

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

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

IN RE:
PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF REVISED
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT/PSD
APPROVAL TO CHRISTIAN COUNTY
GENERATION IN TAYLORVILLE

PUBLIC HEARING
OCTOBER 21, 2009

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	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1	Notice of Public Hearing	13
2	Draft Permit	13
3	Project Summary	13
4	Notice of Public Comment Period	13
5	Construction Permit Issued on 6-5-07	13
6	Project Summary	13

(Exhibits not attached.)

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

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

IN RE:
PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF REVISED
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT/PSD
APPROVAL TO CHRISTIAN COUNTY
GENERATION IN TAYLORVILLE

PUBLIC HEARING held on the 21st day of
October, 2009, between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and
9:00 p.m. of that day, at the Taylorville High School
Cafeteria, 815 Springfield Road, Taylorville,
Illinois 62568, before Robin A. Adams, a Registered
Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
and a Notary Public within and for the State of
Illinois.

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

HEARING OFFICER:

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Dean Studer
1021 North Grand Avenue East
PO Box 19276
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276
217.558.8280
dean.studer@illinois.gov

FOR THE IEPA:

Mr. Robert Smet
Mr. Chris Romaine
1021 North Grand Avenue East
PO Box 19276
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Court Reporter:

Robin A. Adams, RPR, CSR
Illinois CSR #084-002046
Midwest Litigation Services
2021 Timberbrook Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62702
217.787.6167
1.800.280.3376

1 (Hearing began at 7:00 p.m.)

2 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: We're going to go
3 ahead and get started.

4 Good evening. My name is Dean Studer, and
5 I'm the hearing officer for the Illinois
6 Environmental Protection Agency. On behalf of
7 Director Doug Scott, I welcome you to tonight's
8 hearing. My purpose tonight is to ensure that these
9 proceedings run properly and according to rules.

10 This is an informational permit hearing
11 before the Illinois EPA in the matter of an extension
12 for an air pollution control construction permit/PSD,
13 which is prevention of significant deterioration, and
14 that's approval for Christian County Generation, LLC.
15 The originally-issued permit in this matter became
16 effective on January 28, 2008. PSD approvals
17 generally become invalid if actual construction is
18 not commenced or a binding contract for construction
19 is not entered into within 18 months after the permit
20 becomes effective. This 18-month time period may be
21 extended by the permitting authority upon
22 satisfactory showing that an extension is justified.

23 I want to remind everyone here this
24 evening that this hearing is not the meeting related

1 to the proposed plant that the United States
2 Department of Energy, DOE, is scheduled to hold.
3 DOE's meeting is a week from tonight on October 28th,
4 and that will be held here at the high school as
5 well. It will concern the preparation of an
6 environmental impact statement by DOE as related to
7 possible issuance of a federal loan guarantee for the
8 project under the federal Energy Policy Act. The
9 contact for the DOE is Ms. Angela Colamaria, and her
10 telephone number is 202-287-5387 or toll free
11 800-832-0885, extension 75387. If you would like
12 additional information regarding that and that
13 contact information, you may see me either at break
14 or after this hearing, and I can provide that for
15 you.

16 The Illinois EPA has made a preliminary
17 determination that the project meets the requirements
18 for obtaining an extension and has prepared a draft
19 permit to review. Due to significant interest
20 received by Illinois EPA during the public comment
21 period, Illinois EPA is holding this public hearing
22 for the purpose of explaining the draft permit
23 expansion -- extension -- excuse me -- responding to
24 questions, and accepting comments from the public on

1 the proposed extension of the permit for this project
2 prior to actually taking final action on this permit
3 extension. We anticipate that final action will be
4 taken sometime during the next calendar year.

5 The public hearing is being held under the
6 provisions of Illinois EPA's procedures for permit
7 and closure plan hearings, which can be found at 35
8 Illinois Administrative Code, Part 166, Subpart A.
9 Copies of these procedures can be accessed on the
10 website for the Illinois Pollution Control Board at
11 www.ipcb.state.il.us, or if you do not have easy
12 access to the worldwide web, they can be obtained
13 from me upon request.

14 An informational public hearing means this
15 is strictly an informational hearing. It is an
16 opportunity for the Illinois EPA to provide you with
17 information concerning the permit extension. It is
18 also an opportunity for you to provide information to
19 Illinois EPA concerning this permit. This is not a
20 contested case hearing.

21 I would like to explain how tonight's
22 hearing is going to proceed. First, we'll have
23 Illinois EPA staff introduce themselves, and they'll
24 identify their responsibilities within the agency,

1 and, if they so desire, they will make a brief
2 statement. Following this, representatives for
3 Christian County Generation will introduce themselves
4 and make a brief presentation. Following this
5 overview, I will allow the public to ask questions or
6 provide comment.

7 You are not required to provide your
8 comments orally. Written comments are given the same
9 consideration and may be submitted to the Illinois
10 EPA at any time during the comment period, and that
11 comment period ends at midnight, November 20, 2009.
12 All comments submitted by mail must be postmarked no
13 later than November 20, 2009. Although we will
14 continue to accept comments through that date,
15 tonight is the only time that we will accept oral
16 comments.

17 The tentative target date for final
18 decision in this matter, like I said, is sometime in
19 calendar year 2010. However, the actual decision
20 date will be depend upon the number of comments
21 received, the substantive comment -- content of those
22 comments, as well as another -- as well as several
23 other factors.

24 Any person who wants to make an oral

1 comment may do so as long as statements are relevant
2 to the issues at hand and they have indicated on the
3 registration card that they would like to comment.
4 If you have not signed a registration card at this
5 point, please see Brad Frost at the registration
6 table and he will provide you with a comment card.

7 You may indicate that you would like to
8 make oral comments. All these registering tonight
9 will be notified of the final decision in this matter
10 and will be told how they may obtain a copy of the
11 summary of this hearing. If you have lengthy
12 comments or questions, it would be helpful to submit
13 them to me in writing before the end of the comment
14 period, and I will ensure that they are included in
15 the hearing as exhibits.

16 Please keep your comments and questions
17 relevant to the issue at hand. If your comments fall
18 outside of the scope of this hearing, I may ask you
19 to proceed to another issue. All speakers have the
20 option of directing comments to either the Illinois
21 EPA panel or they may make general comments or they
22 may do both.

23 The permit applicant, Christian County
24 Generation, LLC, is also free to answer questions if

1 it is willing to do so, but I am not in a position to
2 require them to answer questions. Our panel members
3 will make every attempt to answer the questions
4 presented, but I will not allow the speakers to argue
5 or engage in a prolonged dialogue with our panel.

6 For the purposes of allowing everyone to
7 have a chance to comment, I am asking groups,
8 organizations, and associations to initially limit
9 their comments and questions. These representatives,
10 as well as individuals of the public, will be allowed
11 up to ten minutes. This should give everyone who
12 desires to speak that opportunity. Once the
13 opportunity to speak has been extended to all those
14 who have indicated that they desire to do so on their
15 registration card, I will ask if there are any others
16 who have not spoken that would like to do so,
17 provided that time allows. After everyone has had an
18 opportunity to speak and provided that time still
19 permits, I will allow those who either ran out of
20 time during their initial comments or who have
21 additional comments to speak.

22 In addition, I'd like to stress that we
23 want to avoid unnecessary repetition. If anyone
24 before you has already presented testimony that is

1 contained in your written or oral comments, please
2 skip over those issues when you speak. Please
3 remember all written comments, whether or not you say
4 them out loud, will become part of the official
5 record in this matter and will be considered.

6 In the responsiveness summary for
7 tonight's hearing, the Illinois EPA will attempt to
8 answer all relevant and significant questions that
9 were raised at this hearing or submitted to me prior
10 to the close of the comment period. The written
11 record in this matter will close on November 20,
12 2009. I will accept written comments as long as they
13 are postmarked by that date.

14 While the record is open, all relevant
15 comments and documents or data will be placed into
16 the hearing record as exhibits. Please send all
17 written documents to my attention. You can send them
18 to Dean Studer, Hearing Officer, Office of Community
19 Relations, regarding Christian County Generation, and
20 that's at Illinois EPA, 1021 North Grand Avenue East,
21 Post Office Box 19276, Springfield, Illinois
22 62794-9276. The address is also listed on the public
23 notice for the hearing tonight.

24 For anyone wishing to make a comment or

1 ask questions, I would like to remind you that we
2 have a court reporter here who is taking a record of
3 these proceedings for the purpose of us putting
4 together our administrative record. Therefore, for
5 the benefit of the court reporter, please keep the
6 general background noise in the room in a minimum so
7 that she can hear everything that is said.

8 Please keep in mind that any comments from
9 someone other than the person who is up front may not
10 be recorded by the court reporter. If you speak over
11 someone else, the court reporter will not be able to
12 take down everyone's comments. This same rule
13 applies to both the members of the audience and also
14 when someone from Illinois EPA is speaking.

15 When it is your turn to speak, please
16 state your name and, if applicable, any governmental
17 body or organization or association that you
18 represent. If you do not represent any governmental
19 body, organization, or association, you may simply
20 state that you are a concerned citizen. For the
21 benefit of the court reporter, I also ask that you
22 spell your last name.

23 Those who have requested to speak will be
24 called upon in the order that I will lay out based

1 upon the cards that I have before me. After I have
2 gone through the cards and, assuming that there is
3 time, if anyone else wishes to comment, we can
4 address it at that time.

5 Are there any questions on how we'll
6 proceed with this hearing tonight?

7 (No response.)

8 Okay. I want to go through a couple
9 preliminary items. First, I've admitted the
10 following exhibits into the record: The notice of
11 the public hearing is Exhibit 1. The draft permit is
12 Exhibit 2. The project summary is Exhibit 3. And
13 the notice of the public comment period is Exhibit 4.
14 The construct permit/PSD approval that was issued on
15 June 5th of 2007 is Exhibit 5. And the project
16 summary for this permit is Exhibit 6. All of these
17 documents were available on the agency's website.

18 I'm now going to ask Illinois EPA staff to
19 introduce themselves, and if they would like to make
20 a short opening statement, they may do so at this
21 time. This will be followed by representatives from
22 Christian County Generation introducing themselves
23 and making a brief presentation. So we'll start with
24 Bob.

1 MR. SMET: Good evening. My name is Bob
2 Smet, and I'm a permit engineer in the Illinois EPA's
3 Bureau of Air. I'll be giving you a brief
4 description of the project and pending application.

