

I N D E X

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

PROCEEDINGS

PAGES

Hearing Officer's Opening Statement	4 - 6
BOA presentation by Mr. Jason Schnepf	6 - 9
Questions/comments from public	9 - 82
Hearing Officer's Closure of Hearing	82

	EXHIBITS	PAGE
1		
2	No. 1	6
	(Agenda)	
3		
4	No. 2	6
	(Notice of Public Hearing and Comment Period)	
5	No. 3	6
	(Construction Permit - NESHAP Source - NSPS Source)	
6		
7	No. 4	6
	(Project summary)	
8	No. 5	24
	(Correspondence dated 1/25/05 from Constance Howard)	
9		
10	No. 6	24
	(Correspondence dated 6/7/04 from Southeast Environmental Task Force)	
11		
12	No. 7	24
	(Outline and correspondence)	
13	No. 8	25
	(Statement presented by Ted Stalnos)	
14		
15	No. 9	26
	(Statement presented by Joe Davis)	
16	No. 10	28
	(Statement presented by Jorge Perez)	
17		
18	No. 11	82
	(Petition - two pages)	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Good evening,
2 ladies and gentlemen. We are going to get started
3 now then. My name is Charles Matoesian. I'm the
4 hearing officer here tonight. I would like to thank
5 you all for coming. I would also like to convey the
6 thanks of Renee Cipriano, the Director of the
7 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

8 Tonight this hearing is being held by
9 the Bureau of Air, which is a division of the
10 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. Chicago
11 Coke Company has applied for a construction permit
12 from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency to
13 rebuild the coke oven battery at 11400 South Burley
14 Avenue in Chicago.

15 Chicago Coke must obtain a permit from
16 the Illinois EPA's Bureau of Air for the proposed
17 rebuild because it will entail modifications to the
18 coke oven battery. Chicago Coke proposes to perform
19 a pad-up rebuild, which involves replacing the bricks
20 in the coke oven battery from the foundation up,
21 without changes to the layout of the battery.

22 As proposed by Chicago Coke, the
23 rebuild and restart of the facility will not
24 constitute a major modification as defined by the

1 Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration rules
2 found at 40 CFR 52.21 or the pertinent Illinois rules
3 found at 35 Illinois Administrative Code, part 203.

4 The purpose of this hearing is to
5 receive comments and answer questions from the public
6 prior to making the final decision concerning the
7 draft permit. This hearing is being held under the
8 Illinois EPA's Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan
9 Rules, which are found at 35 Illinois Administrative
10 code, part 166, subpart A.

11 You do not have to submit comments
12 tonight at the hearing and, indeed, lengthy comments
13 and questions should be submitted in writing. Those
14 comments can be sent to myself, Charles Matoesian --
15 that's M-a-t-o-e-s-i-a-n -- at the Illinois EPA,
16 address of 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O.
17 Box 19276, in Springfield, Illinois, 62794.
18 And that information is available from the materials
19 at the registration desk.

20 Written comments need not be notarized
21 but they must be submitted by midnight February 24,
22 2005; that is, they can be postmarked on that date
23 but we do not have to receive them on that date. But
24 it must be no later than midnight, February 24, 2005.

1 For the record, I would like to state
2 that notice of this hearing was placed in the Daily
3 Southtown Newspaper with run dates of December 11th,
4 December 18th, and December 25th of 2004.

5 I will now turn things over to
6 Mr. Jason Schnepf, who is an environmental protection
7 engineering with the Bureau of Air.

8 (Exhibits 1 through 4 tendered.)

9 MR. SCHNEPP: Good evening, ladies and
10 gentlemen. My name is Jason Schnepf, and I'm a
11 permit engineer in the Bureau of Air. I will be
12 giving you a brief description of the project.

13 Chicago Coke Company has requested a permit
14 for the modification of its existing coke oven
15 battery located in Chicago. This facility also
16 includes a byproducts recovery plant, which receives
17 raw coal -- raw coke oven gas from the battery and
18 processes it, recovering coal tar, ammonia sulfate,
19 and oils. The cleaned coke oven gas, which also has
20 impurities such as sulfur removed, is then used as
21 fuel in the coke oven battery and boilers.

22 The coke oven battery, byproduct plant,
23 and ancillary operations were previously operated by
24 LTV Steel. In December 2001, LTV Steel discontinued

1 coke production and was put into a hot idle mode. In
2 February 2002, the facility was placed into cold idle
3 mode. In December 2002, the facility was sold to
4 Calumet Transfer Company and Chicago Coke Company was
5 designated to operate the facility on Calumet
6 Transfer's behalf. Chicago Coke has decided that for
7 long-term operation a pad-up rebuild of the coke oven
8 battery is necessary. The most appropriate time to
9 perform a pad-up rebuild is during the cold idle
10 mode. This pad-up rebuild involves rebricking the
11 coke oven battery from the pad up, i.e., it does not
12 involve changes to the existing deck slab or coke
13 oven battery footprint.

14 Several improvements will be made in
15 conjunction with the pad-up rebuild. In particular,
16 a new electronic controller system called the
17 pressure-regulated oven or PROven system will be
18 installed on the battery to better manage oven
19 pressure during the coking cycle, which should reduce
20 the number and extent of leaks from the ovens and
21 reduce the associated emissions.

22 Low NOx burners will be installed on
23 Burners 1 and 4 to minimize NOx emissions. The
24 facility will also be replacing the associated steam

1 turbine generator with a larger unit, so that the
2 capacity of the turbine does not act to limit the
3 amount of coke oven gas burned in the boilers. With
4 the larger turbine, less coke oven gas would be
5 flared. This extra coke oven gas will be burned in
6 the lower emitting boilers as compared to flaring.

7 This facility is not considered a new
8 major source because the source was not permanently
9 shut down. In particular, LTV Steel made
10 considerable efforts when operations were temporarily
11 discontinued to minimize the effort and cost of
12 resuming operations at the facility. These efforts
13 included, but were not limited to, operating the coke
14 oven battery in a hot idle mode for a period of time,
15 maintaining and not dismantling or demolishing
16 equipment, and maintaining its operating permit. The
17 goal of Chicago Coke has been to resume operations at
18 this facility as soon as possible, since the market
19 for coke has improved.

20 Under both the PSD rules and the
21 nonattainment New Source Review rules, the proposed
22 project does not constitute a major modification.
23 This is because Chicago Coke will be subject to
24 operating and emission limitations such that a

1 significant increase in emissions will not occur.
2 The plant is located in a nonattainment area for PM10
3 and ozone. The location of the plant is designated
4 attainment for all other pollutants. The
5 nonattainment New Source Review pollutants are PM10,
6 NOx, for the 8-hour ozone standard, and volatile
7 organic material.

8 The Illinois EPA has reviewed materials
9 submitted by Chicago Coke and has determined that the
10 application complies with the applicable state and
11 federal standards. The conditions of the proposed
12 permit contain limitations and requirements of the
13 facility including appropriate testing, monitoring,
14 recordkeeping, and reporting requirements.

15 In closing, the Illinois EPA is
16 proposing to grant a construction permit for the
17 pad-up rebuild of the coke oven battery. We welcome
18 any comments or questions from the public on our
19 proposed action. Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: We will now have
21 questions and comments from the public. We will
22 start with comments from several representatives and
23 agents of Chicago Coke Company. Those of you wishing
24 to speak, please approach the lectern here, speak

1 into the microphone, and please speak clearly and
2 state and spell your name for the record.

3 First speaker will be Mr. Alan
4 Beemsterboer.

5 MR. ALAN BEEMSTERBOER: My name is Alan
6 Beemsterboer. I want to introduce to you two members
7 of Chicago Coke. My name is Alan Beemsterboer. We
8 have Steve Beemsterboer and Simon Beemsterboer.

9 Steve is going to give you a quick overview
10 of the project. Simon is going to give you an
11 overview of some of the environmental issues, and I'm
12 going to talk a little bit about the economic impact
13 in this project.

14 So I would like to turn this over to
15 Steve Beemsterboer and he will continue.

16 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Good evening. And
17 I think we have a lot of supporters out there and
18 appreciate your coming out tonight.

19 We have been working for the
20 Beemsterboer Corporation for a long time. The
21 Beemsterboer Company has been in business since 1946
22 in this area. We have been working in the steel
23 mills full-time since that time. So we have been
24 very familiar with this industry. When this property

1 came up for sale, the three of us formed a group to
2 purchase the property. And when it was on hot idle,
3 ourselves and anybody else could have come up and
4 purchased this plant. But there were no buyers for
5 the plant at that time because the buyer would have
6 to pick up huge liability issues left over from the
7 LTV and 30 or 40 years of operation.

8 So they could not find a buyer. They
9 put the plant on cold idle under the direction of the
10 bankruptcy court, at which time it was -- LTV spent
11 \$3.5 million approximately in cleaning up the plant,
12 cleaning up several environmental issues, and getting
13 the plant to a RCRA status.

14 At that time the bankruptcy judge
15 ordered that it be put on cold idle. They stopped
16 putting gas in the ovens. LTV in addition to
17 cleaning up the environmental issues took great care
18 in shutting down the plant in doing things to the
19 plant so that it could be restarted. It was not just
20 shut off and walked away from.

21 LTV was then ordered to sell the plant
22 to the highest bidder. We formed a company called
23 Calumet Transfer to bid on the plant and was a
24 successful bidder. We then formed a company called

1 Chicago Coke Company because that was the nickname
2 for this plant, Chicago Coke, for many years.

3 We formed that company for two
4 purposes; one, to modify the existing permits to
5 allow for improvements that will greatly reduce
6 emissions, and to market the plant to a qualified
7 steel mill. After two years of hard work and great
8 expense, we are very excited to be here tonight,
9 which is a major milestone in obtaining the final
10 permit in getting this plant reopened.

