

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

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Proposed Issuance of a Construction Permit/PSD
Approval to Mississippi Lime Company in Prairie Du
Rocher

Report of the Proceedings of the Public Hearing held
on November 18, 2010, at 7:00 p.m., at the Prairie Du
Rocher Elementary School Gymnasium, 714 Middle
Street, Prairie Du Rocher, Illinois, before Sharon
Valerius, Notary Public and Certified Shorthand
Reporter #084-003349 for the State of Illinois.

Before Hearing Officer
DEAN STUDER
Illinois EPA
1021 North Grand Avenue East
P.O. Box 19276
Springfield, IL 62794-9276

EPA PANEL:
Mr. Christopher Romaine
Mr. Minesh Patel

1 MR. STUDER: Good evening. I've got
2 just a couple of minutes after 7:00, so we're going
3 to go ahead and get started this evening. Can you
4 hear me in the back?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Barely.

6 MR. STUDER: Okay. My name is Dean
7 Studer, and I'm the hearing officer for the Illinois
8 Environmental Protection Agency. On behalf of
9 Director Doug Scott, I welcome you to tonight's
10 hearing. My purpose tonight is to ensure that these
11 proceedings run properly, according to rules, and
12 that the hearing is conducted in a fair but efficient
13 manner. Personally I will not be responding to
14 specific technical issues related to the permit, but
15 will defer such issues to the technical staff with me
16 tonight up here on the hearing panel.

17 This is an informational hearing before
18 the Illinois EPA in the matter of a new air pollution
19 control construction permit, PSD approval for
20 Mississippi Lime Company for a lime manufacturing
21 plant to be located near Prairie Du Rocher. The
22 plant will be located on the site of its existing
23 limestone mine.

24 The plant will produce lime by
25 calcination or high temperature roasting of crushed

1 limestone in rotary kilns. The kilns will be heated
2 through the combustion of solid fuel, notably
3 powdered coal and coke, with pre-heaters used to
4 provide greater efficiency.

5 The plant would be a major source for
6 emissions of sulfur dioxide, otherwise referred to as
7 SO₂, nitrogen oxide, referred to as NO_x, carbon
8 monoxide (CO), and Particulate Matter, PM, PM₁₀, and
9 PM_{2.5}, under federal rules for Prevention of
10 Significant Deterioration, referred to as PSD. And
11 those regulations are found in 40 CFR Section 52.21,
12 as emissions of these pollutants would be above
13 significant emission thresholds established in these
14 regulations.

15 The Illinois EPA has made a preliminary
16 determination that the project meets the requirements
17 for obtaining a permit for the project and has
18 prepared a draft permit for review. The Illinois EPA
19 is holding this hearing for the purpose of accepting
20 comments from the public on the proposed issuance of
21 a permit for this project prior to actually making a
22 final decision on this application.

23 This public hearing is being held under
24 the provisions of the Illinois EPA's procedures for
25 permit and closure plan hearings, which can be found

1 at 35 Illinois Administrative Code, Part 166, Subpart
2 A. Copies of these procedures can be accessed on the
3 website for the Illinois Pollution Control Board at
4 www.ipcb.state.il.us, or they can be obtained from me
5 upon request.

6 An informational public hearing means
7 that this is strictly an information hearing. It is
8 an opportunity for you to provide information to the
9 Illinois EPA concerning this permit. This is not a
10 contested case hearing.

11 I would like to explain how tonight's
12 hearing is going to proceed. First I will have the
13 Illinois EPA staff introduce themselves and identify
14 their responsibilities within the agency in regards
15 to this permitting action. Then a representative
16 from Mississippi Lime will be allowed to make a brief
17 presentation. Following this overview, I will allow
18 the public to provide comments.

19 You are not required to provide your
20 comments orally. Written comments are given the same
21 consideration and may be submitted to the Illinois
22 EPA at any time during the comment period, which ends
23 just before midnight on December 20, 2010. All
24 comments submitted by mail must be postmarked no
25 later than December 20, 2010. Although we will

1 continue to accept comments through that date,
2 tonight is the only time we will accept oral
3 comments.

4 I should also point out that the notice
5 for this hearing lists a comment closing date of
6 December 18, 2010. However, December 18 falls on a
7 Saturday, so I'll accept comments through December
8 20, 2010, which is the first business day after
9 December 18.

10 The tentative target date for a final
11 decision in this matter is December 27, 2010.
12 However, the actual decision date will depend upon
13 the number and nature of comments received, as well
14 as other factors.

15 Any person who wants to make an oral
16 comment may do so, as long as the statements are
17 relevant to the issues at hand. If you have not
18 signed a registration card at this point, please see
19 Brad Frost at the registration table, and he will
20 provide you with a comment card. Please be sure to
21 check the appropriate box on the card if you desire
22 to make comments at this hearing this evening. If
23 you have lengthy comments, it may be helpful to
24 submit them to me in writing before the end of the
25 comment period, and I will ensure that they are

1 included in the hearing record as an exhibit.

2 Please keep your comments and questions
3 relevant to the issue at hand. If your comments fall
4 outside the scope of this hearing, I may ask you to
5 proceed to another issue.

6 The permit applicant, Mississippi Lime
7 Company, is also free to respond to issues if willing
8 to do so, but I am not in a position to require them
9 to do so. Our panel members will make every attempt
10 to respond to issues raised, but I will not allow the
11 speakers to argue or engage in a prolonged dialogue
12 with our panel.

13 For the purposes of allowing everyone
14 to have a chance to comment, I ask that everyone keep
15 their questions and comments to five minutes. This
16 should give everyone who desires to speak that
17 opportunity.

18 In addition, I'd like to stress that we
19 want to avoid unnecessary repetition. If anyone
20 before you has already presented testimony that is
21 contained in your written or oral comments, please
22 skip over those issues when you speak. If someone
23 testifying before you has already said what you
24 desired to say, you may pass when I call your name to
25 come forward. Please remember, all written comments,

1 whether or not you say them aloud at this hearing
2 tonight, will become part of the official record in
3 this matter and will be considered.

4 After everyone has had an opportunity
5 to speak, and provided that the time still permits,
6 we will allow those who either ran out of time during
7 their initial comments or who have additional
8 comments to speak.