5 Christian County Generation has applied to
6 the Illinois EPA for an extension of the air
7 pollution control construction permit for the
8 Taylorville Energy Center. This plant will be
9 designed to generate 630 megawatts of electricity to
10 be put out onto the grid. It would use Illinois coal
11 as a feedstock, and the proposed plant will be
12 located roughly two miles northeast of Taylorville.

13 The proposed plant would be an integrated
14 gasification combined-cycle power plant or IGCC plant
15 as it is more commonly known. Unlike a conventional
16 power plant that combusts coal in a boiler and
17 subsequently controls pollutants in the flue gases,
18 an IGCC power plant first gasifies the coal and
19 cleans the resulting fuel gas prior to combusting the
20 fuel in turbines to generate electricity. The coal
21 gasification process with its fuel gas cleanup
22 process would be very effective in controlling
23 emissions of sulfur dioxide and particulate matter.

24 For the turbines, a selective catalytic

1 reduction unit and good combustion practices will be
2 used to control emissions of nitrogen oxides.

3 Emissions from other units at the plant, such as the
4 sulfur recovery unit, auxiliary boiler, and material
5 handling, would also be very effectively controlled.

6 As part of the original issuance of the
7 construction permit for this project, the Illinois
8 EPA determined that the plant would be controlled
9 with best available control technology.

10 The air quality analysis for the project
11 originally submitted by Christian County Generation
12 showed that the project would not cause or contribute
13 to violations of ambient air quality standards.

14 The permit issued for the plant contains
15 limitations on and requirements for operation of the
16 plant. The permit also established appropriate
17 testing, monitoring, record keeping, and reporting
18 requirements. This included continuous emissions
19 monitoring for the combustion turbines' emissions of
20 nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide.

21 The construction permit issued for the
22 proposed plant became effective on January 28th of
23 2008 when the USEPA's Environmental Appeals Board
24 concluded its review of an appeal of the permit.

1 This is because the permit also -- I'm sorry -- also
2 provided authorization to construct the plant under
3 the federal rules for Prevention of Significant
4 Deterioration, PSD, under 40 CFR 52.21. In general,
5 PSD approval becomes invalid if actual construction
6 is not commenced or a binding contract for
7 construction is not entered into within 18 months
8 after the permit became effective. This 18-month
9 period may be extended by the permitting authority
10 upon a satisfactory showing that an extension is
11 justified.

12 The Illinois EPA has determined that the
13 extension requested by Christian County Generation is
14 justified. There are no other proposed major
15 projects in the area competing for the air quality
16 resource. Since the permit became effective,
17 Christian County Generation has been working on
18 matters that will allow construction of the plant to
19 commence. It has been exploring avenues for
20 satisfying the -- for satisfying the criteria and
21 requirements of recently-adopted legislation that
22 promotes the development of advanced clean coal
23 technology in Illinois.

24 Along with extending the permit, the

1 Illinois EPA is also proposing to add conditions to
2 the permit addressing regulations and requirements
3 that have been adopted since the original issuance of
4 the permit. In particular, it would address
5 Illinois' new rules at 35 Illinois Administrative
6 Code, Part 225 for coal-fired power plants. It would
7 also include additional measures to minimize flaring.

8 With its extension request, Christian
9 County Generation submitted an analysis that
10 addressed the potential impacts of the proposed plant
11 on particulate matter air quality measured as PM2.5,
12 which had not been required to be addressed as part
13 of the original application. This analysis
14 demonstrated that the PM2.5 air quality standards
15 will be not exceeded.

16 In closing, the Illinois EPA is proposing
17 to grant an extension to the construction permit for
18 the proposed Taylorville Energy Center project. We
19 welcome your comments or questions on our proposed
20 action.

21 Thank you.

22 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you, Bob.

23 MR. ROMAINE: Good evening. My name is
24 Chris Romaine. I'm manager of the construction unit

1 in the air permit section. Welcome to tonight's
2 hearing, and I do not have an opening statement.

3 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you, Chris.

4 I believe that we have -- Greg Kunkel is
5 going to come forward and make a brief statement on
6 behalf of the permit applicant.

7 MR. KUNKEL: Thank you for this
8 opportunity to just address you briefly on the permit
9 and why we asked for an extension. Thank you all for
10 coming this evening and to participate in this
11 proceeding.

12 Christian County Generation appreciates
13 the significance of this project to this community.
14 The economic stimulus it will provide, the hundreds
15 of construction and permanent jobs, and what it means
16 is a step forward in the development of a sustainable
17 energy economy. As a pioneering integrated
18 gasification combined-cycle project with
19 unprecedented environmental performance, the
20 Taylorville Energy Center holds significance for
21 Illinois with its vast coal resources and the entire
22 nation.

23 As we work together on this important
24 project, we're reminded that the technologies we

1 bring to commercial scale here in Illinois can be
2 applied around the world to contribute to energy
3 security and sustainability.

4 Christian County Generation has requested
5 that the Illinois EPA extend the date by which
6 construction must begin in the subject air quality
7 permit. The need for an extension arises out of
8 passage in 2008 of Illinois' Clean Coal Portfolio
9 Standard act. The act sets forth environmental
10 standards for Taylorville Energy Center as the
11 initial clean coal facility. Those standards include
12 an emission's profile comparable to natural gas
13 generation, and a requirement to capture and
14 sequester at least 50 percent of the carbon dioxide
15 that would otherwise be emitted from the facility.

16 Christian County Generation is to report
17 back to the Illinois Commerce Commission and the
18 General Assembly early next year with a facility cost
19 report detailing how these requirements can be met
20 while protecting ratepayers.

21 As of this moment we are on track to
22 deliver that report by January of next year to
23 support legislative approval of the project by the
24 end of May and commencement of construction in the

1 fourth quarter of 2010. With this legislative
2 mandate and schedule in mind, Christian County
3 Generation made the request for the air quality
4 permit extension on May 5th of this year to align the
5 permit with legislative requirements. Since the
6 Taylorville Energy Center's permit was first
7 effective in January 2008, but for extension it would
8 expire before the legislature is to meet in the first
9 half of 2010 to receive and approve the required
10 study results.

11 In its proposed amendment of the air
12 permit, Illinois EPA has included an extension of the
13 effective date of the permit by 18 months and
14 additional changes to reflect regulatory developments
15 since the permit was originally issued. Christian
16 County Generation has reviewed these proposed
17 changes, supports the proposed changes to the permit,
18 and has no additional comments on that IEPA proposal.

19 Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
21 Mr. Kunkel.

22 First person that is going to be making
23 comments tonight is going to be Rodney Davis.

24 And when you come forward, if you would

1 please spell your last name so the court reporter can
2 make an accurate record of your name.

3 MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much. My name
4 is Rodney Davis, D-a-v-i-s, and I come here tonight
5 to speak on behalf of Congressman John Shimkus.
6 Congressman Shimkus asked me to make remarks and
7 offer his wholehearted support in the permit
8 extension that's being requested by Christian County
9 Generation.

10 The Congressman, as a member of the Energy
11 and Commerce Committee, the U.S. House of
12 Representatives, has been one of the leaders in
13 ensuring that we have access to a low-cost, baseload
14 electrical power generation that can be powered by
15 coal and other resources. We cannot -- and you will
16 hear tonight how a project like this will not be
17 beneficial to our environment. You will hear tonight
18 also how carbon sequestration as planned with this
19 facility may not be safe and may not be proven. But
20 let me remind all of you that we sequester natural
21 gas; we sequester other -- other emissions
22 underground. And, hopefully, we can demonstrate
23 through the demonstration projects that are already
24 in place at ADM and other facilities throughout the

1 country to show the safety and the efficacy of carbon
2 sequestration.

3 Now, I work for Congressman Shimkus. He's
4 supportive of this. He wants to see us increase the
5 amount of low-cost energy, but I also live here in
6 Taylorville. So I speak as a resident too. And I
7 have not seen a project that has gotten almost
8 unanimous support from community leaders, organized
9 labor, the farm bureau, and others that are part of
10 our community.

11 We hear policymakers talk about jobs. We
12 hear policymakers talk about keeping electrical rates
13 low. We have an opportunity here in Taylorville with
14 the plan that's been put forth by Christian County
15 Generation to do those things: to create the jobs,
16 to provide low-cost energy for years to come. If we
17 do not increase our supply of energy, if we do not
18 begin to take advantage of the clean coal technology
19 that's out there that this company has designed, we
20 will not be able to take for granted the lights
21 turning on without increased bills and increased
22 costs coming down to the consumer.

23 So I rise on behalf of Congressman Shimkus
24 to offer support for this permit extension; and,

1 also, again, as a resident of Taylorville, please
2 support this project. We can't have workers -- if we
3 don't have workers, we don't have members of the
4 union. If we don't have jobs here in Christian
5 County, we can't begin to see the economic benefits
6 and the tertiary benefits that will be part of the
7 process.

8 So, please, I urge you to extend this
9 permit on behalf of the Congressman and as a
10 resident.

11 Thank you.

12 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
13 Mr. Davis.

14 Next person that we have is Greg
15 Brotherton.

16 MR. BROTHERTON: Again, my name is Greg
17 Brotherton. That's B-r-o-t-h-e-r-t-o-n. And I am
18 currently serving as the mayor of Taylorville.

19 I've lived in this city most of my life --
20 in excess of 45 years. I grew up here. I met and
21 married my wife here, and I raised my children here,
22 and last summer I buried my father here. So this is
23 my hometown, and I want only the best for it and its
24 citizens.

1 Taylorville wants the Energy Center to
2 become a reality. There's hardly a day that goes by
3 that someone doesn't stop me and ask, "How's it
4 looking for the Energy Center? Are we going to get
5 it? Sure would be a blessing, wouldn't it? Have you
6 heard anything new?"

7 This project means more than just some new
8 jobs for our citizens. It represents hope for the
9 entire city and the surrounding area. We truly
10 believe that it will be a catalyst for growth, not
11 only within the city but in those surrounding areas
12 as well.

13 In his book Divided Kingdom, a local
14 author, Carl Oblinger, wrote the following: "The
15 coal fields of central Illinois formed the backbone
16 of a strong regional economy for the first half of
17 the 20th century. These coal mines shaped the
18 identity of the society within the region. The
19 values of those families and communities are still
20 exhibited today in their work ethic and the family
21 ideal." And that's so true.