11 We truly feel this project is a good
12 thing for the local community, the local steel mills,
13 because this coke will be used in the neighboring
14 steel mills. It will help them remain competitive
15 and keep all those jobs going. And we feel it would
16 be a good thing for America because America needs to
17 retain some manufacturing jobs to remain competitive
18 in the global economy we are all in. We cannot allow
19 all our jobs to be shipped overseas unless we want to
20 let our middle class disappear.

21 Lastly, we are very proud to have the
22 support of the Southeast Environmental Task Force.
23 That's the local community group. We received a
24 letter from them of recommendation that they would

1 like to see these jobs come back as long as we or the
2 plant is run under the permit regulations, which will
3 be done.

4 So again, thank you for coming out
5 tonight. That's a short history of what we have
6 done. And during the question and answering period,
7 I would like to answer any other questions you have.

8 MR. SIMON BEEMSTERBOER: Hi. My name is
9 Simon Beemsterboer. I'm one of the partners of
10 Chicago Coke. And when we decided to go ahead with
11 the project, of course one of our first concerns was
12 also the state of the environment on the property.
13 With all the rumors about this being there and
14 different things, we decided to do our own
15 investigation. We found the property not without
16 issues but much better than expected and with no
17 issues that exceed industrial standards. This means
18 that we can put people back to work on this project
19 with just normal environmental considerations,
20 nothing too outlandish to get going.

21 Our next step was to decide our
22 operating policy. Should we take a quick fix, which
23 was just sealing up the batteries and doing the best
24 we could, or go back -- or repairing the plant

1 properly. With the advice of the IEPA and others, we
2 decided that the only real option was to put the
3 plant together properly and go from there.

4 The permit that we are here for today
5 will allow us to build a state-of-the-world coke-
6 making facility. The main refinements will come
7 through under the improved gas handling called the
8 PROven system, the low NOx burners, an upgraded and
9 consolidated coal-handling system, and a whole coal
10 yard water spray system. Along with additional
11 improvements, these will help us build a facility
12 that will meet or exceed all known emission levels
13 well into the future. As projected now, these
14 improvements will create a new target level for all
15 future coke plants.

16 On a broader picture, our environmental
17 responsibility to the area around the plant are also
18 addressed. Water pulled in from the river will be
19 cleaner when it's returned than when we drew it out.
20 Dust pollution with our controls in place and being
21 monitored by a viable business will be better than a
22 barren field.

23 Also, traffic can be held to a minimum
24 as the raw and finished products of the coke plant

1 are moved by rail or water. The largest traffic
2 issues will result from the 200-plus jobs created
3 through this project.

4 We have been working with the IEPA
5 since 2002 to bring this facility back to
6 productivity and believe we have reached solutions
7 that satisfy all conditions.

8 I would like to turn this over to Keith
9 for a couple words, and thank you very much.

10 MR. NAY: Good evening. My name is Keith
11 Nay. I appreciate the opportunity of addressing you
12 this evening from the perspective of a former LTV
13 coke plant employee. I was employed in the steel-
14 and coke-making industry for 28 years, from 1974
15 until my retirement from LTV Steel in 2002. Since
16 then, I have been employed by URS as project manager
17 consulting in the steel- and coke-making industry. I
18 was a former plant engineer for LTV Steel Company at
19 the coke plant at 114th and South Burley Avenue from
20 1985 through the hot and cold idle periods and
21 environmental decommissioning, which finished in the
22 year 2002.

23 It has been my pleasure to assist the
24 Chicago Coke Company in efforts to restart the coke

1 plant. Many former employees of the LTV Chicago Coke
2 plant called me at home and met with me on their own
3 time and volunteered recommendations to make the new
4 Chicago Coke Company even better than it was before.

5 They understood that a pad-up rebuild
6 of a coke battery is a unique opportunity for
7 innovation and improvement which are rarely available
8 in the coke-making industry. Millions of dollars
9 will be spent revitalizing the existing equipment and
10 emissions control equipment and millions more will
11 have been committed to install state-of-the-art
12 emissions controls, including low NOx burners on two
13 of the boilers, the PROven system, which is a
14 pressure oven regulation system which reduces leaks
15 in doors on top of the battery. Also, we will
16 replace all the doors on the battery with the newest
17 generation of coke oven doors. We are also going to
18 increase and add additional coke oven and emissions
19 monitoring systems throughout the plant.

20 These are all -- A lot of these were
21 done voluntarily. The PROven system was the Chicago
22 Coke's idea and they presented the technology to the
23 USEPA and the Illinois EPA. That was done up-front
24 without any encouragement. It is my opinion that

1 it's just common business sense to include best
2 available control technologies and work practices
3 into the restart of this plant. Considering the
4 substantial investment which will be made by the
5 company, its employees, and its suppliers, I believe
6 that the Chicago Coke Company will be an asset to the
7 neighborhood and to the City of Chicago. Thank you
8 very much for this opportunity to speak.

9 MR. ALAN BEEMSTERBOER: As I look over this
10 audience, I see a lot of local residents, I see a lot
11 of union people, a lot of union people. I see
12 bankers. I see people from the railroads. I see
13 business leaders of all kind. I think there is a lot
14 of concern of what's happening to these rusty
15 mausoleums we see on either side of the river.

16 But I can assure you, there are much
17 more important issues than the \$150 million pad-up
18 rebuild of the former Chicago Coke plant. You can
19 look next door, we have got a shopping center that's
20 half empty. People have moved out of the country,
21 out of the area. We have got a degrading infra-
22 structure because we can't have a tax base to support
23 the rebuilding of some infrastructure to attract new
24 business here.

1 We have got a chance here to ignite an
2 economic engine that will revitalize the east side,
3 the local economics, and change some of these rusty
4 mausoleums into maybe something new, like new painted
5 ladies of industry. This is an economic engine that
6 can sustain itself well past you and our children and
7 our grandchildren.

8 This project is about jobs, over 200
9 long-term, well-paying jobs. It's about 5 to 600
10 construction jobs for the next two years. It's about
11 enumerable off-site jobs in the transportation
12 industry, the coal industry, the banking, go on from
13 there. It's about 6 to 700 service-related jobs just
14 to handle the 200 people that are going to be working
15 full-time.

16 This is about the local community
17 having access to these jobs. This is about increased
18 tax revenue for local projects. This is about a 5 to
19 \$600 million economic impact to this area alone.
20 This is about the future of the area. In the last
21 several years, we have all seen what's happened to
22 the steel industry. We have seen foreign countries
23 dumping their steel in our markets. We have seen our
24 steel companies being held hostage for the raw

1 materials we need to supply coke. And most
2 important, we have seen our steel mills close and our
3 work force disappear.

4 We have an opportunity to fight back
5 here. The coke that will be produced at this plant
6 will be high-quality, low-cost coke sorely needed by
7 an industry that needs to cut its costs. By so
8 doing, we can help preserve our work force currently
9 employed at our local steel mills. We can't let
10 these ISGs, these U.S. Steels, these Bethlehems,
11 become the rusting mausoleums of the future.

12 This project is about jobs. It's about
13 superior environmental technology. It's about a
14 self-sustaining economic engine. It's also a
15 tremendous shot in the arm for the local people and
16 the local economy. I make no excuses if I'm
17 passionate about this project. I worked at Wisconsin
18 Steel. I worked at Acme Steel. And I worked at LTV.
19 They are no longer here anymore.

20 We need to take this opportunity and I
21 ask that the final draft of the construction permit
22 be granted. Thank you.

23 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
24 next speaker is Alderman John Pope.

1 ALDERMAN POPE: Good evening. For the
2 record, my name is John Pope, Alderman of the 10th
3 Ward, City of Chicago. I, too, would like to express
4 my support for this project at a time when jobs,
5 especially good-paying union jobs with benefits, are
6 leaving not only the area but the entire country.
7 This coke plant will provide opportunities where and
8 when they are most needed.

9 The impact on the community will be
10 significant with several hundred union construction
11 jobs and, as was said earlier, approximately 200
12 permanent jobs. These are the immediate employment
13 opportunities which do not include other off-site
14 related opportunities, which could also number into
15 the hundreds.

16 Local and state revenues resulting from
17 this project come at a time when our city and state
18 are facing significant budget challenges.
19 Additionally, the economic impact to the community
20 over the long run could reach into the hundreds of
21 millions.

22 I have mentioned several of the
23 economic benefits of this project but would be remiss
24 if I did not speak to the attention that this project

1 gives to the environment. State-of-the-art
2 technology is to be incorporated into this project
3 which will set the bar on a national basis.

4 The once major concern of mercury is
5 addressed where almost all the mercury will be
6 eliminated.

7 Water cannons, storing the material
8 away from the residential communities, and other
9 actions to minimize dust from the piles are included
10 in this project.

11 The protection to our river and lake
12 water has also been considered where no negative
13 impact is anticipated. Additionally, the water
14 that's returned to the river, as was mentioned
15 earlier, is actually going to be better than the
16 water taken out.

17 Great thought and consideration has
18 also been given to the community itself. As a
19 result, the East Side Little League can rest assured
20 that their field, which is actually owned by the
21 applicant, will remain a recreational sanctuary for
22 our youth to enjoy. Bringing the large majority of
23 material in by barge will minimize truck traffic in
24 the neighborhood. And a commitment by the applicant

1 to hire qualified local residents demonstrates their
2 understanding of what it takes to be a good local
3 corporate citizen.

4 As I stated at the beginning of my
5 comments, I'm in support of this project. As your
6 local elected official, I am not alone. It was but a
7 few years ago when this plant was being shut down
8 that U.S. Senator Dick Durbin and I stood at the site
9 trying to do everything we could to keep the facility
10 open. Although the plant eventually closed, both the
11 Senator and I have not lost sight of its importance
12 and value. The Senator was not able to attend but
13 does have a staff member here today to observe and
14 learn more about the current status of this long-
15 awaited project.