9 All who complete a registration card or
10 submit written comments in this matter will be
11 notified of the final decision in this matter and the
12 availability of a responsiveness summary. In the
13 responsiveness summary, the Illinois EPA will attempt
14 to respond to all significant issues that were raised
15 at this hearing or submitted to me prior to the close
16 of the comment period. The written record in this
17 matter again will close on December 20, 2010. I will
18 accept written comments as long as they are
19 postmarked by that date.

20 While the record is open, all relevant
21 comments and documents or data will be placed into
22 the hearing record as exhibits. Please send all
23 written documents to my attention. You can send them
24 to Dean Studer, and that last name is spelled
25 S-T-U-D-E-R, that's Hearing Officer, Office of

1 Community Relations, regarding Mississippi Lime New
2 Air Permit, and that's at Illinois EPA, 1021 North
3 Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276, Springfield,
4 Illinois, and our zip code is 62794-9276. This
5 address is also given on the public notice for this
6 hearing tonight.

7 For anyone wishing to make a comment, I
8 would like to remind you that we have a court
9 reporter here who is taking a record of these
10 proceedings for the purpose of putting together our
11 administrative record. Therefore, for the benefit of
12 the court reporter, please keep the general
13 background noise in the room to a minimum, so that
14 she can hear everything that is said. Also, please
15 silence all cell phones and pagers at this time, if
16 you have not already done so.

17 Please keep in mind that any comments
18 from someone other than the person who is up front
19 may not be recorded by the court reporter. If you
20 speak over someone else, the court reporter will not
21 be able to take down everyone's comments. The same
22 rule applies to both the members of the audience and
23 also when someone from the Illinois EPA Panel is
24 speaking.

25 When it is your turn to speak, please

1 come forward to the podium, state your name, and if
2 applicable, any governmental body, organization, or
3 association that you represent. If you do not
4 represent any governmental body, organization, or
5 association, you may simply state that you are a
6 concerned citizen. For the benefit of the court
7 reporter, I also ask that you spell your last name.
8 If your first name is spelled in an unusual manner,
9 you may also want to spell that.

10 People who have requested to speak will
11 be called upon in the order that I will lay out based
12 upon the cards that I have before me. After I have
13 gone through the cards, and assuming that there is
14 still time, if anyone else wishes to make a comment,
15 I may allow them to do so at that time.

16 I have marked the following exhibits:
17 The public hearing notice is Exhibit 1. The project
18 summary for air pollution control permit application
19 is Exhibit 2. And the draft air pollution control
20 construction permit is Exhibit 3.

21 Are there any questions on how I will
22 conduct this hearing this evening?

23 (There was no response.)

24 MR. STUDER: Let the record indicate
25 that there were no hands raised. I'll now go ahead

1 and turn things over to the Illinois EPA's hearing
2 panel here in front of me this evening. They should
3 introduce themselves, and they may make a brief
4 statement at that time.

5 MR. ROMAINE: My name is Chris
6 Romaine. I manage the construction unit of the Air
7 Permit Section. I'm not going to make a statement
8 tonight. My employee is going to make one for us
9 tonight.

10 MR. PATEL: Good evening, ladies and
11 gentlemen. Welcome to this evening's hearing. My
12 name is Minesh Patel. I am a permit engineer with
13 the Bureau of Air. I will be giving you a brief
14 description of the proposed project.

15 Mississippi Lime Company has requested
16 a construction permit for a lime manufacturing plant
17 at its existing limestone mine located near Prairie
18 Du Rocher. The proposed plant would include two
19 pre-heater rotary kilns, storage and handling systems
20 for limestone, fuel, and lime, and lime hydrating
21 systems.

22 As Mr. Studer has explained, the lime
23 plant is subject to federal regulations for
24 Prevention of Significant Deterioration of air
25 quality, PSD. This is because potential emissions of

1 nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and
2 particulate matter would be greater than 100 tons per
3 year. Accordingly, the plant must use the Best
4 Available Control Technology, referred to as BACT, to
5 control its emissions of these pollutants.

6 For particulate emissions from the
7 kilns, the BACT would be provided by fabric filters
8 or baghouses, which are generally considered the most
9 effective control technology for the particulate
10 emissions from kilns.

11 For emissions of other pollutants from
12 the kilns, BACT would be provided by the pre-heaters,
13 which would lower the fuel consumption of the kilns.
14 In addition, NOx emissions from the kilns would be
15 minimized by combustion management, which would
16 reduce the peak flame zone temperature. SO2
17 emissions are controlled by natural scrubbing by
18 limestone and lime dust in the kilns, which is then
19 captured by the fabric filters or baghouses. CO
20 emissions would be minimized with good combustion
21 practices.

22 For emission units involved in handling
23 and storage of limestone, solid fuel, and lime would
24 be provided by operating practices to prevent
25 emissions and, for the lime product, baghouses.

1 In addition to the Best Available
2 Control Technology, the plant must also perform air
3 quality analyses that assess the potential effect of
4 the proposed plant on ambient air quality. Based on
5 its analysis of the maximum impacts of the proposed
6 plant, and further analysis of PSD increment
7 consumption and maximum ambient concentration, the
8 impact of proposed plant will not be significant.

9 The permit that Illinois EPA is
10 proposing to issue for the plant would include a
11 variety of requirements to ensure that the lime plant
12 is properly constructed and operated.

13 MR. STUDER: Can everyone hear Minesh?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

15 MR. STUDER: Let's see if we can get a
16 mike for him.

17 MR. PATEL: Sorry about that. The
18 proposed permit establishes appropriate testing,
19 monitoring, record-keeping, and reporting
20 requirements. It also includes requirements for
21 continuous emissions monitoring for the kilns
22 emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon
23 monoxide, and opacity.

24 These activities would be overseen by
25 Illinois EPA, which will periodically conduct on-site

1 inspection of plant and review the various reports
2 that plant must submit. We look forward to your
3 questions or comments on this proposed permit, and
4 once again, thank you for attending the hearing.

5 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Minesh. Before
6 we open this up to the public for comments, it is
7 customary at a hearing to allow the permit applicant
8 to make a statement at the beginning of the hearing.

9 MR. KEITH ESPELIEN: Thank you. Let me
10 take just a moment to say thank you and welcome to
11 Mr. Studer, Mr. Patel, and Mr. Romaine, and the court
12 reporter, and Mr. Frost leaving the room. We
13 appreciate you coming to conduct this hearing here in
14 Prairie Du Rocher.