22 The City of Taylorville owes its existence
23 to the coal that is located literally beneath our
24 feet. Coal mining is a tradition in this area, and

1 because it has been such a major part of our culture,
2 we have an appreciation of it that other people may
3 have trouble grasping. To have an energy asset like
4 coal sitting around unable to be utilized because of
5 the sulfur it contains has been frustrating, to say
6 the least.

7 After suffering through decades of a local
8 economic downturn that resulted largely because of
9 the closing of the area coal mines, the idea that a
10 new technology may once again allow this relatively-
11 abundant resource to be used is truly exciting. We
12 are all aware that our reliance on foreign oil
13 weakens us, and we eagerly look forward to the
14 opportunity to regain a greater degree of energy
15 self-sufficiency by using clean coal technology.

16 We are encouraged that our federal
17 government has shown that it recognizes the need for
18 the development of clean energy technologies by
19 including loan guarantees in its Clean Air Act of
20 2005. These guarantees will help make the
21 implementation of these new technologies possible
22 and, in turn, will benefit all of us.

23 We feel confident that the proposed
24 facility will be built and operated well within all

1 the health-based federal and state environmental
2 standards, and no one is more concerned about these
3 issues than we are. I mean, after all, it is our
4 community. It's our environment being impacted, and
5 our quality of life that will be better.

6 Our confidence is based on the fact that
7 we know that the developers of the project have
8 proven to be conscientious neighbors in the places
9 where they currently have facilities. This belief
10 has been reinforced by our own experience in working
11 with them on this local project. I can assure you
12 that the City of Taylorville fully supports this
13 project. Its citizens and their elected officials
14 will do everything they can to bring this project to
15 fruition.

16 The Taylorville City Council has
17 demonstrate its support of the project for many
18 years. We have worked and will continue to work hand
19 in hand with the developers to ensure that the
20 Taylorville Energy Center has what it needs from our
21 city, and now we are asking the IEPA to give the
22 facility what it needs to become a reality.

23 Thank you for allowing me this opportunity
24 to address you.

1 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you, Mayor
2 Brotherton.

3 Next person is John Curtin.

4 MR. CURTIN: My name is John Curtin,
5 C-u-r-t-i-n, and I'm chairman of the Christian County
6 Board, the governing body of Christian County.

7 I am very pleased to be given the
8 opportunity to comment at the request of Christian
9 County Generation, LLC for an extension of the air
10 pollution control construction permit.

11 A project of this magnitude takes time, as
12 I know firsthand about that because the first meeting
13 that was held in Taylorville -- myself and Mayor
14 Montgomery and Todd Ely and Mike McInnis from -- and
15 David Schwartz from the ERORA Group from Louisville,
16 Kentucky -- that took place back in 2001, late 2001.

17 I remember being so impressed with those
18 individuals and their sincerity and knowledge of what
19 they were proposing at that time. I knew they made a
20 lasting impression on me, and when we left that
21 meeting, I felt appreciated at their interest in our
22 area, and we expressed to them that we appreciated
23 them. And they, in turn, left the meeting with the
24 feeling that they were welcome and we were anxious to

1 work with them.

2 I won't elaborate on what has taken place
3 in those years leading up to the present time, but,
4 regardless to say, many things have changed over that
5 period of time. I know that Tenaska has taken the
6 lead on this project with the ERORA Group, and I
7 believe it's for real now.

8 Christian County has long been known for
9 its rich agricultural heritage, and agriculture has
10 always been the number one industry. But coal mining
11 has been number two to agriculture in this county.
12 We have in this county abundant reserves of fossil
13 fuel below the surface, and it only makes sense that
14 we should be using it to put our people back to work.
15 In turn, they can produce electricity and
16 pipeline-quality substitute natural gas, commonly
17 called methane gas.

18 Wind and solar energy is the big talk now,
19 but with the latest technology that's available to us
20 today, fossil fuel can be used in a very competitive
21 manner, again, putting our people back to work and
22 putting the economy back on track in this area.

23 We have two very good junior college
24 districts in this county that are ready and willing

1 to do whatever it needs to train our people for the
2 jobs associated with the generation center. And I
3 would be remiss if I did not mention what it means to
4 this facility and what it would do for the tax base
5 of this county so that we can continue to provide the
6 services from the county as well as helping the
7 schools and other taxing bodies in the county.

8 This is a cooperative effort on behalf of
9 the City of Taylorville, Christian County, Christian
10 County Economic Development Corporation to assist
11 with this project in any way we can.

12 The residents of Christian County and
13 surrounding area are anxious to get the extension,
14 facility -- the generation facility moving forward,
15 and we pray that this extension be granted to provide
16 additional time for the commencement of the
17 construction of their plant.

18 Thank you very much.

19 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
20 Mr. Curtin.

21 Next person is Allan -- is it Lauher?

22 MR. LAUHER: Good evening. I'm Allan
23 Lauher, L-a-u-h-e-r. I'm the president of Central
24 Illinois Building and Construction Trades Council. I

1 too am also a resident of Christian County. I live
2 just down the road in -- seven miles west here in
3 Tovey. So I'm here to speak in support of Christian
4 County Generation in support of the extension of the
5 air permitting and construction permits for the
6 project.

7 The project, I believe, will be extremely
8 good for the local economy, providing over 1500
9 construction jobs. It will bring business to
10 Taylorville and local economy coming with these jobs.
11 The surrounding area should benefit from this also.

12 The construction phase of this project is
13 approximately three years -- I believe I'm correct in
14 that time line -- where jobs will be here in the
15 area. After that, full-time jobs will be associated
16 with the plant for -- for local residents. And the
17 project, with its new -- with its new technology,
18 will put central Illinois on the map as one of the
19 cleanest producers of energy, even though it uses
20 high-sulfur Illinois coal, in the nation.

21 The cutting-edge technology used in this
22 plant will set and raise the standards for local
23 coal-burning power plants in Illinois and the United
24 States. The reduction of emissions with this

1 technology will improve our environment and, with the
2 expanding use of this technology, will increase the
3 demand for Illinois coal and provide good-paying jobs
4 for Illinois coal miners. This project will be
5 another step in proving Illinois coal can be burned
6 cleanly and efficiently and can be used to cut our
7 dependence on foreign oil.

8 With that I would just like to thank you
9 for the opportunity to speak, and, once again, ask
10 you to extend the permitting process so this project
11 can go on.

12 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you.

13 Next person is Victor Joseph Pop.

14 MR. POP: The last name is P-o-p. It gets
15 misspelled constantly.

16 All right. The technology and this coal
17 will, in effect, not only bring down the price of
18 natural gas, but it will give jobs for your pipelines
19 as well as your coal mine. It will also bring
20 stability to this community, which we need not only
21 in this town but this county.

22 It's a known fact that ADM is using this
23 way to -- technology to show how they can put the
24 stuff -- the carbon dioxide and the various things

1 like mercury -- in the ground. This way it will
2 clean up the air.

3 If you've been in Springfield recently,
4 you'll notice that CWLP has already cleaned their
5 line up because, when you look at the new one they
6 just put on line compared to the one that they're
7 going to shut down, one is black and the other one is
8 white. It takes the stuff they put in that one and,
9 in fact, clean up the air. We know that we have the
10 technology to do the same thing.

11 This is advanced technology. We can prove
12 to the State of Illinois, to the federal government
13 that, yes, this technology can be done. That's the
14 whole purpose of getting this permit done so that we
15 can prove to you that it will be done. And by
16 cleaning up the air, you not only will put jobs --
17 people to work, you'll eliminate the poverty rates
18 that you have now.

19 By eliminating mercury, carbon monoxide,
20 political (sic) matter, and the other stuff that
21 causes lung respiratories by using this technology
22 and by permitting this permit, you'll end up
23 eliminating the lung ailments that we have now. It
24 will also show the Dominican Energy that if we can do

1 it so can they.

2 Right now we have about seven or 8,000
3 people out of work. This here will not only put some
4 of the people to work temporarily, but it will also
5 bring other industry in in the long term. This is
6 why this is so important to do this.

7 The sooner you get all the permits on this
8 project ready, the sooner we can go to the state
9 legislature and get this thing passed so that we can,
10 in fact, get this built. And I've already talked to
11 Senator Al Franken this morning. He supports it.
12 I've talked to Harry Reid. He supports it. I've
13 talked to Nancy Pelosi. I've talked to Roland
14 Burriss. They all support it. Most of your
15 legislators in Illinois support it. It's just a
16 matter of getting it past the EPA.

17 Do you know exactly how long it will take
18 to have this permit done? And you did say 18 months
19 it would be good; right?

20 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: The 18 months
21 that I was referring to in my opening statement had
22 to do with how long after a permit is -- becomes
23 effective that there is before either contracts are
24 entered into to begin construction or construction

1 actually starts.

2 MR. POP: But this permit is an extension
3 of the original --

4 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Yes.

5 MR. POP: Okay. So it will be, at most,
6 about 18 months?

7 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: It will be --

8 MR. POP: About 18 months?

9 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: 18 months for --

10 MR. POP: Yeah. Once you okay it, and it
11 will be, like -- well, what? -- 30, 40 days before
12 you actually get it all done?

13 MR. SMET: No.

14 MR. ROMAINE: Well, I need to clarify that
15 we have simply proposed to extend the permit. We are
16 taking comments tonight. We have not made a final
17 decision. Our preliminary decision, based on the
18 information that was presented to us, was that they
19 were entitled to an extension. We expect to hear
20 comments that would suggest that they probably are
21 not entitled to an extension. We will have to wait
22 until to we see what those comments are until we
23 decide what final action to take, and the amount of
24 time that it will take will depend on the nature of

1 the comments that we receive.

2 If we ultimately do decide to extend the
3 permit, then the extension, consistent with
4 established policy for these type of permits as
5 established by the federal USEPA, would be to extend
6 the permit from 18 months from the date on which it
7 would have otherwise ceased to be effective.

8 MR. POP: Okay. So you're saying it could
9 been done somewhere between December and January of
10 next year.

11 MR. ROMAINE: I would hope that we could
12 make our decision on the application sometime in that
13 time frame.

14 MR. POP: Okay. Now, the permit that
15 we're going for tonight -- is this the last permit?
16 Have they got all the rest of them, or do we have to
17 have other meetings?