16 State Representative Connie Howard was
17 also unable to attend but has submitted her written
18 support. And if I may, and I will submit a copy for
19 the record, dated January 25, 2005, "To Whom It May
20 Concern: Unfortunately, I am unable to be in
21 attendance at tonight's hearing. However, I strongly
22 support the proposal designed to redevelop the
23 property on which the LTV Company once operated.

24 "It is heartening to know that issues

1 of major importance to me, and the constituents I
2 represent -- employment opportunities, the
3 environment, revenue for local projects, and reduced
4 dependency on foreign fuel source -- are part of the
5 proposed plan and are being address in such a
6 meaningful way.

7 "Hopefully, as I do, others, also,
8 believe this proposal offers a viable alternative to
9 what is, currently, an unproductive site.

10 "As this proposal goes forth, I would
11 like to be kept informed of community response and of
12 any matter in which it is that I can be of
13 assistance.

14 "Very truly yours, Constance Howard,
15 Representative of the 34th Representative District."

16 State Representative Marlow Colvin, who
17 I joined with this morning at the East Side Chamber
18 of Commerce installation breakfast is now in
19 Springfield. He is unable to attend but also
20 recognizes the many benefits of this project, would
21 like to get more information from IEPA, and at this
22 time is in favor of the project.

23 Many others have joined us tonight
24 including the various labor unions, particularly the

1 one most impacted when this facility tragically shut
2 its doors, United Steel Workers of America,
3 Local 9777. They are here to vehemently support this
4 project, as is our local development commission, the
5 Southeast Chicago Development Commission, or SCDCOM,
6 who was originally created in 1977 to deal with the
7 consequences of the vanishing industrial base in our
8 southeast side.

9 In closing, I would like to thank the
10 IEPA for giving me the opportunity to testify. I
11 look forward toward the expedient review of this and
12 favorable consideration. Most importantly, I would
13 like to thank the applicant, Chicago Coke plant, for
14 pursuing this project which has been, to say the
15 least, a tremendous challenge but whose benefits can
16 and will make it all worthwhile. Thank you.

17 (Exhibits 5, 6 and 7 tendered.)

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker
19 is Mr. Ted Stalnos.

20 MR. STALNOS: My name is Ted Stalnos. I'm
21 vice president of the Southeast Chicago Development
22 Commission. The Southeast Chicago Development
23 Commission is a community economic development
24 organization serving all of southeast Chicago. The

1 organization works with residents, business,
2 industry, government, and other community partners to
3 provide leadership, planning, advocacy, and programs
4 that increase economic opportunities and improve the
5 quality of life for the people of southeast Chicago.

6 SCDCCom supports the Chicago Coke
7 Company in its efforts to obtain a permit to operate
8 the former LTV coke plant at 114th and Burley. The
9 reopening of this facility will produce over 200 new
10 well-paying, permanent union-represented positions.
11 The southeast side's economic backbone was built by
12 steelworkers' paychecks that offer truly meaningful
13 employment.

14 As we recently witnessed with the
15 Chicago Manufacturing Campus, employers know that
16 hiring local makes smart business sense. The Chicago
17 Coke Plant and the family that here is making the
18 presentation tonight has been in this community for
19 decades and plans to utilize the local work force
20 when manning this new venture. We truly look forward
21 to this new opportunity for area residents and
22 businesses alike. Thank you.

23 (Exhibit No. 8 tendered.)

24 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker

1 is Mr. Joe Davis.

2 MR. DAVIS: Good evening. My name is Joe
3 Davis, Business Agent for Local 9777 for United
4 Steelworkers of America. United Steelworkers of
5 America supports the Chicago Coke Company in its
6 effort to secure an operating permit for its coke
7 facility on the southeast side of Chicago. We
8 understand that the Chicago Coke Company will
9 recognize that workers at this plant will naturally
10 seek collective bargaining rights which workers at
11 this site previously enjoyed. That being understood,
12 we see an opportunity for workers to be paid a
13 livable wage and substantial benefits that United
14 Steelworkers members enjoy throughout North America.
15 Furthermore, this plant will produce an important
16 product that is needed for the fully integrated steel
17 plants just across the state line that also employs
18 many residents and steelworkers in the southeast
19 Chicago. We urge the Illinois Environmental
20 Protection Agency to grant a permit to the Chicago
21 Coke Company. Thank you.

22 (Exhibit No. 9 tendered.)

23 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next
24 speaker, I believe, it's Bill Cullen. Is that how

1 it's pronounced?

2 MR. CULLEN: My name is the Bill Cullen.
3 I'm the owner, president of Sharlen Electric, located
4 at 91st and Baltimore. I've run a family- owned
5 business on the southeast side since 1958. I would
6 just like to state that Sharlen Electric supports the
7 Chicago Coke Company in their efforts to obtain a
8 permit to operate the former LTV plant located at
9 116th and Burley, and I wish them all the luck.
10 Thank you.

11 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
12 next speaker is Mr. Jorge Perez.

13 MR. PEREZ: Good evening. My name is Jorge
14 Perez. I'm the President of the Calumet Area
15 Industrial Commission. Since 1967, the Calumet Area
16 Industrial Commission has led the industrial
17 retention and expansion efforts of the Calumet area
18 in order to create an environment in which industry
19 will remain, and more important, grow. Our work is
20 accomplished through business advocacy, industrial
21 development, and our network. Our membership of over
22 134 companies represents over 5,000 employees.

23 As many of you know, the Calumet area
24 has entered renewed industrial activity and

1 investment over the past several years. On behalf of
2 the organization's policy council and its board of
3 directors, we would like to extend our support to the
4 Chicago Coke project in its effort to obtain a permit
5 to operate the former LTV Coke plant. The investment
6 that Chicago Coke proposes is crucial to the overall
7 steel industry, for the impact it will have in the
8 Calumet Area business community and not to mention
9 the employment opportunities. They should also be
10 commended on exceeding the state requirements as part
11 of their plans.

12 As industry and manufacturing continues
13 to evolve in an ever fast-paced global economy, we
14 must look at this type of investment as a positive
15 opportunity for overall renewal in business and
16 community.

17 Again, on behalf of the CAIC Policy
18 Council and its Board of Directors, we extend our
19 support for this project and we thank you for this
20 opportunity to comment. Thank you.

21 (Exhibit No. 10 tendered.)

22 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
23 next speaker is Miss Eva Aseves.

24 MS. ASEVES: Hi. My name is Eva Aseves, and

1 I'm a teacher at Washington High School. And I look
2 around and I see quite a full room here of people.
3 And I think, as human beings, everyone here wants
4 their basic needs fulfilled, food, shelter. But I
5 have to say in opening this coke plant, at what
6 price? At the price of our children? At the price
7 of our elderly?

8 This plant will operate the hours that
9 school operates. Our children will be breathing
10 this. And even though you talk about the
11 state-of-the-art emissions, any kind of pollutants in
12 today's atmosphere is too much. It's a hazard to our
13 elderly. It's a hazard to our very young.

14 And I'm sorry to say, you know, I know
15 jobs are important. Our basic needs need to be met,
16 but at whose quality of life? Not the Beemsterboers
17 because they don't live in this area. Their mothers
18 don't live in this area. Their grandchildren don't
19 live in this area. And if it's going to provide such
20 a great opportunity to our community, hey, come on
21 back. Bring your children back here. Let them go to
22 school to Washington Elementary. Let them go to
23 school to Washington High School. Come on and
24 breathe the same air we are breathing.

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Please allow the
2 person to speak.

3 The next speaker is Miss Peggy Salazar.

4 MS. SALAZAR: My name is Peggy Salazar and
5 I'm a resident of the southeast side of Chicago. And
6 I have been a resident my whole life. And like most
7 people, as you mentioned before, people tend to move
8 out of the area. I have chosen not to. But people
9 that I personally know, and I know quite a few who
10 have moved out of the area, they didn't do so because
11 there were no jobs here. They did so because it's
12 dirty, it's polluted, it's industrial, not because
13 there are no jobs.

14 We don't live in a horse-and-buggy era
15 where you have to live next to your jobs. There is
16 no such thing. You can live anywhere you choose and
17 get a job and get to it by car, whatever.

18 In any case, I have a few questions.
19 There were some comments made that this was going to
20 be a world-class system. And I'm curious because we
21 are going to -- They are going to provide us with a
22 world-class system with minor modifications?
23 Shouldn't we be looking for an exemplary system? I
24 mean this is what I want. If we have to have this in

1 my neighborhood, I want exemplary. I don't want
2 world class because world class apparently means
3 minor modification. So how do we get exemplary? I'm
4 asking.

5 MR. ROMAINE: This plant would be designed
6 and have to comply with standards that have been
7 developed by the United States Environmental
8 Protection Agency specifically to address the
9 operation of coke ovens. And those regulations are
10 developed to require coke ovens to use the technology
11 that is used at the best performing plants across the
12 nation. So that is something that is inherent in the
13 regulatory structure that applies to the emissions of
14 greatest concerns. With regard to this plant, I
15 believe the --

16 MS. SALAZAR: But is it possible to do
17 better? That is my question. Is it possible to do
18 better? Are there technologies out there to do
19 better?

20 MR. ROMAINE: There are two types of coke
21 plants. There are recovery coke plants and
22 nonrecovery coke plants. Given the type of facility
23 we have, we are starting from a recovery-type coke
24 plant. At this point our belief is there can be

1 incremental improvements in how it is operated and
2 maintained, but it is fundamentally constrained by
3 the fact it is a recovery-type coke plant.

4 MS. SALAZAR: Recovery meaning because it's
5 the type of operation or because it's in existence?

6 MR. ROMAINE: Because of the type of
7 operation. This plant is designed to process the
8 coke oven gas that's produced by the ovens to recover
9 valuable chemicals.