15 We're very excited at Mississippi Lime
16 to take this next step in the process to move forward
17 with our permit application. This has been a
18 three-year process for us thus far, and there's been
19 a lot of excellent work between a variety of
20 regulatory agencies, Mississippi Lime folks who are
21 here tonight, the community, and all of those who
22 either support or possibly don't support the permit
23 application.

24 We believe strongly in the process of
25 going through all of this so everyone has a say in

1 what happens in a community. We want to be a part of
2 this community as Mississippi Lime. There are a
3 dwindling number of lime companies owned by U.S.
4 based companies. Mississippi Lime is one of the
5 remaining companies still headquartered and based in
6 the United States. We hope to be able to expand and
7 grow, support our business, support the families and
8 community of Prairie Du Rocher by building this lime
9 plant.

10 Products from this plant will be used
11 in a variety of ways throughout the nation, including
12 businesses such as steel production, water treatment,
13 paper making, orange juice production. You don't
14 know maybe about all of those, but sometimes lime is
15 used in orange juice production and things of that
16 nature.

17 One of the primary uses may be for
18 scrubbing emissions from power plants, so that the
19 material that we produce here in Prairie Du Rocher
20 will be shipped to become a scrubbing agent and clean
21 up the emissions from power plants along the Ohio
22 River and other places throughout the United States.

23 So we're very excited about the
24 opportunity to make an investment here in the town
25 and become part of this community and move forward

1 with our project. I want to thank you all again for
2 coming. I look forward to the questions. Thank
3 you.

4 MR. STUDER: Just for the record,
5 Keith's last name is spelled E-S-P-E-L-I-E-N.

6 MR. ESPELIEN: Thank you.

7 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Okay. When I
8 call your name, if you want to speak, please come
9 forward to the podium. I would ask that you use the
10 microphone, just so that not only we can hear you on
11 the hearing panel, but also so that those that are
12 seated in the bleachers can hear, as well, since your
13 back will be toward them.

14 When you come forward, please state
15 your name, any governmental body, organization, or
16 association that you represent. And then if you
17 would spell your last name for the court reporter.
18 And the first person is Elizabeth Jill Asbury.

19 MS. ELIZABETH JILL ASBURY: Hello. My
20 name is Elizabeth Jill Asbury, A-S-B-U-R-Y, and I'm
21 the superintendent at the school here in Prairie Du
22 Rocher, so welcome. I had an opportunity last
23 Saturday with the mayor and his wife, Mr. and Mrs.
24 Doiron, to take a tour of Mississippi Lime. And so I
25 wanted to see firsthand what it looked like. And

1 from my experience, what I saw, it was a
2 well-maintained, operated, and controlled facility.

3 I also, as the superintendent of the
4 school here, was concerned about how they would help
5 our community. And from a letter that we received
6 from the Chamber of Commerce, Mississippi Lime has
7 been very generous to St. Genevieve, and so we
8 anticipate that same generosity for our school and
9 our community. Thank you.

10 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Asbury.
11 The next person is Ernie Doiron. One thing I
12 neglected to say is that I will let you know when
13 there's about 30 seconds left in your five-minute
14 time frame, just so that we can make sure that
15 everyone that wants to speak this evening has that
16 opportunity.

17 MR. ERNIE DOIRON: Gonna' have to be
18 lowered a little for me.

19 MR. STUDER: You can hold it. Is that
20 okay?

21 MR. DOIRON: My name is Ernie Doiron.
22 I am the president of the Village Board of Trustees
23 of Prairie Du Rocher. That's usually called the
24 mayor.

25 MR. STUDER: Could you spell your last

1 name for the record, please.

2 MR. DOIRON: D-O-I-R-O-N. Several
3 months ago, a representative of Mississippi Lime met
4 with me and our village clerk, discussing the
5 possibility of a new plant. And since that time, we
6 have had an ongoing discussion with our Village
7 Board. At our last November board meeting, the
8 Village Board unanimously passed a resolution in full
9 support and approval of the proposed plant.

10 To get a different opinion, I contacted
11 St. Genevieve Chamber of Commerce, Dena Kreitler, the
12 executive director. Her response on the phone was
13 very favorable concerning Mississippi Lime, who have
14 been a neighbor of the St. Genevieve community for
15 over a hundred years. And she also followed up with
16 a letter, which Jill alluded to, but I'm just going
17 to read the actual, not the whole letter, to keep it
18 short.

19 But she said: Mississippi Lime has
20 been a part of our history and growth for over 100
21 years. I truly believe that should your community be
22 so fortunate to have this company grow and expand in
23 your community, everyone wins. Not only will it
24 create jobs, it will also create economic development
25 and many other opportunities within your region.

1 Signed Dena Kreitler, Executive Director.

2 I also had the opportunity, with Jill,
3 to tour the Mississippi Lime plant. I was very
4 impressed how clean it was. And I was even more
5 impressed when I watched the computers, which control
6 the data, to make sure that they are in compliance
7 with all the EPA regulations. I would wish that
8 everyone could tour the plant. I would think you
9 would come away with a very good impression. The new
10 technology which they showed us is the technology
11 they're gonna' use at this plant here in Prairie Du
12 Rocher, the very latest, the very best.

13 I believe, and our Village Board
14 believes, that Mississippi Lime is a company owned
15 and operated by good people serving the St. Genevieve
16 area for over a hundred years, providing employment
17 and healthcare, health insurance.

18 And we have people -- I had a lady come
19 to me this week and say, We are gonna' lose
20 everything, 'cause my husband just lost his job. And
21 we need employment in this area. The economic
22 development and the potential for employment with a
23 good solid company, Mississippi Lime Company, is what
24 we need. Thank you.

25 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Doiron.

1 The next person is Kathy Andria.

2 MS. KATHY ANDRIA: My name is Kathy
3 Andria, A-N-D-R-I-A. I don't have formal comments at
4 this point, but I do have some questions. I will ask
5 a few of the questions, and then I'll come back. I'm
6 President of American Bottom Conservancy, and I'm the
7 Conservation Chair for the Kaskaskia Group of the
8 Sierra Club.

9 I certainly appreciate the need for
10 jobs in this town, and we are not here to not support
11 the plant. We are here to support better controls.
12 And I would remind people that whenever there are
13 controls, more better controls, those controls have
14 to be maintained, and there are jobs in producing
15 controls, and there are jobs in maintaining
16 controls.