18 MR. ROMAINE: That's really a question
19 that should be directed to Tenaska because there are
20 certainly other permits and other requirements that
21 may be very desirable for this project. A project of
22 this magnitude, has as already been commented, can
23 evolve and change over time. So I'm not in a
24 position to say that there will not be the need for

1 other meetings with regard to this project.

2 MR. POP: Okay. This is what I wanted to
3 know. And with that, my speech is done.

4 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
5 Mr. Pop.

6 Next person is Adam Johnson.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Pass.

8 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Pass? Okay.

9 Next person is Gary -- is it Philo or
10 Philo?

11 MR. PHILO: Philo. My name a Gary Philo,
12 P-h-i-l-o.

13 I'm here tonight representing the Illinois
14 Office of Coal Development and the Illinois
15 Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity,
16 DCEO.

17 We are here in full support of the
18 Christian County Generation and its request for a
19 time extension for the previously-issued air
20 pollution control construction permit for its
21 proposed power plant in Taylorville.

22 For more than five years we have had a
23 front row seat as this project has developed and
24 matured. From our perspective, it is the most

1 exciting commercial-scale deployment of ultra clean
2 coal technology anywhere in the United States.
3 Better still, this state-of-the-art facility will be
4 fueled by coal, one of Illinois' most abundant
5 resources.

6 Others have or will explain why this
7 project outpaces virtually all other clean coal
8 initiatives being developed elsewhere in the United
9 States. It was proposed with leading-edge technology
10 when the initial air permit was issued, and it will
11 far exceed those standards in its reincarnation, in
12 no small part, as a result of policy leadership on
13 green house gas reductions, championed by, among
14 others, Governor Quinn, Attorney General Madigan, the
15 Illinois General Assembly, U.S. Secretary of Energy
16 Steven Chu, and the administration of Barack Obama.

17 Therefore, DCEO recommends that the
18 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency grant the
19 requested extension, and our support is based on a
20 number of factors. DCEO, through its Office of Coal
21 Development, has committed substantial time and
22 resources in support of the development of the
23 Christian County Generation facility. Initial
24 discussions began in 2005 and have continued to this

1 day. DCEO has subsequently supported this project
2 with a \$2.5 million state grant issued in state
3 fiscal year 2006. This investment provided partial
4 support for the preliminary design and engineering of
5 the facility. This grant was matched with a grant of
6 \$2.5 million from the SIU Clean Coal Review Board, a
7 public-private partnership to advance coal
8 utilization technology.

9 Based on reviews by engineering and
10 scientific experts from inside and outside of
11 government, we believe the Taylorville Energy Center
12 will be among the cleanest coal-fired facilities
13 constructed in the nation in terms of criteria
14 pollutants. The emission profile reflected in the
15 current permit supports this concept.

16 The developer proposes to invest more than
17 \$2 billion towards the construction of the
18 Taylorville Energy Center. Huge economic development
19 benefits will be realized for Illinois and the region
20 in terms of job creation, business growth, and
21 revenue growth. The proposed facility is projected
22 to use approximately two million tons of coal mined
23 in Illinois. Like the impact on jobs, the increase
24 in coal production and utilization is in keeping with

1 the mission of DCEO's Office of Coal Development.

2 The Illinois General Assembly, by strong
3 partisan majority, has documented its support for the
4 project with the passage of Public Act 95-1027 which
5 requires the developer to produce a detailed facility
6 cost report to show how expenses are tightly
7 controlled and that purchasers of energy from this
8 project will get their money's worth.

9 In furtherance of the legislature's
10 mandate, DCEO provided a grant award last month of
11 \$18 million in coal development bond funds to Tenaska
12 for the preparation of the facility cost report.
13 This project is ongoing and expected to be completed
14 in early 2010. The report that they will -- that
15 they are preparing will provide a detailed assessment
16 of the capital costs of the plant, including cost of
17 sequestration of carbon dioxide emissions from the
18 facility; the operating and maintenance costs of the
19 facility; the coal facility's ability to deliver
20 power and energy to the applicable regional
21 transmission markets; the expected capacity factor
22 for the initial clean coal facility; and the cost to
23 ratepayers of electricity produced from the facility.

24 Upon its completion, Public Act 95-1027

1 directs Tenaska to submit the facility cost report to
2 the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Illinois Power
3 Agency, and the Illinois General Assembly. It will
4 be the basis for a final decision by legislators in
5 creating rate incentives for new coal -- new
6 technology coal projects.

7 In summary, this project, along with the
8 FutureGen project in Mattoon, is fulfilling what the
9 public and its elected leadership demand: That we
10 utilize coal in a fashion that makes economic and
11 environmental sense. The further demand is that we
12 undertake this mission using ever-cleaner, ever-
13 smarter technologies such as those planned for the
14 Taylorville Energy Center.

15 Thank you.

16 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you, Mr.
17 Philo.

18 Next person is Ken Lambert.

19 MR. LAMBERT: Thank you. My name is Ken
20 Lambert, L-a-m-b-e-r-t, and I am the current chairman
21 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical
22 Workers State Conference. And on behalf of all the
23 IBEW members, I'm asking you to approve the
24 Taylorville Energy Center request for an air quality

1 permit extension. The IBEW has total confidence in
2 the environmental standards our state and the federal
3 government have imposed on this project.

4 Some of the positive effects we believe
5 this project will create are, number one, millions of
6 dollars in annual savings in power costs to
7 consumers. Number two, economic development for a
8 job-starved region. Number three, the creation for a
9 new market for Illinois coal; and, finally, the
10 creation of 1500 to 2,000 construction jobs that
11 equate to six million manhours. These are good-
12 paying jobs with health and welfare and pension
13 benefits. This doesn't include the 120 jobs that it
14 will create -- permanent jobs it will create at the
15 completion of the job to run the plant, nor the
16 hundreds of mining jobs it will create.

17 The IBEW State Conference and its 60,000
18 members are asking the Illinois EPA to support this
19 project and move forward as quickly as possible for
20 this permit extension. Our members and the citizens
21 of Illinois are counting on you.

22 Thank you.

23 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,

24 Mr. Lambert.

1 Next person is Becki Clayborn.

2 MS. CLAYBORN: Hi. My name is Becki
3 Clayborn. That's C-l-a-y-b-o-r-n. I'm a regional
4 representative with Sierra Club Beyond Coal campaign.
5 And I'd like to speak for the group. And if I run
6 out of time, I'd like to come back up at the end.

7 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Sure.

8 MS. CLAYBORN: We will also be issuing
9 written comments in addition to our comments here
10 tonight.

11 So the Sierra Club Beyond Coal campaign is
12 concerned with how coal affects our environment from
13 the mining of the coal, to the burning of the coal,
14 to the disposal of the coal waste. So we're paying
15 attention to air quality, water quality, and, yes,
16 global warming. Global warming is a major concern
17 for us.

18 Two years ago, when we were here for the
19 last hearing, we brought up global warming, but it
20 was really only in the last two to three years when
21 we've started realizing that global warming is a
22 serious concern and that we have to reduce how much
23 CO2, a major global warming pollutant -- we have to
24 reduce the CO2 in our atmosphere 80 percent by the

1 year 2050, and, more urgently, in the next 20 years,
2 we have to reduce the amount of CO2 going into our
3 atmosphere by 30 percent or we've hit a point in time
4 where we're actually melting glaciers that have
5 captured other CO2 or other global warming
6 pollutants. When they melt, they release those
7 global warming pollutants, and then we have just kind
8 of a runaway problem with global warming. So we're
9 urgently trying to reduce how much CO2 and global
10 warming pollutants go into our atmosphere.

11 This plant, unfortunately, only adds to
12 the problem. It's not replacing the old plant. So
13 it's not taking care of the CO2 from another source.
14 So it's going to be adding CO2 to our atmosphere.

15 We believe that our energy needs can be
16 met with other sources. Between energy efficiency
17 and renewable energy, we think we can transition
18 beyond coal as our main source of energy.

19 We also think that the green energy jobs
20 that can come along with that technology from the
21 manufacturing of energy efficiency products --
22 technology such as programable thermostats, creating
23 manufacturing jobs for building wind turbines and
24 building the components that go into wind turbines --

1 those are all an economic developer as well.

2 And, in fact, part of the problem is we
3 don't even need the electricity that is being
4 proposed here with the Taylorville Energy Center.
5 Right now in Illinois 30 percent of energy that's
6 created in Illinois is exported to other states. So
7 there's no immediate need for this energy in
8 Taylorville or in Illinois at all.

9 And when I talk about green jobs -- again,
10 two years ago, when I was standing here talking at
11 the air permit hearing, there were only -- there was
12 only a hundred megawatts of wind power that had been
13 developed in Illinois. We're now up to a thousand
14 megawatts. That's only two years, and we've
15 developed 900 megawatts extra wind power. There's
16 the potential for 10,000 megawatts of wind farm to go
17 in in Illinois. And if a wind farm the size of the
18 Taylorville Energy Center were to be built here in
19 Taylorville instead of the Taylorville Energy Center,
20 it would create 1,050 construction jobs and it would
21 create 70 permanent jobs. Not quite the amount that
22 the Taylorville Energy Center would be creating, but
23 it's still creating jobs.

24 In fact, just last night in Galesburg,

1 there was a conference about how to attract these
2 wind manufact -- wind component manufacturing
3 businesses into Illinois to make sure that the green
4 energy boom -- we take advantage of it here in
5 Illinois as well. Even though we are a coal state,
6 we can diversify a little. In one wind turbine they
7 need 80,000 different components. These are
8 batteries. These are wiring components. These are
9 cranes. These are things that we can make here in
10 Illinois as well.

11 Those are just some examples of why we
12 think that it's important to transition past coal.
13 It can still be an economic developer -- development
14 tool to increase energy efficiency and renewable
15 energy.

16 But now to talk specifically about this
17 power plant. Of course Sierra Club -- every time you
18 come to one of these permit hearings, we always say
19 we think that this should be a more holistic process.
20 That when a project comes to the EPA for a permit,
21 we'd like to see all of the environmental effects
22 being discussed all at the same time: the water
23 effects, the air effects, the land effects, if there
24 are going to be any.

1 And one of our questions is we know that,
2 since the Taylorville Energy Center has received
3 initial approval from the Department of Energy for a
4 \$2.5 billion loan guarantee, we know that they are
5 going to be going through an environmental impact
6 statement process, and that next week here in
7 Taylorville they're actually having their scoping
8 meeting about the environmental impact statement.