10 MS. SALAZAR: So basically you are saying
11 then that we could not have a better system than what
12 they are going to provide us with, you are saying
13 that there is no way to provide a better system.
14 This is the question I'm asking.

15 MR. ROMAINE: We have not looked at that
16 question. Our charge is to look at whether the
17 proposal meets applicable requirements.

18 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. I understand. But what
19 I'm saying is I'm against the plant unless it can be
20 exemplary and it can be the best there is. Because
21 if I have to have this plant in my neighborhood, I do
22 not want this plant. I want a plant that's going to
23 be using all the modern technologies possible to make
24 certain that we have the least amount of emissions

1 and still provide the jobs that we are supposed to be
2 providing.

3 Secondly, I was impressed with the
4 philanthropic spin on the jobs and providing the
5 middle class and rah-rah, hooray, hooray. So I'm
6 going to sacrifice the quality of my air, the
7 cleanliness of my community. What are you
8 sacrificing?

9 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We feel that --

10 MS. SALAZAR: What are you sacrificing?

11 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Can I answer?

12 MS. SALAZAR: Yes.

13 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We work in this
14 area every day. You say we don't and you said we
15 didn't live here. I live here ten hours a day in
16 this area. I breathe in the same air. We have gone
17 through the best efforts we can do to bring the best
18 coke plant possible here.

19 MS. SALAZAR: No. It's not the best.

20 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: No, what I'm
21 saying is --

22 MS. SALAZAR: Apparently it's not the best.

23 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: I don't want to
24 speak for Chris. I'm saying for our group.

1 MS. SALAZAR: But I'm saying it's not the
2 best.

3 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We have searched
4 worldwide technology. We brought technology to this
5 plant that doesn't exist in the United States. It
6 comes from Germany. We have done -- We feel that we
7 have brought you the best technology possible. That
8 was our goal from day one.

9 MS. SALAZAR: So you are saying it is the
10 best technology?

11 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We believe it's the
12 best available that we know of.

13 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. But you qualify by
14 saying what you know of, okay.

15 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: I have been in the
16 industry for 30 years.

17 MS. SALAZAR: But apparently he makes it
18 sound like there are others that are better or
19 possibly better.

20 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We don't know of
21 any.

22 MS. SALAZAR: Okay.

23 MR. SIMON BEEMSTERBOER: We don't know of
24 any, and you are mixing a different type of coke

1 plant.

2 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. My other question
3 is -- So you are basically going to provide all
4 these, and so we are going to have fewer emissions.
5 In terms of everyone who is involved with this
6 project, in terms of partnerships and so forth, I
7 know you don't live in the area, but do you live
8 anywhere near any type of facility that produces
9 these types of emissions in any kind of amount?

10 MS. HODGE: Excuse me?

11 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: I'm sorry, yes?

12 MS. HODGE: Kathy Hodge. I'm not sure of
13 the relevancy of the question to tonight.

14 MS. SALAZAR: Because I'm entitled to ask
15 questions.

16 MS. HODGE: But they are based on relevance.

17 MS. SALAZAR: It is relevant because I want
18 to understand that they are going to come and build
19 this in my neighborhood and tell me how good it is
20 for us, but yet basing it on, what, on their profits,
21 on the money that's going to be made?

22 Oh, one more question, one more
23 question. Beemsterboer has been in the neighborhood
24 for many, many years; correct? And you are part of

1 the good neighbor dialogues, correct?

2 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Is that an
3 organization?

4 MS. SALAZAR: Good neighbor dialogues are --
5 It's an environmental organization that is in our
6 neighborhood. They conduct good neighbor -- what
7 they call good neighbor dialogues with the businesses
8 who cooperate with us and who address our complaints
9 and try to work with the organization. So I'm asking
10 as -- are they part of the good neighbor dialogues;
11 and if so, what improvements or what changes have
12 they done to improve their impact on the community.
13 Because I don't know of too many, if any.

14 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Okay. Steve
15 Beemsterboer. The Beemsterboer Company is part of
16 that organization. Peter Beemsterboer represents us
17 on that. And we have worked closely with Marilyn
18 Byrnes, you probably know.

19 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. So what have you done?

20 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: They came to us
21 from day one and said if you don't build the cleanest
22 plant possible --

23 MS. SALAZAR: That's not what I'm talking
24 about. I'm talking about existing operation. You

1 have a company here that's been here for years. I'm
2 not talking about something that's out in the future.

3 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: I don't understand
4 your question.

5 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: That really
6 isn't relevant.

7 MS. SALAZAR: Well, history and track record
8 is relevant to me. I'm sorry.

9 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Well, I
10 understand but let's --

11 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. Well --

12 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Let's concern it
13 to this particular permit.

14 MS. SALAZAR: Well, I just want everyone to
15 be aware of the track record they have. Okay?

16 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Please. You can
17 pose questions, no one is required to answer them.
18 But if you would like to pose those for the audience,
19 perhaps that's all right.

20 MS. SALAZAR: All I want to make certain is
21 you are providing what you consider the best.

22 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Yes.

23 MS. SALAZAR: But not necessarily is the
24 best, correct?

1 MR. ROMAINE: I would agree.

2 MS. SALAZAR: Okay. And that's about it.

3 And I know I have other comments. I got this just
4 today. I walked in and got this just today. So it's
5 very difficult to preview something. And I
6 understand the Union's attitude because, believe me,
7 you know, I understand about job loss. And I
8 understand a lot of that. But if you think it's just
9 about what's going on right now, that's going to
10 correct a situation, that has many factors that play
11 into it. That's not really what it's all about. You
12 are talking politicians. You are talking about
13 companies that didn't want to deal with environmental
14 regulations and also not wanting to pay the wages
15 that the Union wanted. So don't sell yourself short
16 and settle for stuff that people are willing to throw
17 at us. Thank you.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you,
19 ma'am. The next speaker is Abigail Corso, please.

20 MS. CORSO: Not speaking.

21 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Oh, not
22 speaking.

23 The next speaker then is Mr. Tom Hall.

24 MR. HALL: Good evening. My name is Thomas

1 Hall. I'm a vice president, division head, of
2 Commercial Lending with Pullman Bank here on the
3 southeast side. Pullman Bank maintains three
4 branches in the southeast side as well as several
5 branches in the south suburbs.

6 Our focus is to provide financial
7 services to residents of the southeast side as well
8 as provide services to commercial entities and
9 region. We at Pullman Bank support the approval of
10 the requested permits and strongly endorse the
11 redevelopment of the Chicago Coke plant. We are
12 confident that the investment will have substantial
13 positive impact on the area.

14 And it could, in fact, be somewhere
15 north of \$500 million. This is based on conservative
16 assumptions and based on the initial investment
17 capital of over \$150 million, annual capital
18 maintenance of 5 million, which will total 25 million
19 in the first five years. So we think this is a
20 substantial opportunity for the area.

21 It's our belief that this is also an
22 opportunity to create incentives for other industries
23 and other businesses to come in the area. Investment
24 is contagious. This operation will likely lead to

1 continued momentum and incentives which would,
2 without doubt, bring additional companies to the
3 area.

4 Additionally, I would like to mention
5 that in our line of work we work with organizations
6 in the environmental area, environmental engineers,
7 as well as the EPA on an ongoing basis. And we feel
8 that appropriate measures have been taken to protect
9 the local residents. Thank you very much.

10 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
11 next speaker is Miss Cynthia Bogнар I believe it's
12 pronounced.

13 MS. BOGNAR: Yes. My name is Cynthia
14 Bogнар, with Navarra Minerals. We are a family-owned
15 business that is one of those peripheral industries
16 that is affected by the existence of the Chicago Coke
17 Company. We take the small by-product coke, process
18 it, and in turn send it back to the U.S. steel mills,
19 as well as some of the ferro alloy institutions.

20 Obviously, this is a source of raw
21 material to us. It makes us competitive in an
22 industry that has had its share of ups and downs
23 through the years, mostly down from the past 20. I
24 come from Pittsburgh. I have seen a lot of brown

1 mills that have been torn down and it's rather sad.
2 Pittsburgh has never regained its economics based on
3 the demise of the steel mill. Therefore, based on
4 what I have seen in the 20 years of being in this
5 industry, I strongly support the Chicago Coke Company
6 and the issuance of this permit. So for the job
7 security of the local community, the steel industry
8 as a whole, the ferro alloy industry, and all of
9 these little peripheral industries, I want to again
10 express my strong support for this project. Thank
11 you.

12 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: The next speaker
13 is Miss Verena Owen.

14 MS. OWEN: Good evening. I'm Verena Owen.
15 I'm the Clean Air Campaign Chair for the Illinois
16 Sierra Club. First of all, let me thank you, the
17 Illinois EPA, for holding the hearing. I really
18 appreciate this opportunity to address you.

19 Folks, you are assured that this is a
20 state-of-the-art or state-of-the-world facility. And
21 I reiterate the question this lady had, what is BACT
22 for those types of recovery coke plants? And if you
23 haven't looked at it, which you said you have not, I
24 hereby officially request that you do a BACT

1 determination and answer that question in the
2 Responsiveness Summary. Will you do that?

3 MR. ROMAINE: We can do that, yes. We have
4 not looked at the question of whether it has the best
5 control technology. We, as you indicated and others
6 have answered the question, whether it's
7 appropriately controlled. And we have concluded it
8 is appropriately controlled in terms of specific
9 regulations, but we have not done a comprehensive
10 review to determine whether there are additional
11 features that could be present that would make it the
12 best controlled plant of this type.

13 MS. OWEN: And I think the community was
14 promised the best. So somebody has to decide what
15 the best is.

16 I understand the regulations enough,
17 don't understand Table 1. But I understand that the
18 reason you did not do a BACT determination, one of
19 the reasons, is that it -- the increased emissions
20 wouldn't rise to the level that was needed. But it's
21 a very close call. They are off by, you know, half a
22 ton here, half a ton there.