17 We sit here across from St. Genevieve
18 County, which has the, one of the world's largest
19 cement kilns. The area is already non-attainment for
20 fine particulates, PM2.5, in Madison, St. Claire, and
21 Monroe County and part of Randolph County, Baldwin
22 Township.

23 I'm wondering, first of all, USEPA in
24 their guidance for lime manufacturing, says that the
25 rotary kiln which is proposed here is the second

1 worst in uncontrolled PM emissions, and that
2 fluidized beds have the highest levels of
3 uncontrolled PM emissions.

4 And I'm just wondering whether
5 consideration had been given by the company or by the
6 agency toward requiring stronger controls, because it
7 is my understanding that if the area, if this part of
8 Randolph County becomes non-attainment for fine
9 particulates, that that will, that will have a severe
10 impact on future development. So I was wondering if
11 fluidized beds had been considered as a control, as a
12 separate kind of use for the kiln.

13 MR. ROMAINE: I did not quite follow
14 the comment that you were making. You were
15 commenting about the uncontrolled emissions of
16 different types of plants?

17 MS. ANDRIA: I'm commenting -- well,
18 first I was commenting, just to let you know that we
19 sit across from St. Genevieve County. And my
20 understanding from Missouri DNR is St. Genevieve
21 County is going to be also non-attainment for fine
22 particulates. We're already non-attainment for fine
23 particulates.

24 And I'm just wondering why we're not,
25 to protect the people who live here, to protect the

1 future development of the area, to protect the nature
2 preserves and the historic properties, why we're not
3 requiring them to have better, the fluidized bed,
4 which has a better control, from what I understand,
5 since the rotary is the second worst.

6 MR. ROMAINE: Okay. I guess I still
7 don't understand the question, because you described
8 a technology that had higher uncontrolled emissions.
9 The key factor that we're --

10 MS. ANDRIA: You're right. I'm reading
11 my notes wrong, and I apologize. I will come back
12 with that question.

13 MR. ROMAINE: Okay. Well, you've asked
14 the question.

15 MS. ANDRIA: Okay.

16 MR. ROMAINE: The issue for control of
17 particulate matter from this kiln is the
18 effectiveness of the baghouse or fabric filter on the
19 stack. That's what's being relied upon to control
20 particulate matter emissions. Fabric filters are
21 considered the most effective device for control of
22 particulate matter where they can be applied, and
23 they certainly can be applied to lime filters, lime
24 plants, lime kilns. And the permit would establish a
25 stringent limit for the performance of the fabric

1 filter.

2 In terms of comments with regard to
3 particulate matter air quality, we, as an agency, are
4 concerned about particulate matter air quality. The
5 area that is the focus of those efforts is, in fact,
6 the industrialized St. Louis, Metro East area, the
7 industrialized, heavily developed urbanized area. To
8 bring that area into attainment of the particulate
9 matter standard, there will have to be a number of
10 measures taken that roll back particulate matter
11 emissions from the sources in those areas, as well as
12 regional sources, as well as measures to reduce
13 precursor emissions. Those measures should act to
14 improve particulate matter air quality in outlying
15 rural areas such as Randolph County.

16 The comment was made that Randolph,
17 that Baldwin Township in Randolph County is
18 designated as a non-attainment area. That is not
19 because of the actual air quality in that township.
20 It's because it's the location of the Baldwin Power
21 Plant, and the Baldwin Power Plant has an impact on
22 regional air quality, given the magnitude of that
23 facility.

24 For that reason, USEPA deemed it was
25 appropriate that it be included in the planning, in

1 the efforts to reduce emissions of sources that
2 contribute to non-attainment areas. And they
3 specifically cut out Baldwin Township and said,
4 You're going to have to address your Baldwin Power
5 Plant as if it were in a non-attainment area, because
6 it does contribute to the problems that we are
7 experiencing downwind.

8 It doesn't actually mean that citizens
9 in that community actually experience excessive
10 levels of PM10 air quality. It's simply how we
11 address that plant into the future.

12 I can't speak for the circumstances of
13 St. Genevieve County across the river. I would say,
14 to the extent that Missouri has identified areas in
15 that county that have problems, potentially due to
16 concentrations of sources of development or its
17 impact on the St. Louis area, again, the actions that
18 are taken in that county to reduce emissions and
19 improve quality will have benefits for people living
20 across the river in Randolph County.

21 MR. ANDRIA: They're using, they're
22 going to be using either coal or petroleum coke or a
23 combination of both. Was consideration given, since
24 we're non-attainment, the other three counties are
25 non-attainment for ozone, was consideration given to

1 natural gas?

2 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, it was, as discussed
3 in the project summary that we prepared. I don't
4 know if you have copies of it. We looked at the cost
5 effectiveness of using natural gas and concluded that
6 the cost of using natural gas as a means to control
7 emissions would be excessive.

8 In part, that's because the sulfur
9 dioxide emissions from the plant would be very
10 well-controlled by the scrubbing action of the lime
11 and limestone dust as it passes through the system
12 and is collected in the baghouse. So that the use of
13 natural gas really wouldn't have much of an effect on
14 SO2 emissions.

15 The other difficulty with natural gas
16 is because of the way fuels are burned in a kiln, use
17 of natural gas should also be expected to result in
18 increase in emissions of nitrogen oxides. The
19 nitrogen oxides are a pollutant that has a role in
20 causing ozone, air quality, bad ozone levels. It
21 also has experienced bad effects as a precursor to
22 forming of fine particulate matter.

23 So natural gas has certain benefits
24 certainly. It would be advantageous in terms of
25 perhaps greenhouse gases. But in terms of specific

1 air quality issues, it would be negative implications
2 for nitrogen oxides, which are a concern because of
3 the air quality issues that Ms. Andria has
4 identified.

5 MS. ANDRIA: How much mercury will be
6 emitted?

7 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have that number
8 with us. We'll have to get back to you on that
9 number.

10 MS. ANDRIA: I couldn't find it
11 anywhere in the document.

12 MR. STUDER: One more question, and
13 then we're going to move on.

14 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. One more question.
15 Where will be the closest air monitor, ambient air
16 monitor?

17 MR. ROMAINE: I don't know, off the top
18 of my head. During the break, we can look at our
19 annual ambient air quality report and find out where
20 those are located. Do you happen to know, Kathy, in
21 preparation?