9 For those in the audience, it will be
10 here, Wednesday night, 5:00 to 7:00 is an open house,
11 and then at seven o'clock is presentations.

12 And I'm just wondering how that process of
13 the environmental impact statement works with the
14 IEPA's air permit process. How you guys work
15 together on that, if at all.

16 MR. ROMAINE: In fact, we do not work
17 together on that. They are very separate processes.
18 We have to take action on the permit application,
19 which is specifically addressing the emissions of the
20 proposed plant. The federal loan guarantee is a
21 potential source of financing for this plant, but it
22 is certainly not something that has to be acted upon
23 by the Department of Energy.

24 MS. CLAYBORN: Okay. I'm not sure I

1 understood that last sentence but --

2 So you're saying that the -- my
3 understanding is, is that, in order to determine if
4 the loan guarantee goes through, the DOE is doing an
5 entire environmental impact statement to consider all
6 of the different environmental impacts.

7 MR. ROMAINÉ: That's the nature of the
8 federal process when significant federal actions are
9 taken. That's correct.

10 MS. CLAYBORN: And whether or not the air
11 permit is approved, disapproved, whatever, they don't
12 have to worry about that.

13 MR. ROMAINÉ: Well, it would not make
14 sense for them to act on their application at the
15 federal level for a loan guarantee if a decision were
16 made not to issue an air permit. In that sense, the
17 issuance of the air permit -- the extension of the
18 permit facilitates the federal loan guarantee
19 process, confirming that this is a permitted source.

20 MS. CLAYBORN: Great.

21 MR. ROMAINÉ: Permitted construction
22 activity.

23 MS. CLAYBORN: So we have several
24 questions about the nature of this facility and how

1 it's changed since the first time that it was
2 permitted, and whether or not this is actually a new
3 per -- a new plant or if it is, in fact, just an
4 extension of the same plant.

5 And one of our concerns is that the
6 megawatts seem to keep going up on the size of the
7 plant. I can't remember what it was originally, but
8 it was somewhere between five and 600 megawatts. The
9 last time it was 630, and now it's up to 730. And my
10 guess is that's because there's some extra power
11 needed for their change in plans, which is to make
12 more synthetic natural gas as opposed to burning the
13 syngas to make electricity right off the bat. I'm
14 just wondering if you could talk about the
15 differences in their plans.

16 MR. ROMAINE: I'm looking at Mr. Smet to
17 listen to what I'm saying very carefully.

18 I am not sure exactly what numbers you're
19 referring to. My expectation is the difference
20 between the gross output of the plant and the net
21 output of the plant. A lot of the elec -- I'm sorry.
22 A portion of the electricity generated by the plant
23 is consumed internally for operating the power plant.
24 In particular, the air separation unit is a

1 significant consumer of electricity. So it's very
2 important to be -- understand whether you're
3 listening to data for net output or gross output of a
4 power plant.

5 MS. CLAYBORN: I'm going to find those
6 numbers because I do recognize that there's a
7 difference between the net and the gross, and I think
8 all of those numbers have gone up.

9 MR. SMET: In terms of the extension, the
10 630 megawatts remains the same as before.

11 MS. CLAYBORN: Is that net or gross?

12 MR. SMET: Net.

13 MS. CLAYBORN: Okay. It's my
14 understanding that there is nothing in this permit
15 that addresses CO2 emissions in terms of how much is
16 going to be coming out of the power plant; is that
17 correct?

18 MR. SMET: That's correct.

19 MS. CLAYBORN: In the fact sheet that was
20 handed out by Taylorville Energy Center tonight, they
21 said they were going to be using about two-and-a-half
22 million tons of coal a year, which roughly -- very
23 roughly -- translates to about five million tons of
24 CO2 into the atmosphere. In the past they've talked

1 about sequestering anywhere from half of that.

2 They've also talked about sequestering one million
3 tons. Is there anything in this permit that will
4 even require them to report how much CO2 is going to
5 be emitted?

6 MR. SMET: No, not in this permit.

7 MS. CLAYBORN: In light of the fact that
8 the federal EPA has actually started the rulemaking
9 about large sources of CO2 -- in September they
10 announced they were going to start a rulemaking to
11 actually regulate sources of CO2 that were larger
12 than 25,000 tons a year -- is the Illinois EPA taking
13 that into consideration at all in this permit?

14 MR. ROMAINE: We're certainly aware of
15 that development, but that, again, is a proposed
16 rule. The USEPA, from some perspective, is proposing
17 to regulate sources of CO2. From another
18 perspective, they're acting to not regulate sources
19 of CO2 below the emission thresholds that you
20 mentioned when it takes action to regulate CO2
21 emissions from motor vehicles.

22 I think the other point is that USEPA has
23 adopted regulations that would require reporting of
24 CO2 emissions from plants of this type. So under a

1 federal requirement, Tenaska would be required to
2 report its CO2 emissions.

3 MS. CLAYBORN: I think Sierra Club would
4 like to see Illinois EPA actually not issue permits
5 until such time that these federal CO2 regulations
6 have been put into place.

7 MR. ROMAINE: I understand that request,
8 and it's certainly one that we will consider. One of
9 the difficulties with federal regulations and why
10 it's difficult to rely on them is that many of the
11 actions that USEPA has taken are appealed and do not
12 become effective for years.

13 One of the sad things that happened
14 recently is the USEPA adopted a federal regulation
15 for control of mercury emissions, and when it was
16 challenged, it was struck down, and USEPA has to
17 start that process again. So that's just a practical
18 reason why it is inadvisable sometimes to rely on the
19 future adoption of federal regulations.

20 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: We've gone for 12
21 minutes in here. So I'm going to interrupt. You can
22 ask one or two more questions if you're along this
23 line --

24 MS. CLAYBORN: That's fine. I'll just

1 wait and come back up later.

2 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Okay.

3 MS. CLAYBORN: Thank you.

4 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: And I'll keep
5 your card here to come back.

6 Is it Vetena Owen?

7 MS. OWEN: No. Verena.

8 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Verena. I am so
9 sorry. That is an R, not a T, and I apologize.

10 COURT REPORTER: What's your name?

11 MS. OWEN: That's fine. Let me spell my
12 first name and my last name. It's Verena,
13 V-e-r-e-n-a, O-w-e-n. Thank you, first of all, for
14 holding the hearing. I really appreciate it, and
15 thank you all for coming. This is obviously of great
16 interest to everybody in the room.

17 And before I start, actually have two
18 quick questions as a follow-up what Becki was asking.
19 Did I understand it right that there is no carbon
20 sequestration required in the permit?

21 MR. SMET: That's right. That's correct.

22 MS. OWEN: Does the permit require them to
23 use Illinois coal? I guess not.

24 MR. SMET: It's based on the use of

1 Illinois coal.

2 MS. OWEN: But it doesn't say they have
3 to.

4 MR. SMET: That's correct.

5 MS. OWEN: Thank you.

6 COURT REPORTER: Could you slow down a
7 little bit? Your accent is throwing me. sorry.

8 MS. OWEN: I can do something with the
9 speed. I'm afraid I cannot do much about my accent.

10 I am, as I said, Verena Owen. I am the
11 chair of Sierra Club Beyond Coal campaign and one of
12 their lead volunteers in this effort.

13 Yesterday the National Resource Council
14 issued a report to Congress on the hidden costs of
15 energy and the unpriced consequences of energy
16 production and use. This was something that Congress
17 has requested. They wanted to assess -- somebody to
18 assess the life cycle cost of fossil fuels, and the
19 Natural Resources Council came back and said,
20 considering all fossil fuels, the hidden cost to
21 human health is \$120 billion. I repeat that: \$120
22 billion. And this did not, by the way, include any
23 kind of cost assessment for global warming. This is
24 just criteria pollutants, not SO2 and mercury. I

1 find that to be a shocking number. Excuse me. Not
2 even mercury. I take that back. Mercury was not
3 included either in the study.

4 The problem is that the effects of those
5 hidden costs are not reflected in the energy prices.
6 So businesses and governments -- local governments
7 and the federal government -- and consumers do not
8 realize the full impact of their choices. And I want
9 everybody to think about the full impact of your
10 choices here.

11 When it comes to global warming -- and
12 I'll go back to the criteria pollutants in a minute.
13 When it comes to global warming, the National
14 Resource Council tried to come to a consensus, but
15 they did give a range of values. The range of values
16 stated that damages from CO2 will be worse in 2030
17 (sic) than it is now. And they said even if the
18 total amount of CO2 per year remains steady -- not
19 increase, remains steady -- the damage of each ton of
20 CO2 will increase between 50 and 80 percent by 2030.
21 Will increase even if we keep it steady.

22 Folks, I have four kids. This is not
23 something I want to leave them. I am working on
24 Beyond Coal because I believe in the scientists that

1 tell us we have to reduce global warming emissions 30
2 percent by 2030 and 80 percent by 2050. We can no
3 longer stick our head in the sand and pretend this is
4 not necessary. This plant will not help at all.

5 Also, I go back a little bit to the cost
6 and health study. I'm actually interested about the
7 particulate matter limits in this permit. Can you
8 explain why a local monitor was not used and why one
9 in Springfield was procured in air modeling?

10 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.

11 MS. OWEN: A local monitor. Air modeling
12 monitor. I was kind of surprised to see that, and I
13 let you know why I'm surprised to see that. I
14 testified at the EPA hearing which then promulgated
15 new PM2.5 limits. I said they are not protective of
16 human health. Well, maybe that meant little
17 difference, but I do think that the scientific
18 advisor's advice that the new standards were not
19 protective of human health made much more of an
20 impact, and EPA vacates the rule and will come up
21 with a new rule for PM2.5 that will be protective of
22 human health. And I believe that you need to look
23 into the fact that lower standards are coming and if
24 Taylorville will be able to meet the lower standards

1 on particular matter emissions.

2 I think that's it. If I may -- I think my
3 time is up. If I have more questions, can I come
4 back later?

5 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: I'll keep your
6 card up here.

7 MS. OWEN: Thank you very much.

8 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Is it Timothy --
9 is it Drea or Drea?

10 MR. DREA: Yes. That's Timothy Drea,
11 D-r-e-a. I'm secretary-treasurer of the Illinois
12 AFL-CIO. But I too, somewhat like other speakers,
13 have the point of view of living down here, and coal
14 mining's been my life. Spent -- actually, I'm out of
15 work because of -- I was out of work when I got laid
16 off because of the failure to burn clean -- coal
17 cleanly.