23 And this is a community, an
24 environmental justice community of concern. And I

1 believe that the IEPA not only has the duty but has
2 the authority for something that is that close of a
3 call to initiate the maximum public process and the
4 maximum public protection that is available and make
5 this a true BACT facility and also MACT.

6 So let's call it a major. Why don't
7 you call it a major and then we can take it to an
8 independent board to decide which is best available
9 control technology for this facility.

10 MR. ROMAINÉ: I understand your comment.
11 Thank you.

12 MS. OWEN: And my second question is I was
13 very surprised, especially with those gentlemen
14 sitting next to the table, we have met before, that
15 you did not require air modeling or did not do air
16 modeling on your own. Is that correct?

17 MR. ROMAINÉ: That's correct. For a project
18 of this type, air modeling is not required. We have
19 done some preliminary modeling that indicates that
20 the plant would not pose a threat to the National
21 Ambient Air Quality Standards. Obviously, in terms
22 of particulate matter, we are comparing it to our
23 particulate matter 10 attainment demonstration, make
24 sure it's within emission levels, evaluate it as part

1 of that demonstration. In terms of ozone, we did not
2 look at ozone because this is a part of the Chicago
3 ozone nonattainment area.

4 However, this particular location does
5 not experience exceedances of the ozone air quality
6 standard. It's part of the nonattainment area
7 because it contributes to exceedances further to the
8 north.

9 MS. OWEN: Thank you. So the answer is you
10 did not really do an air model. However, again, this
11 is an environmental justice community. When you were
12 up in Waukegan, all these people sitting at the table
13 came to Waukegan three times, two times for
14 permitting, once to explain to the community the
15 results of the air modeling they have conducted. And
16 this was for a source, now I can be off by a ton or
17 two, that is about 100 tons of emissions, not 3,000
18 like this one. So what is different here that you
19 don't feel that you have to do this for this
20 community what you did for the community in Waukegan?

21 MR. ROMAINE: We are dealing with an area
22 that we have a fair amount of knowledge in given its
23 historical interest. It's a PM10 nonattainment area.
24 We are dealing with changes to an existing facility.

1 We are not dealing with adding a new source to an
2 area.

3 MS. OWEN: However, it was 100 tons in
4 Waukegan. Over 3,000 or something here, and you
5 don't think that you should do air modeling for this
6 facility?

7 MR. ROMAINE: We have done some preliminary
8 air modeling as I have said.

9 MS. OWEN: Have you shared that with the
10 public?

11 MR. ROMAINE: No, because it's preliminary
12 air modeling.

13 MS. OWEN: Can you explain to me, because I
14 do understand, what kind of level of modeling you
15 did.

16 MR. ROMAINE: Of particular concern was
17 looking at the sulfur dioxide emissions because I was
18 not aware that sulfur dioxide emissions had been
19 modeled. And we modeled the sulfur dioxide emissions
20 in the combustion stack to verify compliance of the
21 sulfur dioxide emissions of the air that was taken.

22 MS. OWEN: But just for SO 2.

23 I couldn't find it anywhere in the
24 permit, but how many and what kind of hazardous air

1 pollutants will they be allowed to emit?

2 MR. ROMAIN: The plant would emit,
3 surprisingly enough, a pollutant known as coke oven
4 emissions. It would also emit benzene emissions from
5 the byproducts.

6 MS. OWEN: What is coke oven emissions?
7 Sounds like a mix of things.

8 MR. ROMAIN: It is a mix of things that is
9 emitted from coke ovens.

10 MS. OWEN: Like --

11 MR. ROMAIN: Polycyclic organic materials,
12 benzene, a variety of hydrocarbons USEPA has
13 suggested in its maximum achievable technology
14 regulations for coke oven batteries.

15 MS. OWEN: What about heavy metals?

16 MR. ROMAIN: There may be also some heavy
17 metals in coke oven emissions, but that is not the
18 major concern. My understanding is the major concern
19 is the various organic constituents.

20 MS. OWEN: And this facility will have the
21 best controls to control these emissions?

22 MR. ROMAIN: This facility will be required
23 to comply with the regulations developed by USEPA to
24 address hazardous air pollutant emissions.

1 MS. OWEN: Thank you.

2 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you,
3 ma'am.

4 The next speaker I believe it's Tim
5 Sausman. Is he here? Tim -- It looks like
6 S-a-u-s-m-a-n. No? Okay. Well, we can always come
7 back if he shows up.

8 Then George Alivojvodic? Sorry if I
9 mispronounce it.

10 MR. ALIVOJVODIC: I just put a question mark
11 where it says oral speaking, so I didn't know if I
12 wanted to speak or not.

13 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay.

14 MR. ALIVOJVODIC: So I'm taking in
15 everything everyone is saying right now.

16 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. That's
17 fine. That's fine.

18 The next would be Mr. Keith Harley.

19 MR. HARLEY: My name is Keith Harley. I'm
20 an attorney at the Chicago Legal Clinic. The Chicago
21 Legal Clinic's office is at 91st and Commercial
22 Avenue. It's been there since 1981.

23 I was asked by the American Lung
24 Association of Metropolitan Chicago to review the

1 records. Have you done that? We FOIA'd for all of
2 the records related to the permitting of this
3 facility. We read every page of those records and
4 then we compared those records and what the applicant
5 was proposing to what other facilities were doing.
6 Have you done that? And we compared it to what the
7 regulatory standards are for this kind of facility.

8 I did this myself. I did it with a
9 couple law students who worked with me, Ellen
10 Bluestone and Michael Hill, to answer a simple
11 question. And this is the question that we wanted
12 answered: Does Illinois EPA's draft permit
13 adequately protect local residents? The answer, no,
14 it doesn't and it's not even close.

15 Let me put this another way: Does the
16 state-of-the-art facility deserve a state-of-the-art
17 permit? It does. But this is not a state-of-the-art
18 permit.

19 Let me put it another way: Even if you
20 support the reopening of this facility, don't local
21 residents deserve the best level of environmental
22 protection that is achievable? I mean isn't that the
23 way where everybody wins, a good facility, well-
24 controlled? This permit is not even close to that

1 standard.

2 And if you want to see the evidence of
3 that, if this is such a great performer, if it's such
4 a state-of-the-art facility, equal to world -- world
5 best facilities, why is it that this facility is
6 actually emitting more pollutants than the old
7 facility?

8 Now, I'm not just making that up. If
9 you look on table 2 of the project summary that's in
10 your packet, you will see that this facility is
11 actually a worse environmental performer than the one
12 it's replacing in every category. It emits more
13 particulate matter, 14.5 more tons per year. More
14 sulfur dioxide, 39.5 more tons per year. More
15 volatiles, 24.5 tons per year. More nitrogen oxides,
16 39.5 tons per year. And more carbon monoxide, 99.5
17 tons per year.

18 This isn't state-of-the-art for 2004.
19 This isn't even state-of-the-art for 1980s. This is
20 a worse performer than the facility it's replacing.
21 Don't the people in this community deserve a facility
22 which has emission limits in its permit that are
23 consistent with a state-of-the-art facility? I think
24 they do.

1 Moreover, for every single one of these
2 pollutants, the applicant is being given permission
3 to emit right up to the threshold, within half a ton,
4 that if it went that much further, it would be
5 considered a major source, a new source. Now, why is
6 that so important? You have heard that a couple
7 times this evening.

8 Why is it so important that this
9 facility be considered a new source? Let me explain
10 to you why that is. Despite the major work that's
11 going to be completed at this facility, by
12 characterizing this as a minor modification, the
13 Illinois EPA is taking a pass on ensuring that you
14 get a permit that is the most protective. This area
15 doesn't need meet healthy air standards for
16 particulates and ozone. And these pollutants will be
17 emitted by this facility. These pollutants will
18 contribute to these unhealthy conditions here and
19 elsewhere.

20 If this facility were treated as a
21 major new source, an entirely different kind of
22 permitting would take place that would be much more
23 protective. This facility would have to meet the
24 standards for its emissions equivalent to the best

1 performing facility anywhere in this country.

2 You know what else it would have to do?

3 It would have to acquire offsets from existing
4 facilities for those pollutants, meaning that by
5 virtue of this facility being restarted, we would
6 actually have cleaner air. The Illinois EPA is not
7 requiring that of this facility. This is not a
8 state-of-the-art facility. It is not adequately
9 protected.

10 Another reason why this issue is
11 important is for some pollutants this area has very
12 good air quality. But this facility is emitting
13 pollutants in such a quantity that there is a risk
14 that that good air quality could degrade as a result
15 of its emissions. For those pollutants, you know
16 what Illinois EPA should be doing? They should be
17 requiring best available control technology for those
18 pollutants. Are they? No.

19 They should be requiring comprehensive
20 modeling to ensure that pollutants that come from
21 this facility will not degrade your air quality in
22 this community or in other communities. Is Illinois
23 EPA conducting that kind of comprehensive modeling or
24 requiring it of the permit applicant? No, they are

1 not.

2 I also want to address a couple other
3 issues, and then I will stop. This facility could
4 unilaterally reduce its emissions of hazardous air
5 pollutants like benzene by simply making the choice
6 to change from a recovery to a nonrecovery facility.
7 It's not written in stone that this has to be a
8 facility that recovers the byproducts of coke oven --
9 coke oven emissions. A nonrecovery facility
10 eliminates hazardous air pollutants into the
11 surrounding community. Most coke ovens that are
12 subject to best available control technology in this
13 day and age are nonrecovery facilities. That's an
14 option here that has not been taken, and it means
15 that more hazardous air pollutants will be emitted
16 from this facility into this community.

17 Last point. There is absolutely no
18 evidence in all those pages of those permit records
19 that Illinois EPA has even considered the potential
20 for a significant adverse impact on the surrounding
21 neighborhood. This is an environmental justice
22 issue. Because it receives federal funds, Illinois
23 EPA must ensure its activities do not cause an
24 adverse impact on minority communities.