22 MS. ANDRIA: I think maybe perhaps
23 Baldwin. I don't know.

24 MR. ROMAINE: Well, that would be for
25 particulate matter, but --

1 MS. ANDRIA: The nearest one here would
2 be in Missouri, I would assume.

3 MR. ROMAINE: It's quite possible that
4 the other monitors, the nearest monitors would be
5 located across the river in Missouri.

6 MS. ANDRIA: Is there any consideration
7 to adding to the monitoring network?

8 MR. ROMAINE: Umm --

9 MS. ANDRIA: I know you guys are just
10 lush in money.

11 MR. ROMAINE: We certainly have
12 concerns about our monitoring network, but this
13 project doesn't pose the levels of impact that would
14 suggest additional monitoring is needed in this
15 area. We're actually working with the proposed
16 Prairie State Power Plant, and they've actually
17 supplemented our monitoring network. I think they've
18 established another monitor on the outskirts of
19 Belleville, which is much more useful for us to
20 evaluate impacts again on the developed urbanized
21 area, which is the major focus of our efforts to
22 improve air quality. That's where we need to improve
23 air quality.

24 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. Thank you. I will
25 be back with questions after other people have

1 spoken.

2 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Kathy. I'll
3 keep your card up here and call you back when, if
4 time permits, when we get through the cards. The
5 next person is Rodney Linker.

6 MR. RODNEY LINKER: Thank you. My name
7 is Rodney Linker, L-I-N-K-E-R. And I have two
8 perspectives from which I'd like to comment tonight.
9 First as a resident, landowner, and taxpayer of
10 Illinois, I support a business that can effectively
11 utilize a resource which our region is fortunate to
12 have available and who demonstrates compliance in
13 excess of those required to meet the ambient air
14 quality standards.

15 Any company willing to invest in
16 recovery of these types of mineral assets should have
17 a right, responsibility, and purpose for the people
18 of this country to do so. Lime is a basic material
19 that has been used for centuries and represents
20 nothing of a new or uncertain consequence. I
21 encourage IEPA to issue this permit for the benefit
22 of jobs in this community and the region, for the tax
23 base it represents, and the support of the needs of
24 others who use this resource.

25 Secondly, as an officer of the company

1 who quarries limestone in St. Genevieve, Missouri,
2 and as a current board member of that state's
3 Limestone Producers Association, I wish to encourage
4 the issuance of permits to those companies that have
5 exhibited responsibility in the past, achieved safety
6 awards and recognition for their attention to
7 employee training and well-being, and who have
8 supported their communities in which they operate.

9 Numerous companies mine and process
10 limestone in this region for a variety of purposes.
11 I expect all of the regulatory agencies to treat each
12 equally, fairly, and explicitly within the guidelines
13 of the existing statutes. The resulting message is
14 one that provides equal opportunity, benefits all
15 miners, educates and protects the general public, and
16 culminates in the realization that the system works.

17 While I do not imply that I promote
18 this particular company, I do encourage issuance of
19 the subject permit, inasmuch as I would expect it to
20 be issued if I were the applicant. Thank you.

21 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Linker.
22 The next person, if I can pronounce the last name
23 correctly, is it Roger Melliere?

24 MR. ROGER MELLIERE: Roger Melliere,
25 M-E-L-L-I-E-R-E. I am a concerned resident of this

1 town. It kind of -- you guys kind of explained to me
2 already that basically when you said about the
3 emission things or whatever were gonna' be over in
4 St. Genevieve, that basically kind of says you're not
5 really, that ain't gonna' help us out here, because
6 winds here are north and south. So the emissions
7 really ain't gonna' show us here how bad it is, when
8 you got it over there in St. Genevieve, and we get
9 north and south winds here.

10 Two, you basically kind of explained or
11 basically kind of said already, or you haven't said
12 that it's not gonna' pollute our air. I think it's
13 gonna' pollute our air. You basically kind of, you
14 know, didn't say it's not gonna' pollute our air. We
15 have enough health reasons, problems in this
16 community already. I think adding another one to
17 this is just gonna' add more to it.

18 To me, I do understand some people are
19 hurting for jobs and money. But to me, you can't put
20 a price on health. I don't care how much money you
21 make in life. And to me, as a resident living here,
22 I mean, I'm a farmer. Honestly, if I would be
23 farming and this would get developed, I probably
24 would move. I'll be honest with you.

25 To me, my kids are the most important.

1 What they come to school and go out on recess and
2 have to inhale this every day, I wouldn't say every
3 day, but every time we get a north wind, you guys can
4 say that, oh, it's gonna' be, you know, nice to live
5 around. But can you honestly tell me it's not gonna'
6 pollute any more air to it? I mean, it's gonna' be
7 one hundred percent, you know, to be lived by?

8 I mean, is it gonna' be, umm -- can you
9 honestly sit there and tell me that it's gonna' be a
10 hundred percent safe to live by, not gonna' have any
11 health risks in the future, nothing's gonna' affect
12 us? You basically kind of said on the papers that
13 it's gonna' produce, I don't remember what all it
14 says, that it's gonna' produce some things out of it
15 that basically you're kind of admitting that yeah,
16 it's gonna' pollute the air.

17 So, I mean, that's just my concern.
18 And I feel that -- I'll be honest with everybody
19 here. I don't want it. I mean, I do understand it's
20 gonna' bring money to the town or whatever. But to
21 me, money doesn't mean everything when it comes to
22 health reasons in the future. You know, you might
23 make a million dollars one day, but if three years
24 later you're not here to use it, what's the use of
25 making it? That's just my point.

1 MR. ROMAINE: We certainly respect your
2 opinion, and we have no dispute with your personal
3 opinion. We're here simply to tell you that we have
4 reviewed the application. The information that has
5 been provided to us shows that this project would
6 comply with the applicable requirements. That
7 includes keeping air quality within levels that have
8 been established and refined by the United States
9 Environmental Protection Agency as being safe for
10 public exposure. Can we say that there will be
11 absolutely no effect from this plant? Certainly
12 not. But the effects should not be of a level that
13 should affect public health.

14 MR. ROGER MELLIERE: So basically,
15 you're saying yes, it's gonna' pollute the air?

16 MR. ROMAINE: Absolutely. We are in
17 the business of permitting sources of emission to
18 make sure they comply with the applicable
19 requirements to minimize the impact, and in areas
20 that have clean air, like Prairie Du Rocher currently
21 does, to maintain clean quality air.