18 But the people here in Christian County
19 have always been on the forefront of clean, reliable
20 energy. The farmers farming right now with the
21 ethanol that goes into our cars. There's a wind farm
22 proposal in the western part of the county that I
23 believe is moving right along for clean energy. And
24 it just makes sense to us that a plant like this,

1 with the IGCC technology coming online, that we could
2 use coal in a safe, reliable manner, and as this
3 technology moves forward, we can actually start
4 shutting down these dirtier plants in other areas.

5 45, 50 years ago they built the
6 Commonwealth Edison plant, now the Binyon (phon.)
7 plant, to -- it was a new technology here in
8 Christian County. Clean -- it was a cleaner-burning
9 plant than the plants that were in Chicago. People
10 made good livings here in Christian County because of
11 that plant and produced three million ton of coal out
12 at Peabody, and it just makes sense to us to start
13 bringing those old plants down and bringing new
14 plants up so that we can continue to have good, safe,
15 reliable, and cost-efficient energy.

16 So as for that, the Illinois AFL-CIO asks
17 the Illinois EPA to go ahead and extend this permit
18 and to keep in mind that coal is not a four-letter
19 dirty word.

20 Thank you.

21 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
22 Mr. Drea.

23 Mary Renner?

24 MS. RENNER: Thank you. My name is Mary

1 Renner, R-e-n-n-e-r. I'm here this evening speaking
2 on behalf of the Christian County Economic
3 Development Corporation. I serve as their director
4 here in Christian County.

5 Let me start off my comments by saying
6 that there's nothing more that CCEDC and our
7 development partners -- the City of Taylorville,
8 Christian County, the Taylorville Development
9 Association -- want to see happen more than the
10 Taylorville Energy Center project.

11 For about 20 years during my tenure with
12 the then Illinois Development of Commerce and
13 Community Affairs, I had the opportunity to and the
14 privilege to oversee many large-scale projects like
15 this one, and I know the dramatic effect that they
16 have on an area and on a region, certainly, not only
17 immediately but for years to come. And this project
18 would be certainly one of the primary fitting in that
19 category.

20 The project will put Taylorville and
21 central Illinois on the map in terms of
22 environmentally-responsible electric generation, and
23 it also will open the door for other uses of Illinois
24 coal, a very important commodity certainly in central

1 Illinois and other parts of Illinois -- particularly,
2 in Taylorville -- and will help to generate future
3 clean coal projects.

4 I think you've heard earlier and I will
5 reiterate. My understanding is that this project
6 will create at a minimum 1500 construction jobs and,
7 after the plant is up and operating, at least a
8 hundred. And I think, most importantly, it will
9 revive hundreds of coal mining jobs, providing an
10 opportunity for a considerable number of trained and
11 skilled workers to go back to work and to be used at
12 an optimum, something we unfortunately haven't seen
13 here for a long time.

14 In addition, with the potential of
15 supplier chain development and future investment and
16 job creation, we're likely to have some additional
17 auxiliary development in our new Taylorville Business
18 and Industrial Park which we are in the process of
19 putting together in close proximity and location to
20 the Taylorville Energy Center.

21 I'd like to stress, with an emissions
22 profile similar to a natural gas plant, we have full
23 confidence that the facility will not have a
24 significant environmental impact on the community or

1 the surrounding area. There have been a number of
2 steps that this project has overcome -- and I know
3 you know -- in the past -- over -- well, probably
4 close to ten years now. We've rooted for it all
5 along. We still do so with the utmost enthusiasm.
6 We have every confidence that Tenaska is going about
7 developing this project in the most environmentally-
8 responsible way.

9 We ask you, on behalf of the community of
10 Taylorville and our development organization, to, in
11 fact, act expeditiously on approving this permit
12 extension.

13 I thank you for the opportunity to speak
14 to you.

15 And, now, if you would let me, I would
16 like to read into the record a letter from David
17 Kolata, who is the executive director of the Citizens
18 Utility Board.

19 COURT REPORTER: Spell the name, please.
20 Kolata.

21 MS. RENNER: K-o-l-a-t-a.

22 The letter is dated October 20, 2009.

23 "On behalf of the Citizens Utility Board,
24 I am requesting that the Illinois Environmental

1 Protection Agency grant Christian County Generation,
2 LLC an extension of its air quality permit for the
3 Taylorville Energy Center.

4 "We have supported this project as an
5 important piece of comprehensive strategy to meet our
6 energy challenges, including, during development, the
7 Illinois Clean Coal Portfolio Standard law, which
8 potentially sets the stage for long-term financing of
9 the TEC. CUB recognizes that clean energy projects
10 are crucial to the economic health of our state, but
11 they must be financed in a consumer-friendly way.
12 The General Assembly has asked for additional cost
13 analysis to confirm the final cost of the project so
14 that it's possible to guarantee that consumers will
15 be protected if the TEC moves forward, an approach we
16 strongly support.

17 "We look forward to working with the
18 General Assembly and Governor Quinn on a
19 comprehensive energy strategy next session, and we
20 ask the IEPA to provide the Taylorville Energy Center
21 the additional time necessary to meet the legislative
22 requirements by extending the facility's air quality
23 permit.

24 "Sincerely, David Kolata, Executive

1 Director."

2 Thank you.

3 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,

4 Ms. Renner.

5 Next person is Allen Rider.

6 MR. RIDER: My name is Allen Rider,

7 R-i-d-e-r, and I am a concerned citizen from

8 Christian County.

9 I would like to thank -- thank the members
10 here to allow the public and myself to speak.

11 The first thing that, when I researched
12 the project, I found out, of course, that -- and it's
13 been previously mentioned -- that the state as well
14 as the federal government is supporting this with
15 loan guarantees and grants and that type of thing,
16 and I think that's fine.

17 I question why the state is only
18 supporting -- I'll call it a commercial type of
19 energy efficiency or a new energy clean environment
20 technology and does not have any kind of program for
21 residential use. I would suggest to you that the
22 State of Illinois needs to do, as many other states
23 have, a residential program to stimulate clean energy
24 and new technology.

1 And, in fact, a recent issue of Newsweek
2 magazine dated October 12, 2009, suggested that,
3 among others, Japanese, Germans -- Japan, Germany,
4 and China are the solar leaders in the world. In the
5 area of wind generation, we've got Spain, Germany,
6 and Denmark are ahead of the United States in wind
7 generation. And even in the controversial nuclear
8 energy, France is ahead of the United States. So if
9 we are looking about -- looking for long-term
10 economic impact, I would suggest that the State of
11 Illinois focus on those sorts of things.

12 And when you talk about green jobs and
13 economic impact, I would like to tell you what the
14 Allen Rider residence has done in the last 30 months.
15 We spent \$800 on additional insulation. We spent
16 \$700 on a high-efficiency clothes washer. We've
17 replaced two drafty windows for \$700. We purchased a
18 hybrid automobile for \$21,000. We've also purchased
19 a high-mile-per-gallon automobile for another 20,000,
20 and if the weather ever cooperates, I'm going to
21 install a geothermal heating system in my property
22 for 12,000. That's \$55,000 in 30 months that Allen
23 Rider, private citizen, is doing to reduce his energy
24 use and his so-called carbon footprint.

1 I would ask these questions, and some of
2 these questions have been answered or brought up, and
3 I will mention them very briefly. Do we need this
4 energy? And I'm also concerned about federal
5 regulations, and I understand federal bureaucracy
6 that the gentleman on the -- my far right addressed a
7 moment ago. I fully understand that. They are also
8 our elected officials.

9 I think everyone in this room would agree
10 that education is extremely important, and the United
11 States has a great education system. We have
12 scientists who study many, many topics. One area
13 they've been studying recently is CO2. They've been
14 studying what that does for us. Well, what are they
15 saying about CO2? They're saying it's not good.
16 They're saying we have too much. They're saying we
17 need to reduce it. We need to reduce CO2. That's
18 what the scientists are telling us.

19 The Taylorville project suggests that they
20 will reduce CO2 by 50 percent. That's great. Thank
21 you. But if they agree that CO2 is harmful and they
22 want to reduce it by 50 percent and we have the
23 scientific community -- that perhaps we have
24 relatives and friends that we know about -- that are

1 telling us that CO2 is not good, we need to reduce
2 it, then how is this project beneficial?

3 That's all I have, and I thank you for
4 giving me this opportunity to speak. Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
6 Mr. Rider.

7 Will Reynolds.

8 MR. REYNOLDS: Will Reynolds,
9 R-e-y-n-o-l-d-s.

10 I have a few questions I'd like to ask EPA
11 that don't think will take too long.

12 I read on Department of Labor site that --
13 that the amount of coal being mined has gone up
14 steadily over the last 20 years or so but that the
15 number of coal mining jobs has gone down dramatically
16 and that was largely due to new mining methods. That
17 the mining companies have figured out how to mine
18 twice as much coal with half as many miners.

19 Does the EPA have any information here or
20 anything it can share about how many Illinois coal
21 mining jobs have been lost to new mining methods?

22 MR. ROMAINE: No. We do not look into
23 issues such as employment. In fact, the number of
24 jobs created by this proposed project is not a factor

1 in our decision-making directly. Our question is
2 whether the proposed project would comply with
3 environmental requirements. To some extent,
4 obviously, there's certain issues about alternatives
5 to projects and whatever, but the fundamental aspect
6 of permitting is compliance with environmental
7 regulations.

8 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. The -- I guess
9 there's the proposal that -- that companies -- or
10 that utility companies would be required to buy some
11 of their power from this plant, which seems like that
12 that wouldn't be necessary. If the rates were going
13 to be at an economically-competitive rate, why would
14 that be needed?

15 But I heard the representative for DCEO
16 talk about some rate incentives for clean coal. Is
17 it your understanding that that roughly means that
18 there would be higher rates for this electricity than
19 other plants in the area?

20 MR. ROMAINE: I can't comment on that
21 either. Again, that's a program administered by the
22 Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, not
23 the environmental program that we administer.

24 MR. REYNOLDS: Do you look at or do you

1 have information about whether this would have higher
2 rates for this power? Is that simply part of another
3 political process?

4 MR. ROMAINE: Well, I can answer it based
5 on my general knowledge. New modern technology is
6 much more expensive than the old power plants that
7 have been built.