1 Within one mile of this facility,
2 56.6 percent minority population, much greater than
3 Illinois generally. These percentages actually grow
4 within two and three miles of this facility. Because
5 of this line-up, I am making a formal request tonight
6 for Illinois EPA to conduct comprehensive modeling of
7 facility emissions including hazardous air pollutants
8 to determine if this facility as proposed will result
9 in a significant adverse impact on the
10 disproportionately minority community that surrounds
11 it.

12 I'm making a formal request to analyze
13 how these impacts will be altered if best available
14 technology and lowest achievable emissions rates were
15 imposed on this facility.

16 I have taken up too much of your time.
17 Thank you for listening.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
19 next speaker is Mr. Ray Chamberlain.

20 MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I will reserve for later.

21 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. Next
22 speaker then is Marian Byrnes.

23 MS. BYRNES: I am Marian Byrnes, volunteer
24 with the Southeast Environmental Task Force. That's

1 been my role for the last 15 years. Many people in
2 the room know me. Last summer when we were
3 approached for a letter for our preliminary position
4 on this facility, we did submit a letter after having
5 a conversation with the USEPA official in which he
6 assessed that the technology being proposed was
7 state-of-the-art.

8 We submitted a letter that we would not
9 oppose this permit. That does not mean that we don't
10 have questions and that we will not continue to
11 assess the situation as it goes on. We are in
12 constant good neighbor dialogue with neighboring
13 industries in the community looking for ways to
14 reduce the emissions and dust conditions like odors
15 and nuisances even beyond what EPA requires.

16 We do promote sustainable
17 state-of-the-art economic development at the same
18 time that we do this. And we think that the two
19 processes complement each other. We have learned
20 just recently, in fact, just tonight actually, that
21 this facility is not best available control
22 technology, which is BACT for short.

23 Looking for BACT technology would be
24 consistent with the kind of economic development and

1 protection of community health that we try to
2 promote. Therefore, we do encourage IEPA and we
3 support Keith Harley's request that IEPA consider
4 redefining this permit as a major modification and
5 that you do put in provisions for best available
6 control technology to adequately protect the health
7 of the community.

8 One more measure that we would like to
9 see, which may or may not be required by BACT, is a
10 fence line monitoring system for the facility so that
11 the community can know exactly what kinds of
12 emissions are escaping into the community.

13 Thank you for the opportunity to
14 testify here.

15 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
16 next speaker is Gerry Weston.

17 MR. WESTON: My name is Gerry Weston and I
18 am a resident of the southeast side here. I'm not
19 here to argue. I don't even know how my own
20 community of Jeffrey Manor would even benefit from
21 this company. But I do have this question: There
22 are several references to mercury in the permit. And
23 since mercury is likely to be emitted, why is there
24 no limit on mercury emissions?

1 MR. ROMAINE: At this point in time we did
2 not believe that there was adequate information on
3 the level of mercury emissions to test a quantitative
4 limit. We believe that the information that USEPA
5 had assembled on mercury emissions showed that the
6 byproduct recovery plant is effective in controlling
7 mercury emissions.

8 In fact, that's one of the
9 counterbalancing forces that is present with this
10 distinction between a recovery coke oven plant and a
11 nonrecovery coke oven plant. But until recently
12 there hasn't been a lot of rigorous testing of how
13 effective byproduct recovery plants are in
14 controlling mercury. And for that reason, we did not
15 set a mercury limit. There is no legal requirement
16 to set a mercury limit. Instead, we addressed the
17 mercury emissions of the facility qualitatively with
18 a target that the facility achieve at least
19 90 percent control of mercury emissions and if it
20 doesn't achieve 90 percent control of mercury
21 emissions that provision for corrective or mitigation
22 actions come into play.

23 MS. WESTON: So we don't know? I mean how
24 does one know if there is a safe level or unsafe

1 level?

2 MR. ROMAINE: In terms of mercury emissions,
3 there is ample information that indicates that
4 mercury is not a threat in the ambient air. The
5 concern for mercury is not breathing mercury. The
6 concern for mercury is consumption of mercury-
7 contaminated foods. And certainly in an urban area,
8 there is a concern for people that fish in urban
9 waterways eating excessive amounts of fish that could
10 be contaminated with mercury.

11 But the solution to that at this time
12 until there are comprehensive approaches at the
13 national level to deal with it, that addresses not
14 only this plant but other existing power plants, is
15 to be cautious on the amount of fish that is eaten.
16 There are specific advisories warning people about
17 how much predatory fish should be eaten from
18 different bodies of water. And that ties back more
19 generally into the thought that you need a balanced
20 diet, that it is inadvisable to rely heavily on one
21 particular food group in general.

22 So this facility does not pose a direct
23 threat because of its mercury emissions. It
24 contributes to the overall loading of mercury

1 emissions to the environment that is broadly a
2 concern that everybody, everybody should have, as it
3 affects particularly young children, the unborn, and
4 accordingly, pregnant women.

5 MS. WESTON: Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
7 next speaker is Josephine Troncozo I believe it's
8 pronounced.

9 MS. TRONCOZO: My name is Josephine Troncoz.
10 I'm a very close resident of this site that you are
11 talking about. And I have to plead ignorance, all
12 these terms that you are using about emissions and
13 chemicals and all that type of thing, I will just
14 talk very basically to you.

15 One of my concerns is that all the time
16 since 1991 that I have been residing at this 112th
17 Street address, until LTV left, we were having
18 problems with breathing. And it was a very, very
19 strong problem we were having in this community. And
20 I happened to have grown up in south Chicago. I was
21 raised at -- I grew up by the steel mills over
22 there. But some kinds of chemicals that were being
23 emitted over here were different than I guess the
24 natural chemicals from the other area.

1 And this problem existed in spite of
2 the fact that we have this federal EPA and Illinois
3 EPA, that we are supposed to regulate this LTV
4 company. And as I'm saying, I'm talking very
5 basically because I don't believe in these government
6 places really following through on regulating.
7 Sometimes they don't have the personnel, sometimes
8 they don't have the time.

9 And I could just tell you that I had
10 great difficulty in breathing, and so did my
11 neighbors. It was a gagging type of air that --
12 Especially in the summer between the humidity and
13 whatever was being emitted. And it wasn't until they
14 actually closed up the place that our air became
15 clean.

16 So you talk about dollar bills. I
17 don't know, I'm talking about my health and others'.
18 And, as I said, I can't be as -- to be argumentative
19 and be technical like all the other people, I'm just
20 talking basic.

21 So I have a simple question. And is
22 there going to be an increase in emissions as
23 compared to the former operation of the facility?

24 MR. ROMAINE: The permit allows there to be

1 a slight increase in emissions from the facility.
2 This is because the permit is based on historical
3 operation for the period of time before the facility
4 shut down, at which time the facility was not
5 operating at maximum capacity levels. So it's
6 basically linked to a particular snapshot in time and
7 only allows slightly more production above that
8 level.

9 MS. TRONCOZO: Okay. Fine. That's all I
10 needed to know.

11 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. The
12 next speaker is George Christos.

13 MR. CHRISTOS: Well, I'm with the
14 Ironworkers Local 63 here in Chicagoland. My last
15 name is C-h-r-i-s-t-o-s.

16 I have heard both sides of the story,
17 and I can weigh both sides of those stories. But I
18 don't think these are our enemies here. These people
19 have standards that are set that they have to
20 enforce. And if the guidelines under those meet what
21 these three gentlemen here are proposing to build, I
22 think that's what the law states. I mean if the
23 speed limit is 55 and you are doing 55, not 54, it's
24 somewhat the same thing. These aren't --

1 I know that they have gone around and
2 shut a lot of industry down. They shut the Clark Oil
3 refinery down. They shut the incinerator down in
4 Robbins. They do their job. A lot of times it's the
5 other way around where they are there enforcing the
6 laws. They are out monitoring the air quality. And
7 I think if we take the balance of this -- And there
8 were good questions brought up. And I think, I
9 noticed, I was sitting by Alderman John Pope, he was
10 taking many notes; and I think there will be more
11 questions asked.

12 But in the bottom line, if they meet
13 those standards, I'm all for this. And I'm all for
14 it for a lot of reasons. Somebody says, What are you
15 doing, what are you giving? I think these three guys
16 here can probably find a lot of other things to do
17 with their money, just like everybody else in
18 industry seems to be, not caring about America, not
19 caring about the different people in these states.

20 The one thing that I'm concerned about
21 as an ironworker was a lot of projects were shut down
22 and we're in a light situation now because of the
23 price of steel went up 66 percent this summer. It
24 was all over the papers. It went up 66 percent

1 because the market was captured by the Chinese, the
2 Koreans. And they were able to, once they took
3 control of that market, jump it up. All of our
4 contractors, where there were electricians here, the
5 price of conduit, the price of metals went up,
6 ironworkers, anything that has to do with metal, pile
7 drivers, everything was stopped.

8 Here is some guys coming in here,
9 digging in their own pockets and creating some jobs,
10 and I'm all for it. I don't want to be dependent on
11 foreign countries. I want to see steel made here. I
12 think it's the backbone of America. Whether it's for
13 defense or construction, it's good jobs. I am
14 concerned about air quality. But if the standards
15 are met, I say we go with it. Thank you.

16 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you.
17 That's all the people who filled out registration
18 forms who wish to speak. If anyone would like to
19 speak, including the people who reserved the right
20 earlier, you can do so.

21 Any questions or comments, please just
22 approach the podium and state and spell your name for
23 the record.

24 MR. CHAMBERLAIN: My name is Ray

1 Chamberlain. I'm a business representative of
2 Millwright Local 1693, which encompasses the
3 Chicago -- entire Chicagoland community as well as
4 the ten counties around Chicago.

