are
22 already running late. So I thank you all for coming. Renee
23 Cipriano, Director of the EPA, thanks you all for coming. And
24 have a good night.

1 * * *

* * *

* * *

2 (Ending at 10:05 p.m.)

3 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
4) ss.
5 COUNTY OF RANDOLPH)

6 I, RETHA R. MEYERHOFF, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
7 Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in and for
8 Randolph County, Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing
9 is a true and accurate transcript of a hearing on the Proposed
10 Issuance of a Construction Permit/PSD Approval to Prairie State
11 Generating Company, LLC, held Monday, March 22, 2004, at the
12 Marissa High School, Marissa, Illinois, and as reported by me
13 in machine shorthand and thereafter reduced to typewriting by
14 means of computer-aided transcription; and that the foregoing
15 110 pages comprise a true, complete, and correct transcript of
16 the testimony given and the proceedings held at the taking of
17 said hearing.

18 Dated this ____ day of April, A.D. 2004.

19

20 _____
21 Retha R. Meyerhoff
22 Certified Shorthand Reporter
23 Notary Public in and for
24 Randolph County, Illinois.