8 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. I've read that with
9 carbon capture technology that the carbon's captured
10 in rock underground, that it's stored in rock
11 underground, and that there's human activity that can
12 cause some low levels of seismic activity, like,
13 drilling. Do you know -- I mean, is that -- do you
14 know what -- if there are such activities that might
15 result in CO2 stored in rock being released? And are
16 there drilling or those kind of activities happening
17 in this area?

18 MR. ROMAINE: No, I don't. What I do know
19 is that the USEPA Department of Energy, under the
20 National Energy Technology Laboratory, is intensively
21 studying how to safely sequester CO2. The USEPA is
22 also developing regulation as part of their
23 underground injection control program that would
24 address sequestration -- geological sequestration of

1 CO2.

2 So to the extent that there are concerns,
3 there are programs underway to make sure that, when
4 sequestration is implemented, it is implemented in a
5 way that is safe as possible.

6 My other understanding is that the concern
7 for sequestration for the most part is the
8 effectiveness of retention. The presentations I've
9 heard suggest that there isn't any particular health
10 threat/human threat from the sequestration of CO2.
11 It's just can you make sure that it stays down there
12 for long enough that it chemically converts and
13 becomes with the rock matrix and you can then forget
14 about it.

15 MR. REYNOLDS: Okay. If a significant
16 amount of CO2 that was captured was released into --
17 either into the air or the groundwater, would there
18 be any public health threat associated with that?

19 MR. ROMAINE: Well, that's a theoretical
20 question. The whole purpose of the underground
21 injection control program is to sequester -- or can
22 any other ground injection well develop and operate
23 in such a way to protect groundwater resources.

24 MR. SMET: I want to add, you know, just

1 a -- in addition to what Chris said in regard to, you
2 know, we look at compliance to environmental regs and
3 such. The questions you've raised are addressed
4 elsewhere. It's not like we look at them and -- but,
5 you know, just focus on that. Our job is just to
6 look at the compliance to regs, issue permits
7 accordingly, et cetera.

8 In regard to your questions about carbon
9 sequestration, the people that have studied that here
10 in the State of Illinois is Illinois Geological
11 Survey, and that's basically right down their alley.
12 Rob Finley, who is the head of that, has looked into
13 that extensively. We've only gotten what we've
14 gotten through whatever -- just discussions in
15 confer -- you know, like, a conference or something.
16 So we're not necessarily expert in that as much as he
17 has studied that full time. That's what he's been
18 looking into for quite some time.

19 MR. REYNOLDS: All right. Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,

21 Mr. Reynolds.

22 Anne -- is it Logue?

23 MS. LOGUE: Yes.

24 I'm with the Sierra Club, and thank you

1 for listening to my questions.

2 COURT REPORTER: Last name, please.

3 MS. LOGUE: Logue, L-o-g-u-e.

4 What I see here is a lot of people who are
5 desperate for jobs, and I don't think we'd even be
6 here if we didn't really need these jobs. Because if
7 this plant isn't really necessary for energy in this
8 area and this is just going to contribute to a higher
9 CO2 level, I don't even understand why we're
10 considering this permit extension.

11 MR. ROMAINE: It's a proposed project. It
12 has to comply with environmental regulations. To
13 proceed with the project, the company needs to apply
14 for a permit. They have gotten a permit. It would
15 have -- at this point would no longer be considered
16 effective, and to proceed they have to get it
17 extended.

18 The question is whether it complies with
19 applicable environmental requirements that now govern
20 CO2 emissions as well as other aspects of the plant's
21 emissions.

22 MS. LOGUE: I think ethically, though,
23 that's what I'm asking is why is the EPA considering
24 this when we're facing the crisis with the plant's

1 CO2 emissions?

2 MR. ROMAINE: It's very straightforward.
3 We are a nation of law. We have to act on
4 applications according to current laws and
5 regulations. We are not entitled to make up new
6 requirements on the fly for each project as we see
7 fit. We look at what's currently on the books, what
8 has been established as enforceable requirements.
9 Those are the requirements that we have to look at.

10 We certainly agree with you completely
11 that CO2 is an important critical question for
12 mankind. There's no question about that. But the
13 appropriate way to address it is through adoption of
14 control programs. Should it be the Waxman-Markey
15 bill? Should it be the -- well, the other one. That
16 is the question before us. Should the State of
17 Illinois act independently of federal action? That,
18 again, is a question that should be posed for our
19 legislature, but it is not a question that the
20 Illinois EPA has the authority or ethically the -- it
21 is not appropriate for us to address during a permit.

22 MS. LOGUE: I'm suggesting it should be.

23 MR. ROMAINE: Thank you. I certainly
24 appreciate your position from where you are speaking.

1 MS. LOGUE: Recent -- well, not recently,
2 but wasn't there a cancer cluster here in Taylorville
3 at one time that was associated with the coal
4 gasification?

5 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have enough
6 information to comment on that. I suggest that would
7 be better directed to residents of Taylorville who
8 might be familiar with the situation.

9 MS. LOGUE: One more comment. I really
10 think this company is taking advantage of the lack of
11 employment around here, and I find that very
12 disturbing.

13 And, also, cleaner coal is extremely
14 expensive so I don't understand how that will reduce
15 energy prices. And, also, when the coal is gone, so
16 are the jobs. So I -- you know, I kind of am
17 skeptical about why they're purporting to say, you
18 know, long-term employment because, when the coal
19 goes, the jobs go.

20 That's all I have. Thank you.

21 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
22 Ms. Logue.

23 This looks like D.J. Kennedy.

24 MR. KENNEDY: Good evening, ladies and

1 gentlemen. My name is D.J. Kennedy, K-e-n-n-e-d-y.

2 I'm the immediate past chairman of the board of
3 directors of the Greater Taylorville Chamber of
4 Commerce. The organization is comprised of 300
5 members strong and growing. Our commitment is to
6 enhance the economic, civic, and cultural well-being
7 of Taylorville and Christian County.

8 Tenaska, through its design of the
9 Taylorville Energy Center, is committed to using
10 state-of-the-art technology and ensure the plant is
11 environmentally friendly.

12 The economic impact of this project over
13 the life of this plant will have billions of dollars
14 of impact on our county.

15 Our president and CEO, Fred Ronnow,
16 R-o-n-n-o-w, has worked hand in hand with Tenaska to
17 bring this project to fruition for several years.

18 We are proud and pleased to support the
19 extension of -- application for the extension of this
20 project.

21 Thank you.

22 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
23 Mr. Kennedy.

24 Jack Norman.

1 MR. NORMAN: My name is Jack Norman.

2 That's N-o-r-m-a-n, and 1066 for those are who are
3 history buffs.

4 I don't have a written statement at this
5 time. I will submit by the deadline a written
6 statement. Tonight I'd like to hit fairly briefly on
7 a number of points.

8 First of all, I don't represent anybody
9 but myself. When I have not been busy earning a
10 living or tending to family affairs, I have been
11 active in promoting environmental health and
12 community vitality and justice. I reside not in this
13 county, I'm sorry to say, because it's a nice county.
14 My brother taught school in this very building at one
15 time. I live in Monroe County in a city which is
16 mostly in Monroe County and partly in St. Clair
17 County in metro East St. Louis. That part of
18 Illinois can fairly be described as typical of the
19 United States farm belt, as part of a metropolitan
20 area, as a gateway to southern Illinois, and as part
21 of the coal country.

22 With that preliminary, my first point is
23 that it has been not easy to acquire documents
24 regarding this project and this permit. The meeting

1 notice has a link to the website at which it is said
2 one can find the draft permit and project summary.
3 That link today wasn't delivering anything at all,
4 let alone those two things. The notice also gives a
5 telephone contact which takes you to someone's
6 answering machine and no information from it that's
7 useful and no other response.

8 Second point is that the permitting
9 authority apparently accepts the applicant's
10 assertions without verification. An example is in
11 the project summary on page four. The first two
12 sentences assert that the applicant's analysis
13 "demonstrates that." It would be more accurate, I
14 would think, to say that the applicant's analysis
15 "concluded that," and verification is something else
16 that the agency ought to be doing. Maybe it is, but
17 there's no indication in the project summary that
18 that is happening.

19 The third point is that the proceedings on
20 this permit extension seem to be based on the
21 assumption that relevant conditions remain as they
22 were understood to be when the permit was first
23 issued. That may or may not be the case. Our
24 conditions tend to change and our understanding of

1 them tends to improve. That is an example.

2 People like to get up and talk about clean
3 coal. I will assert that there is no such thing as
4 clean coal. Coal is dirty in extraction, in
5 transport, in processing, and in the combustion
6 byproducts and disposal of them. It is also dirty in
7 another sense in that it is dangerous work, and
8 everybody in this community probably knows that.
9 Certainly, in my part of Illinois, everybody knows
10 that.

11 Fourth point is the agency reasoning is
12 not always as careful as it ought to be. Again, in
13 the project summary on page two, paragraph four, the
14 first two sentences demonstrate it's easy to slip
15 from one proposition to another without paying too
16 much attention to how they're connected to each
17 other.

18 The fifth point is that we should, I
19 think, take advantage of our opportunities wherever
20 we live but only responsibly and sustainably and
21 fairly.

22 The sixth point is I and another person
23 that was -- in my day I have been chair of my
24 county's planning commission land use committee. I

1 have been chair of my city's planning commission.

2 And on both those bodies, our policy was that at that
3 time -- and, as far as I know, still is -- that, in
4 dealing with applicants, the first thing to do is to
5 follow the laws. The second thing to do is to follow
6 the law in a way that is fair to the applicant, which
7 means deal with the permit applications or petitions
8 or whatever the case may be expeditiously and in
9 impartially.

10 Thank you.

11 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
12 Mr. Norman.

13 Next person is Chris Pearson.

14 MR. PEARSON: Hello. My name is Chris
15 Pearson. I live in Sangamon County, and I'm just
16 representing myself.

17 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Can you spell
18 your last name, please.

19 MR. PEARSON: Oh. P-e-a-r-s-o-n.

20 Yeah. I'm going to be very brief. I
21 think I'm probably the last.

22 The -- you know, I guess, you know, from
23 what I've heard and what I've read about this that I
24 would have to concede that, for the coal plants I've

1 looked at, this is a cutting-edge proposal. It's
2 well designed, and it pushes the envelope in a lot of
3 ways.