5 As a young millwright, when I started
6 working in this trade, I worked at Republic Steel. A
7 lot of you people, I'm sure, remember Republic Steel.
8 I also worked at LTV Steel many times late at night,
9 many times working off of a mound of coal as a work
10 platform. I don't live in the southeast community.
11 I live in the south community of Chicago. But for 27
12 years my family operated a business at 85th and south
13 Chicago Avenue called Ed & Sam Motors. Some of you
14 people may remember that American Motors dealership
15 that was in my family for 27 years. So I spent six
16 days a week in this community.

17 I represent just over 900 members,
18 millwrights, that proudly built this community for
19 years, worked in these mills for years. And I can
20 tell you that one of the last jobs that I did at LTV
21 Steel or at Republic Steel was to pull out the
22 14-inch mill. I got to work in that mill with
23 no heat in February when it was about 21 degrees
24 below zero outside. And I, along with 12 of my

1 brothers, pulled that mill out along with the
2 ironworkers that helped us rig it, and we sent it to
3 Korea.

4 I don't think that helps the Chicago
5 economy. I don't think that benefits any of the jobs
6 or people that, you know, supported this for years
7 and years. So I think on behalf of the United
8 Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America at
9 12 East Erie in Chicago and Millwright Local 1693 in
10 Chicago, I support this project 100 percent.

11 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. Are
12 there any other questions?

13 Yes.

14 MR. SADLOWSKI: It's more of an observation
15 and a question as well. My name is Ed Sadlowski. I
16 have been with the steelworkers union for 49 years.
17 I have also been a resident in this community all of
18 my life and worked in these steel mills. And I sit
19 here realizing that there is a basic need for the
20 turnaround of the economy in this community.

21 We have got kicked right up our butts
22 there for the last 20 years. The only one who felt
23 it worse is the steelworkers. But also at the same
24 time I don't like to be fooled. And everything that

1 has been said tonight by the virtue of the people
2 that want to put this in, these guys here, revolves
3 around the dollar. It has nothing to do with
4 patriotism, they are trying to stop steel from being
5 shipped here, shipped there. Also at the same time
6 the facts of the matter are that there is as much
7 steel being manufactured today in this country today
8 as there ever has been.

9 It's not a question of importation and
10 exportations. The question of scarcity of steel is
11 that they just weren't manufacturing enough of it.
12 That's why you had to start going into Korea again.
13 You know, nobody rushed over to reopen those coke
14 factories when the market was down. When the market
15 went through the roof, everybody was pounding on the
16 door. So that's the real reason here. It's nothing
17 to do with save the community and what have you.

18 Also, at the same time about pollution.
19 I have been in coke factories from Sparrows Point,
20 Maryland, to South Gate in California. And there is
21 no such thing as a clean coke oven no matter what the
22 standard is. It's not clean. It's dirty. It's
23 filthy. It's inherent in nature being dirty.

24 The best I have seen is the one in

1 Inland Steel right over in east Chicago probably.
2 That's about maybe 10, 15 years old; and I'm sure
3 there are better ones. And I think that it is owed
4 the people in this community, we've got kicked in the
5 ass so many times, that the state-of-the-art goes
6 right to the state-of-the-art, to the highest
7 possible.

8 And also at the same time, when we
9 built the state-of-the-art or reconfigure this coke
10 factory, we make sure that jobs are going to be paid
11 a decent wage. And all I ask for that is prevailing
12 wage, which most of you guys all know what that is
13 about. You raise all kinds of hell if it wasn't a
14 prevailing wage on your job. And there are standards
15 within the industry of how much a coke oven worker
16 should be paid and is paid.

17 And I ask the three gentlemen, are they
18 willing to accept that wage level? Will you
19 guarantee that wage level? Will you pledge that you
20 will pay that wage level here tonight to workers that
21 ultimately go in that factory? And at the same time
22 will you give an opportunity, if wanted, to those
23 workers that worked in the coke factory to get first
24 grabs at it, guys that have been unemployed now for

1 the last six, seven years? Those are the questions I
2 ask of you, and I hope you can answer them. I hope
3 you can answer them so that I can go home tonight and
4 sleep well.

5 And to the EPA guys, there is
6 mechanisms and modes that can be used to make it the
7 best possible, to make it the best possible. Not
8 because you meet this standard. Make it the best
9 possible. I wouldn't want my grandchildren riding
10 around the back of a car with substandard automobile
11 tires, no more than I want the guys that work in that
12 factory to work under substandard conditions or even
13 standard conditions because they are not good enough.

14 And in this community, I will tell you,
15 I have been opening my window at night and sleeping.
16 Hooray. First time in 30 years maybe. Sleeping
17 well, not getting a mouth full of shit, you know. So
18 we can, we can balance this off, guys. We can
19 balance this off with good jobs, good jobs, not
20 inferior jobs, and clean air. And that's I think
21 what anyone in this community, what anyone in this
22 country, should want, good jobs and clean air.

23 So I would like to hear your comment
24 about that prevailing wage for coke factory workers

1 and the standard that has been set by the
2 steelworkers union around the country. Thanks for
3 your time.

4 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Yes. We fully
5 intend -- We are all union people. I'm a union
6 cardholder. I want to get paid a decent wage. I
7 want to be paid a decent wage. Yes, we will be
8 paying prevailing wage.

9 If someone says nonrecovery coke
10 batteries are better, there is a lot of room for
11 debate there. We work with one every day. I see it
12 in operation every day. I would rather do what we
13 are doing here than do what is going on over there.

14 MALE VOICE: Where is that, the
15 nonrecovery?

16 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: There is a couple
17 nonrecovery in the country. One is at Inland Steel,
18 one is down in Virginia.

19 MALE VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: That's open for
21 debate on which is the cleaner. And again, I will
22 repeat what we said before, we think we are bringing
23 the best plant we can bring. Thank you.

24 MR. SADLOWSKI: Would you attempt to hire

1 those that have been laid off, former coke factory
2 workers that have the experience and be given a first
3 shot at this job?

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Mr. Sadlowski,
5 correct, that's your question?

6 MR. SADLOWSKI: That was my question, yes.

7 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: Yes. Our intention
8 has always been to hire from local resources, the
9 local people. The people that worked there before
10 are trained. If you want to look at just dollars,
11 that saves the company money. We want good trained
12 people there.

13 MR. SADLOWSKI: Well, you guys look at just
14 dollars.

15 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: No, we don't. If
16 we were just looking at dollars, I'd be sitting in
17 Florida right now, not struggling with this for
18 the last two years.

19 MR. SADLOWSKI: You're waiting so you can
20 sit in the Riviera.

21 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: We want to make
22 money, there is no doubt about it. But we also are a
23 good -- We try and be a good corporate citizen. We
24 have been in this area since '46. I want to see --

1 Our fourth generation is coming up in another couple
2 of years here. I want to see our family business
3 continue for another two or three generations. You
4 don't do that by screwing people or not doing the
5 best you can.

6 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you. Are
7 there any other questions or comments then?

8 MR. KELLY: My name is William Kelly. I'm a
9 business manager for the labor union in this area.
10 I'm here to show the support along with some of my
11 fellow brothers in the back. We hope that the permit
12 is passed and like to thank the Beemsterboers. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. BANK: My name is John Bank. I was a
15 former LTV employee of this coke plant. For the
16 people that voiced their opinion about it, I would
17 just like to say I was there for 11 years. It's a
18 state-of-the-art facility sitting there needing to be
19 started up. It was not lacking for anything
20 environmentally. There was a lot of heart and soul
21 put into that plant, that's why you can start it up.

22 And I just want to lay that out on the
23 line because there is a lot of good people that want
24 to come back to this plant. It was well taken care

1 of. You have a state-of-the-art plant sitting over
2 there. Thank you.

3 MR. SZAMATOWICZ: My name is John
4 Szamatowicz. S-z-a-m-a-t-o-w-i-c-z, I think that's
5 it. I'm with the Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad. I am
6 here to represent -- We have 850 employees. And we
7 are 100 percent behind this operation. We have done
8 business with the Beemsterboers. We are greatly
9 involved with the steel mills. What is being
10 presented here is the best of all worlds and we fully
11 support them.

12 MR. VILLANOVA: Good evening. My name is
13 Tom Villanova. I'm the president of the Chicago Cook
14 County Building and Construction Trades Council. I
15 would like to thank everybody from this board tonight
16 and also would like to thank all my brothers and
17 sisters that came out tonight to support this. And
18 on behalf of 100,000 members of the 24 unions that I
19 represent, we strongly support this. Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Any additional
21 comments or questions?

22 MR. BOSKOVICH: Bob Boskovich, Local 1
23 Ironworkers, president and business manager. And the
24 Local 1 ironworkers strongly support this. I think

1 we have 400 in the community. We are strong for this
2 and thank you. Thank you.

3 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Any additional
4 comments or questions?

5 MS. TRONCOZO: A very minor one, but I
6 happen to be one of the very different -- I don't
7 have any organization and I don't have a union. Just
8 my concern is that I don't really see that many --
9 My concern is that I look around and I see all these
10 guys, I can see there is more men than women here,
11 and I see all these buttons. And residents like
12 myself, I don't see that many here. And I really --

13 I try to read as much as I can because
14 I'm, I consider myself rather active in the
15 community. I belong to some organizations and I know
16 quite a few different people. And I don't see
17 anybody that's more or less from the same background
18 that I come from. I'm not talking --

19 MALE VOICE: I live here.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: All right, all
21 right.

22 MS. TRONCOZO: I'm talking about not really
23 looking for a job. Just the fact that I'm breathing
24 the air here. And I'm just wondering, where you

1 advertised, I didn't really hear about it. Somebody
2 made a phone call to me and told me about this. I
3 didn't see it in our paper, which is the Observer.