22 MR. ROGER MELLIERE: As it currently
23 does, we have clean air now. But when that facility
24 is put up, we won't have the same clean air.

25 MR. ROMAINE: There will be slightly

1 more emissions in this area, but it should still
2 qualify as clean air.

3 MR. STUDER: We're starting to diverge
4 on dialogue here, and dialogue is something that I
5 don't permit at hearings. So if you have comments,
6 continue. I don't mean to interrupt you, but --

7 MR. ROGER MELLIERE: I'll just, I'll
8 just state out that I'm against it. You know, I
9 don't care how much money it brings. Honestly,
10 people, if this gets built, in five, ten years down
11 the road, it's, oh, you know, it's starting to give
12 them problems, they're gonna' grandfather it in.
13 They're gonna' say that, oh, you know, it's too late,
14 you know, you can't change anything.

15 And then before you know it, there's a
16 lot of things start happening. You're gonna' see the
17 school close. People are gonna' wise up, and they're
18 gonna' be like, you know what? I'm moving. My kid
19 ain't gonna' come to this school. You gotta' think
20 of that. That's all I have. Thank you.

21 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Looks like we
22 have, if I can pronounce it, Margo Asselmeier? It
23 looks like -- I can't read the writing. It looks
24 like it's M-A-R-E-G-O is the first name, and
25 Asselmeier.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't want to
2 speak.

3 MR. STUDER: Did you want to make
4 comments?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

6 MR. STUDER: No? Okay. Harry Glenn?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I pass.

8 MR. STUDER: Thank you. The next
9 person would be Gene Clerc. It looks like
10 C-L-E-R-C.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Pass.

12 MR. STUDER: Okay. That was a pass?
13 Okay. Mark Wilson?

14 MR. MARK WILSON: Hi. My name is Mark
15 Wilson, and I'm just a concerned citizen. And, you
16 know, basically I think everybody wants to promote
17 economic development. And I think the biggest
18 concern with everybody would be the environmental
19 impact and long-term effects of exposure to, you
20 know, the pollutants that are going into the air.

21 And I've got a couple of questions. I
22 mean, there was a period of about 14 years where
23 Mississippi Valley Lime had a 26 percent increase in
24 their emissions. And the last one that I found was
25 in 2002, where, and for whatever reason, I can't find

1 any data beyond that.

2 But, you know, at the time, in 2002,
3 there was 172,000 pounds of sulfuric acid, 156,000
4 pounds of hydrochloric acid, 1,511 pounds of lead
5 compounds, and 33 pounds of mercury compounds. Three
6 of those four are cancer-causing carcinogens, which,
7 to me, you know, again, based on the total
8 environmental releases and the pollution score cards,
9 Randolph County is one of the, is ranked in the
10 highest, the 20 percent highest counties for
11 hazardous air pollutants. And granted, I think
12 Illinois Power is probably the primary cause for that
13 in Randolph County, but that's me.

14 But the question I have is, over a
15 period of time, you know, I can definitely see when a
16 company comes in and they begin working, and they're
17 really being closely monitored, they're gonna' be,
18 they're gonna' maintain their filters, change them
19 out, do whatever's necessary to try and do the clean
20 air. And I've got a feeling that over a period of
21 time, maybe they get a little lax in the
22 maintenance.

23 And what I'm getting at is, again, in
24 the period of 1988 to 2002, there was an increase of
25 26 percent in emissions. I mean, that, I guess

1 that's known for the total environmental releases.
2 When you see an increase in emissions like that, does
3 the EPA flag something and say, Wait a minute, what's
4 going on? Do they come in and do an investigation or
5 some kind of research to find out why are your
6 emissions increasing, what can be done to reduce
7 those emissions?

8 MR. ROMAINE: I guess I first need to
9 back up. I'm not familiar with the data that you're
10 referring to.

11 MR. WILSON: It came from a pollution
12 score card, www.scorecard.org, for total
13 environmental releases and toxic chemical releases.

14 MR. ROMAINE: Well, then part of the
15 issue is, if it's the environmental score card, is
16 it's reporting not only emission releases but
17 wastewater releases, and it's potentially solid waste
18 from a facility.

19 MR. WILSON: Well, in this particular
20 one, the total environmental releases -- and again,
21 this was based on 2002 rankings. Again, there
22 could've been improvements between now and then, and
23 but, you know, at the time, they ranked 90 to 100
24 percent, which was like dirtiest/worst facilities in
25 the U.S. And as far as non-cancer risk score, they

1 were also 90 to 100 percent, which was dirtiest/worst
2 facilities. As far as cancer risk scores, they were
3 in the 70 to 80 percent, which, you know, again, on
4 the upper edge of the dirtiest to worst facilities.

5 So, you know, when I look at this, and
6 again, you know, I had some questions up front. And
7 a gentleman from the EPA was saying, yeah, this is
8 reliable data. So I have to ask myself, you know,
9 right now the plant's not there. You bring the plant
10 in, we've got pollution that we didn't have before.
11 So yeah, there is an increase. And it does concern
12 me.

13 I'm just wondering, when it's up and
14 running and everything's going, does the EPA walk
15 away, or do you -- I know you guys continually, they
16 always have to get their emissions and send you that
17 data, and you guys compile it. But at some point in
18 time, do you flag it when you see those emissions
19 start increasing, saying, Hey, what's going on? Are
20 we not filtering it properly? What's going on?

21 MR. ROMAINE: Well, certainly we check
22 the data. If there's something changing, we're
23 curious why. I really can't comment on that 26
24 percent increase, particularly as it involves, I
25 think, things other than emissions. It could simply

1 mean that they had 26 percent production increase in
2 that period of time and doing more business.

3 MR. WILSON: Well, this particular,
4 what I'm talking about did not count, it wasn't
5 counting any kind of waste that was transported off
6 site. It was emissions in the air, sulfuric acid,
7 hydrochloric acid, lead compounds, mercury compounds.

8 MR. ROMAINE: Again, I can't comment on
9 it without having seen it in advance.

10 MR. WILSON: All right. I mean, my
11 main concern is that, again, it's the emissions. If
12 I knew one hundred percent that it was controlled and
13 monitored and if for some reason, filters, the
14 maintenance of your filtration system wasn't being
15 maintained properly, that somebody would raise a
16 flag, it would be investigated, and something would
17 be done about it.