4 But I would, like a lot of other of the --
5 some of the other speakers, am concerned about CO2
6 emissions, and, as a general rule, I think I would
7 prefer that the -- that the extension not be granted
8 because I prefer that further investment in energy in
9 this part of Illinois be in technologies that don't
10 produce any CO2 at all, and that's really all I have
11 to say.

12 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
13 Mr. Pearson.

14 We've now gone through all the cards for
15 people that have indicated that they want to speak.
16 Is there someone present here tonight --

17 MR. HART: My name is Ken Hart, H-a-r-t.
18 I am president of the Taylorville Development
19 Association, the Taylorville Industrial Development
20 Corporation. I also serve as the founding president
21 of the Christian County YMCA and moved here in 1973
22 with my wife and at that time 18-year-old daughter.

23 We had a thriving coal industry at that
24 time of approximately a thousand people. In 1991 the

1 Clean Air Act was passed, and the coal mine shut
2 down, and it was devastating to the community,
3 county, and also to Taylorville.

4 Along with Mr. Curtin, I understand that
5 agriculture is our number one product and our number
6 one source of income for the community, but the
7 underground coal that we have is probably one of the
8 largest assets that we have, not only in this county
9 but in central Illinois, and I would ask that you
10 would grant the extension of this permit. I think it
11 is technology -- leading technology. It's a source
12 of clean-burning energy, a source to keep energy
13 prices down for all consumers, and I would just urge
14 that you grant the extension.

15 Thank you very much.

16 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
17 Mr. Hart.

18 Is there anyone else that hasn't spoken
19 that would like to speak tonight before we go back to
20 those that ran out of time?

21 MR. TAPLIN: Quinn Taplin, T-a-p-l-i-n.

22 I would like to suggest that those
23 speaking against the emissions of new technology
24 plants -- that they should be on the other side of

1 the aisle advocating for this technology to be
2 proven; that those facilities could then be built
3 elsewhere replacing older plants. We understand that
4 there are many countries with a vast number of
5 polluting plants such as China, probably others, but
6 those plants could then be replaced with these new
7 plants that have much greater environmental benefit
8 than the older, highly-polluting plants.

9 I forgot my other point. I'll excuse
10 myself, and I have an early morning.

11 Thank you.

12 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you,
13 Mr. Taplin.

14 Is there anyone else that hasn't spoken
15 tonight that would like to do so?

16 Okay. Becki Clayborn.

17 MS. CLAYBORN: I have a question that
18 probably should have been asked right in the very
19 beginning. What exactly is the criteria for deciding
20 whether or not a permit gets an extension?

21 MR. ROMAINE: USEPA has not established
22 any explicit criteria by rule. Then we are bound to
23 follow our good administrative judgment in that
24 regard.

1 MS. CLAYBORN: So it would seem to me that
2 there have been many decisions regarding CO2 that
3 have occurred since this permit first was issued.
4 Things like CO2 has been found to be an endangerment
5 to public health.

6 MR. ROMAINE: Excuse me?

7 MS. CLAYBORN: Go ahead, Chris. What do
8 you need to say?

9 MR. ROMAINE: Well, USEPA has made a
10 proposed endangerment finding for CO2. That means
11 their intent is to say that, but it is not a final
12 action yet.

13 MS. CLAYBORN: Thank you for correcting
14 me. You know what I meant. CO2 has, in fact, been
15 proposed to -- they propose that it does affect
16 public health, and we believe that they are going to
17 act on that proposed thought. That's happened since
18 this permit originally was issued.

19 We also know that there have been proposed
20 rulemakings about CO2 on large sources that are more
21 than 25,000 tons a year, and we believe that's
22 happened since the last time this permit was issued.

23 And so I would like the IEPA to take that
24 into consideration: That these upcoming regulations

1 should be considered. And since these are new --
2 these are new happenings since the last time it was
3 issued -- the permit was issued, we think that this
4 extension should actually be denied, and they should
5 actually have to start over with their -- with a new
6 permit.

7 Another question I had is when exactly
8 does the existing permit that they had already
9 received -- what was the expiration date for that
10 permit?

11 MR. SMET: July 28th.

12 MR. ROMAINE: If they had not applied for
13 an extension of the permit, that permit would have
14 lapsed on July 28th.

15 MS. CLAYBORN: Interesting. We believe
16 that as well. We believe that it actually did expire
17 on July 28, 2009, and it's confusing to me how an
18 extension can be given to a permit that's actually
19 already expired.

20 MR. ROMAINE: And we'd be interested in
21 your legal support for that position.

22 MS. CLAYBORN: Don't worry. You'll get
23 it.

24 In terms of the CO2 issue, which really is

1 the issue that Sierra Club has at this point, along
2 with some PM2.5 issues that we have some concern
3 with, but in terms of the CO2 footprint, a synthetic
4 natural gas plant like this -- really, their CO2
5 output, if they are not to sequester at all, is at
6 least twice that of a natural gas plant, and it's at
7 least 30 percent more CO2 than a pulverized coal
8 plant. Synthetic natural gas production is very
9 energy intensive. They require a lot more energy
10 than -- than just burning natural gas, for example.
11 In order to make it into natural gas first takes a
12 lot of coal, which means it's going to have -- it's
13 basically increasing emissions just by nature of what
14 the plant is.

15 Sierra Club believes that there's no
16 reason to go down this path. That, really, we don't
17 need to make synthetic natural gas and figure out a
18 way to make something that's already carbon intensive
19 even more carbon intensive.

20 And the bottom line is that we should not
21 be adding any CO2 or global warming emissions to our
22 atmosphere. We have to be reducing. Not just not
23 adding, we need to reduce our CO2 emissions. And
24 so even adding 50 percent of a power plant's

1 emissions -- CO2 emissions to the atmosphere is not a
2 good thing. We should not be permitting anything
3 that is adding CO2 to our atmosphere.

4 And we know that there's talk of carbon
5 capture and sequestration with this project, and,
6 unfortunately, even though CCS -- that's called --
7 carbon capture and sequestration is CCS. Even though
8 it might play a small part in our energy future
9 somewhere down the road, we don't think that it's the
10 silver bullet to solving global warming. We don't
11 think that it's the answer for our energy needs, and
12 we -- we know that carbon capture and sequestration
13 is not ready yet on a large scale.

14 Somebody sent me an e-mail today saying,
15 "Hey, look, carbon capture and sequestration just
16 worked in West Virginia." They had put a thousand
17 tons of CO2 in the ground. This plant is going to
18 put five million tons of CO2 out its stack. That is
19 a far cry from they stored a thousand tons of CO2 in
20 West Virginia underground and now they claim success.
21 It's very different size. We're talking -- pilot
22 projects have occurred here and there, and, actually,
23 this one would even be a pilot project because it's
24 not sequestering a hundred percent of its CO2. It's

1 only sequestering a portion of it.

2 Not only is CCS not ready, but, as you
3 said, there's no regulation in place at this point
4 for making sure that carbon stays underground and
5 doesn't reemerge into the atmosphere. There are
6 regulations for putting carbon into the ground and
7 making sure that it doesn't affect our drinking
8 water, but there's nothing in place about monitoring
9 and ensuring the permanent storage of that carbon
10 into the ground. Until those regulations are in
11 place, there's no way we can be ensured -- assured
12 that the carbon dioxide that Taylorville Energy
13 Center plans on sequestering is actually going to be
14 sequestered. Nobody's doing it yet. There's no
15 regulations for it yet.

16 We need IEPA to put a limit on their CO2
17 in the permit so that they are legally bound to
18 reduce their CO2, if they said they're going to
19 reduce their CO2.

20 Since we -- I know that you guys are
21 frustrated because we're sitting here telling you to
22 do something that's not your job, and you're saying
23 the federal government needs to do it, but they
24 haven't done it yet. You know, this is the point in

1 time -- this is one of the first one of these power
2 plants that's being proposed in the United States.
3 Everybody wants -- everybody's frustrated. I'm sure
4 Taylorville Energy Center is frustrated because
5 they're trying to do the right thing, and they can't
6 get it to move forward, and it's because nobody is
7 willing to say, "You're right. Let's do this carbon
8 capture and sequestration thing, but let's do it
9 right. Let's make regulations for it. Let's make
10 sure that we're doing it the right way so that we're
11 not making global warming worse."

12 Nobody's taking it on and doing it. And I
13 urge Illinois EPA to take this on and say this is
14 where it's going to be regulated because we know we
15 can. And if we have a problem at the federal level,
16 then we need to make them take it on. We can't sit
17 around here anymore and say, "Oh, it's going to be so
18 great. We're going to put it underground." Nobody
19 knows it's going to work. Nobody knows that it's
20 going to work. Sorry. I got a little frustrated
21 there.

22 I do think also -- I have to point out
23 that the state has put \$23 million towards this power
24 plant. \$23 million that could have been used for job

1 development of energy efficiency and renewable
2 energy. \$23 million to make the most expensive power
3 available other than nuclear. \$23 million of
4 taxpayer money to make sure that Taylorville Energy
5 Center qualifies to have every single utility be
6 required to buy their power. This doesn't make
7 sense. This doesn't make sense.

8 If the state wants the coal gasification
9 plant so badly, maybe they should build one and use
10 your taxpayer dollars and actually say, "Taxpayers,
11 we're using your dollars, and we're going to build a
12 coal gasification plant, and then make you buy the
13 higher-priced electricity." That's what's happening
14 here.

15 And I'm sorry. My grandfather was a coal
16 miner. I understand job development. I do. But we
17 have to think on a bigger level of global warming, on
18 how we're getting -- how we're being used -- our
19 taxpayer dollars are being used, how we're going to
20 be forced, as ratepayers, to pay more for electricity
21 from a coal gasification plant that's not ensured
22 that they're going to reduce their global warming
23 emissions.

24 I urge the Illinois EPA to take a stand.

1 Put CO2 in the permit or deny this extension and make
2 them start over.

3 Thank you.

4 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you, Ms.
5 Clayborn.

6 Verena Owen, did you want to --

7 MS. OWEN: No, thanks. I think those were
8 perfect closing remarks.

9 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Okay. I'll give
10 one more opening for anyone here that has not spoken
11 this evening or that would like to make additional
12 comments, if they've already spoken.

13 Okay. Seeing that there is no one, we
14 will go ahead and adjourn this hearing.

15 I do remind everyone -- I do remind -- I
16 do remind everyone that the record is open for 30
17 days from this evening, and I thank you for attending
18 this hearing tonight. This hearing is adjourned.

19 (Hearing adjourned at 8:49 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24