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: This was placed
5 in the Daily Southtown on December 11th, 18th, and
6 the 25th.

7 MS. TRONCOZO: Oh, see, the Southtown isn't
8 really a community paper. He lives here but he's got
9 a button on, too, so that means he's union.
10 Apparently the unions did get to know about it. But
11 I don't see any of my neighbors like from the East
12 Side Pride, from the Fair Elms, the senior citizens
13 organizations. That's the only comment I wanted to
14 make.

15 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. Thank
16 you, ma'am.

17 Are there any other comments, please?

18 MR. LESCZYNSKI: My name is Abe Lesczynski.
19 I don't even live in the area but, hell, I'm
20 convinced, I'm going to buy some property over here.
21 I have worked in these mills. I have been in the
22 steel industry for over 27 years, guys. I worked in
23 all the mills from Alabama, Ohio, Kentucky region,
24 Michigan, Indiana, Illinois. And this is a state of

1 art.

2 You know, you guys, you say your goals,
3 you build your things to that goal. Technology
4 changes daily. You know, you can't -- You can't put
5 a goal down and all of a sudden change it in the
6 middle of your stream there. You set your goals, you
7 build your standards. And I think this is a
8 state-of-art. I've worked around a lot of coke
9 batteries.

10 And you know, you get that in first,
11 you get the groundwork in, you get the
12 state-of-the-art going. And then as the future
13 progresses, then you change with technology.

14 So like I say, I'm not from the area,
15 I'll probably never work on that job. I am a union
16 carpenter. And I'm proud just to be associated from
17 the Gary area just to find out what's going on
18 because all the steel industry needs to be cleaned up
19 a little bit, and this is one good foot forward for
20 us.

21 MR. QUIGLEY: My name is Jim Quigley, and
22 I'm an ironworker. And I am from this area, 109th
23 and J. My parents live on 109th and B. My grandpa
24 lives at 103rd and G. My brother lives at 110th and

1 C. And we need these jobs. We need this work and my
2 family needs this work. Thank you.

3 MR. STOCKMAN: My name is Carl Stockman,
4 Local 1 ironworker, live in Hegewisch. We not only
5 need these jobs, but we maintain. After we build
6 these places, we'll be the guys in here maintaining
7 this place. And that's why we need it to keep this
8 environment clean, which is guaranteed by the checks
9 and balances in the place.

10 It would be BACT. We live here. Our
11 kids are raised here, go to school here. We need
12 these jobs, and this Local 63 and all the other
13 ironworkers, riggers, machine movers, all back this
14 job. Let's do it.

15 MR. KRAUSE: My name is Bill Krause. Both
16 of my parents worked in the mills when I was growing
17 up. When the mill shut down over here, it was a real
18 hard time for our family. And I'm looking forward
19 for the mills opening again and giving the new
20 generation a chance to, you know, build good families
21 for, you know, for everybody. And I'm in strong
22 support of reopening of the coke battery. Thank you.

23 MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is Rich
24 Kelly. I'm a business agent with Local 134, the

1 electricians' union. I do not live in this area. I
2 live in Mount Greenwood area. I worked at Republic
3 Steel for ten years for Dyer Electric of Indiana. We
4 worked, we built the original -- We did the
5 electrical work on the original battery that's there
6 now, not the original, the second one. The one
7 that's there now.

8 Our business manager, Mike Fitzgerald,
9 Local 134, reached out to our members that are in
10 this area questioning them on the need of the coke
11 battery, and we heard not one word against it.
12 Everybody that had responded to it is for it. The
13 Local 134 backs this 100 percent.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Would anyone
15 else like to make a question or comment or ask a
16 question or make a comment?

17 MR. STEVE BEEMSTERBOER: There is one other
18 thing I wanted to address, the bad air. People have
19 the windows open now at night and that's great. But
20 keep in mind, Acme coke plant, which was very old,
21 very dirty, shut down, Acme Steel's plumes shut down
22 in addition to the LTV coke plant. That's three
23 major plants in your area that shut down all at once.
24 Bringing back one of those is not going to bring back

1 the amount of dirt that you guys had before. It will
2 be cleaner than it was before.

3 (Discussion outside the record.)

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Would you like
5 to make a comment.

6 MR. SADLOWSKI: Just to really set the
7 record straight now so there is no mass thinking and
8 hysteria and that. That coke factory will employ
9 approximately 220 people. Let's not talk about some
10 big pie-in-the-sky thing and come in and maintain it
11 or so. If we get the rights to organize and we get
12 the rights to collectively bargain, we are going to
13 make sure it's those some 220 people that maintain
14 that facility, as we did in other plants. You guys
15 know that. 220 some people, and I don't really know
16 what the scheme of the contractors are in putting
17 that thing back on line. But I would venture to
18 guess and, I don't know, you guys could say better
19 than I can on that question. But it's not no pie-in-
20 the-sky venture now. You know, believe me when I say
21 that. There has been a lot of things said that are
22 not necessarily true or unless you have been
23 misinformed. So you know, watch your haircuts on
24 that question.

1 And we need a commitment out of these
2 guys here to make sure that it's the best that is
3 possible, the best. And not that it was good enough
4 30 years ago or so. Well, it ain't good enough
5 today, pure and simple. Just ain't good enough
6 today.

7 I want jobs here more than you guys
8 will ever know, you know. Talk about representing, I
9 represent 137,000 steelworkers in this district. And
10 I want jobs now. It's down to nothing, 50,000 now.
11 So there has been 40 some thousand jobs on that
12 Calumet River alone that were under collective
13 bargaining agreements with the steelworkers' union.
14 There's 40,000 just from the mouth of that river to
15 the Ford plant. Those are facts. And we are looking
16 at 200 people, 225 I would say. Those are facts as
17 well.

18 So don't say it's going to revitalize
19 the community and all of that. But it's 225, and I
20 will grab that if I can. But don't jump out the
21 window on these things. You guys owe this community
22 the best there is. And you guys owe the worker the
23 best there is. You are getting it for a song and a
24 dance. You almost stole the goddamn thing, and you

1 guys got to make sure that it's the best there is.

2 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Would anyone
3 else like to make a comment or ask a question?

4 MR. STORRNO: My name is Victor Storrno.
5 I'm the ex-local union president that -- I used to
6 run the local union. I hear tonight how everybody is
7 concerned about jobs. Yes. I worked 41 years in the
8 steel industry. I started working in the steel
9 industry when I was 18 years old. And there was the
10 Wisconsin Steel coal plant on top of battery.

11 At that time there wasn't environmental
12 control, there was nothing. We used to get our
13 handkerchief, put it on our mouth so we can protect
14 our lungs. At four months and a half, I took a job
15 from the coke plant and I went from the labor
16 department. I'm a foreigner.

17 If you guys can understand me tonight,
18 I want you to be patient and I will make sure that
19 everybody gets the message. My friend, what he said,
20 is true. We try to keep the steel industry open. We
21 give a concession. And I'm a craftsman. I'm a what
22 you call general mechanic. And they are the best job
23 in the mill. So you do not come to be all the
24 impurity of the coke plant if you work on the coke

1 plant itself. But as a laborer, as a coke plant
2 employee, what I was before, yes, I did. I did the
3 work every phase in industry in a coke plant, the
4 moving mill, soaking pit, on top overhead cranes.

5 But what concern me tonight is this,
6 the air our community breathes. I used to live over
7 here. I no longer live over here but I have got
8 relatives that live over here, and they have got
9 young children. I understand you guys are
10 businessmen. And you go where business is good and
11 you can make a dollar. I understand business. I
12 study business, too. Because when you are the union
13 officer, you have to have a knowledge of the business
14 to represent people.

15 And EPA, I'm surprised, I have a lot of
16 respect for people involved in protecting the health
17 of the people that they are work in the steel
18 industry and all over our industry. But I remember
19 when we used to call for them to come. There were
20 weeks, come an opportunity to fix some of the major
21 problems. I witnessed it. I called, myself, the
22 EPA. I went downtown several times. I am 64 years
23 old. I was 62 when I got out from the steel mill
24 because the plant shut down. I was one of the last

1 ones. As president, I was the one that see that
2 everybody got what they could but we didn't get
3 nothing. Our pensions were gone. Our insurance was
4 gone. All that we worked for, promises. They took
5 wages hourly for a benefit. And now here I hear
6 that, the health of the people in this neighborhood,
7 so we do the best. It's not enough. You need to get
8 whatever is available in the country, in the world,
9 if you want to build this plant over here. And I'm
10 not against business. But I'm pro health and long
11 life. And if you guys can understand me, you ask me
12 a question I understand, and I will explain. Thank
13 you.

14 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Are there any
15 other questions or comments?

16 MR. FEINBERG: My name is Jerome Feinberg.
17 Everything basically we heard tonight was where is
18 the money coming from. But one thing we haven't
19 heard is EPA saying we are going to guarantee clean
20 air. That's it.

21 MR. ROMAINE: Our charge is to provide clean
22 air and to protect air quality. That's quite simply
23 why we are here tonight.

24 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Would anyone

1 else like to make a comment or ask a question?

2 Anyone? No? Anyone?

3 (No response.)

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Well, then thank
5 you all for coming.

6 Once again, my name is Charles
7 Matoesian. And on behalf of Renee Cipriano, Director
8 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, I
9 thank you again; and I close this hearing.

10 * * *

11 (Exhibit No. 11 tendered.)

12 (Which were all the proceedings had
13 in the above-entitled cause.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
2 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

3

4 I, JANICE H. HEINEMANN, CSR, RDR, CRR,
5 do hereby certify that I am a court reporter doing
6 business in the State of Illinois, that I reported in
7 shorthand the testimony given at the hearing of said
8 cause, and that the foregoing is a true and correct
9 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
10 aforesaid.

11

12

13

14 _____
Janice H. Heinemann CSR, RDR, CRR
License No 084-001391

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