18 I mean, right now, I realize that a lot
19 of times people have a tendency to turn the other way
20 and sometimes, you know -- well, I'm not gonna' go
21 into that.

22 MR. ROMAINE: Well, in terms of
23 monitoring, the kilns would be required to be
24 continuously monitored for their emissions of CO, for
25 carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide.

1 Those are the primary pollutants emitted by the kiln,
2 and that would provide solid data on a continuing
3 basis for the performance of the kilns.

4 In addition, monitoring is required for
5 opacity of the exhaust, which is an indicator of the
6 performance of the baghouses for controlling the
7 particulate matter emissions.

8 MR. WILSON: One thing I want to be
9 real, real clear about. When I talked about the
10 total environmental releases and the non-cancer risk
11 scores and stuff and I said it was in the 90 to 100
12 percent dirtiest/worst facilities, that doesn't mean
13 the cleanliness of the plant itself. It's strictly
14 talking about the emissions coming out. Okay? I
15 mean, I heard some comments talking about how they
16 took tours to the plant and it was really clean and
17 everything looked great. That's not what this is
18 talking about.

19 MR. ROMAINE: Well, you know, that
20 database, in fact, I think they're reporting on the
21 toxics release inventory developed by the USEPA. The
22 purpose of that database, the reporting requirements,
23 was to focus attention on releases of hazardous
24 materials in wastewater, in solid waste, in
25 emissions, so that sources would take measures to use

1 other types of materials or minimize the uses of
2 those materials to reduce releases to the
3 environment. And the program has been effective in
4 that regard.

5 MR. WILSON: Okay. That's all I have.

6 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Tiffany
7 Stellhorn?

8 MS. TIFFANY STELLHORN: Thank you. My
9 name is Tiffany Stellhorn, S-T-E-L-L-H-O-R-N, and I
10 am a concerned citizen. Going off of his comment,
11 it's to my understanding that a plant, if they pass
12 regulations so often, they get pollution points. Is
13 that correct? As some kind of incentive to keep your
14 plant clean, to be low on emissions, do they get
15 pollution points?

16 MR. ROMAINE: I'm not familiar with
17 pollution points.

18 MS. STELLHORN: No incentive for
19 keeping them clean or anything like that?

20 MR. ROMAINE: No. Plants are supposed
21 to comply with regulations, period.

22 MS. STELLHORN: Okay. All right. Then
23 these pollution points are then, I'm done. Thank
24 you.

25 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Suzanne

1 Wilson?

2 MS. SUZANNE WILSON: You guys didn't
3 shuffle these cards at all, did you?

4 MR. STUDER: What's that?

5 MS. WILSON: You guys didn't shuffle
6 these cards at all, did you? All three of us are
7 related.

8 MR. STUDER: I generally don't shuffle
9 them.

10 MS. WILSON: I'm just teasing. I want
11 to thank you for letting me speak a little bit here.
12 My name is Suzanne Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N, and I am a
13 concerned citizen. I just have a few questions, not
14 very many. Well, now I have a concern. Earlier when
15 you were talking about the air monitor closest
16 location -- thank you to the lady that brought that
17 up -- I was not aware that you weren't even
18 considering putting one in Prairie Du Rocher. You're
19 thinking more closer to Belleville. And I'm kind of
20 like, why so far away?

21 MR. ROMAINE: Oh. The simple answer
22 for that is, we're monitoring the emissions as they
23 come out of the stack, which is a much more reliable
24 measure to assure that the facility's emissions are
25 within acceptable levels. The purpose of ambient

1 monitoring is to address the combined impact of
2 emissions from many sources, as well as motor
3 vehicles. And accordingly, we place monitors in
4 locations where we have more concentrated
5 population.

6 MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you. I've
7 also heard rumors in regards to jobs being
8 increased. How many jobs is it going to create in
9 order to build the plant?

10 MR. STUDER: That's a little outside of
11 Illinois EPA's --

12 MS. WILSON: Oh, okay.

13 MR. STUDER: You know, we don't address
14 non-environmental issues.

15 MS. WILSON: Gotcha'. Okay. Then why
16 did you choose Prairie Du Rocher for the plant?

17 MR. ROMAINE: Again, we're the Illinois
18 EPA. We're regulating the plant. We are not
19 Mississippi Lime.

20 MS. WILSON: Okay. So those are
21 questions I need to direct to them.

22 MR. ROMAINE: Mississippi Lime is the
23 company. They went through their business process.
24 They obviously have a resource of limestone in the
25 area and believed it was appropriate to develop a

1 lime facility, utilizing that resource. But that's a
2 decision that the company made, the source made.

3 MS. WILSON: Gotcha'. Okay.
4 Basically, those are my main concerns. If those line
5 of questions you can't answer, then I will finish
6 with my conclusion. But I do just want to state that
7 I can see both sides of the road here. I can see
8 where yes, it'll bring jobs to the area. I can see,
9 you know, progress. But it just concerns me.

10 And I appreciate you being able to give
11 us the information after this meeting with all the
12 answers and the opportunity to be able to e-mail you
13 more questions, 'cause I'm sure I will have more
14 after I hear all this. So thank you very much.

15 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Gerald Mill?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I pass.

17 MR. STUDER: You pass?

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's already been
19 asked.

20 MR. STUDER: Sheryl Prange, or is it
21 Prange?

22 MS. SHERYL PRANGE: My name is Sheryl
23 Prange, P-R-A-N-G-E.

24 MR. STUDER: I really did a number on
25 that one. I'm sorry.

1 MS. PRANGE: That's okay. And I'm
2 representing the Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing
3 Drainage and Levee District. The project that's
4 under discussion here is located within the
5 boundaries of that district, and the commissioners
6 have just asked me to express their support of the
7 project that's being proposed. Thank you.

8 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Daryl Clerc?

9 MR. DARYL CLERC: My name is Daryl
10 Clerc, C-L-E-R-C. I'm a concerned citizen. And I'd
11 like to preface this by stating that I think it's
12 great that a sound company like Mississippi Lime
13 would consider building a plant here. As far as I
14 know, they are, you know, they have a good
15 reputation.

16 However, my question concerns what
17 recourse Prairie Du Rocher has if the EPA limits are
18 found to be too high? Probably many people here
19 aren't aware of the scope and size of the plant. And
20 I'm quoting here from the EPA application. The plant
21 will be allowed to generate 1,533 tons per year of
22 nitrogen oxide, 1,095 tons per year of carbon
23 monoxide, 283 tons per year of SO₂, 52.3 tons per
24 year of PM_{2.5}. That's particulate matter having size
25 below 2.5 microns. And 22 tons per year of volatile

1 organic materials.

2 Okay. So really, those are just the
3 numbers, but that's pretty much equivalent to a
4 midsize power plant. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I
5 looked up like some power plants in Kentucky, and
6 they have similar emissions. So it's like a
7 medium-size power plant.

8 So if, let's suppose this plant's up
9 and running. What do we do if the air starts getting
10 bad here? I mean, you know, what recourse does a
11 town have? Well, you know, we can monitor at the
12 stack, but that doesn't account for the circulation
13 in the air and perhaps forming pockets along the
14 bluffs. I know it's difficult to model air flow
15 around bluffs.

16 I think there should be more monitoring
17 stations, not St. Gen or Belleville, but there should
18 be some here to account for the bluffs, 'cause they
19 don't have bluffs in Belleville, whereas we do here.
20 So we need a station in this town. And ideally,
21 periodic testing by an independent testing facility.
22 I think all of that should be built into the permit,
23 so that, you know, the process is in writing for, you
24 know, the recourse that the citizens in the town have
25 to address, you know, the air quality.

1 And also, it should include the
2 increased diesel truck traffic to and from the town.
3 We're looking at about 80 to 100 trucks a day. You
4 know, that should be included in the emissions
5 analysis. Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

6 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Michael, is it
7 Sabo or Sabo?

8 MR. MICHAEL SABO: Good evening. My
9 name is Michael Sabo, S-A-B as in boy O. I'm from
10 Prairie Du Rocher, G Road. And, uh, so I'm a
11 resident and a concerned citizen. Umm, I'd like to
12 thank you for bringing up the issue of the wastewater
13 release, because the previous understanding, I
14 understand this is the air division, but this hearing
15 officer, I'd appreciate it -- I don't expect you to
16 know this -- but when you get back up to Springfield,
17 to find out if an NPDES water permit has been issued
18 for this, and if there hasn't, when the public
19 hearing is gonna' be, that would be nice, so again,
20 we can have people turn out for that.

21 MR. STUDER: Let me explain how the
22 NPDES system works. And that is basically when that
23 application is received by our agency, we'll review
24 it and make a preliminary determination on that. If
25 it is such that we would, you know, consider issuing

1 a permit, we would public notice that. You would
2 then have the opportunity then to comment on the
3 draft permit and/or request a public hearing at that
4 time.

5 MR. SABO: Well, if there is one, I'd
6 like to request a hearing.

7 MR. STUDER: That has to be done during
8 the --

9 MR. SABO: I understand.

10 MR. STUDER: -- specific notice --

11 MR. SABO: I understand.

12 MR. STUDER: -- pursuant to federal
13 regulations.

14 MR. SABO: Yeah. I'll keep an eye out
15 on my public notices. So my understanding is, the
16 Best Available Control Technology is determined by
17 the fuel source that is ultimately used in the plant;
18 is that correct? That's a strong determinant on what
19 we call BACT?

20 MR. ROMAINE: Umm, I guess that's a
21 pretty general statement. I'm not sure where you're
22 going with it.

23 MR. SABO: Okay. Well, if there wasn't
24 sulfur in the fuel source, you wouldn't be concerned
25 about sulfur dioxide emission?

1 MR. ROMAINE: That's correct. Well, I
2 shouldn't say that. Sulfur also is present in the
3 limestone, but the more significant concern is the
4 sulfur in the fuel, yes.

5 MR. SABO: So for when you were
6 considering the natural gas solution, I'm assuming
7 you looked at various design options on how fast to
8 heat the fuel so that you could use low NOx burners
9 and such with the fuel source. I guess my question
10 is, do they present a plan to you, and then you
11 comment on it as part of this review process? Or is
12 it more like a give and take, they say we want to
13 build one, and then you like throw out some fuel
14 sources, and then they say, okay, well, we can work
15 around this?

16 MR. ROMAINE: Under this permitting
17 process for a major project, they put forward the
18 project they're proposing. As part of their
19 application, they have to include an analysis of the
20 various alternatives that might be used as Best
21 Available Control Technology to minimize emissions.

22 MR. SABO: Uh-huh.

23 MR. ROMAINE: So as part of the
24 application, for example, Mississippi Lime evaluated
25 what would be the consequences, for example, of using

1 natural gas as a fuel.

2 MR. SABO: So, you know, obviously, you
3 know, a lot of times power plants use a combination
4 of cyclon separators, baghouses, and electrostatic
5 precipitators. And I'm just curious why there was no
6 requirement to use electrostatic precipitators as a
7 final cleansing step on this.

8 MR. ROMAINE: Generally in
9 circumstances where baghouses are practicable
10 devices, they're considered more reliable and more
11 effective than a baghouse. That's not to say that
12 electrostatic precipitators can't be very effective.
13 But they pose certain challenges that aren't, they're
14 not as straightforward to operate, from my
15 perspective, as simply putting in a baghouse which
16 filters the dust out of the exhaust.

17 MR. SABO: I'm curious, since even
18 though I'm Prairie Du Rocher mailing address, I live
19 up on the bluff, as opposed to down here in the
20 ditch. And how often did your organization do any
21 modeling on the frequency of temperature inversions
22 in the Mississippi Valley? And if so, how does the
23 temperature inversion affect the short-term exposure
24 to the people in the area?

25 MR. ROMAINE: Well, I can't

1 specifically speak to the inversion issue. The
2 modeling that was conducted is based on a five-year
3 period of meteorology. So it looks through five
4 years, hour by hour data, and evaluates what is the
5 worst or the highest impacts under that set of
6 meteorology. So and it's a very thorough analysis
7 that would certainly, you know, I would expect would
8 be sufficient to address the particular circumstances
9 here, given the data. But beyond that, I'd have to
10 go back to our modelers to see how they actually
11 addressed the circumstances.

12 MR. SABO: Well, the reason I asked
13 this is because the National Weather Service data
14 climatology data for Prairie Du Rocher is actually
15 Sparta Airport. Sparta's a little bit different
16 topography speaking, wide open, flat, like much of
17 Illinois, as opposed to here where we basically live
18 in a bucket.

19 MR. ROMAINE: Uh-huh.

20 MR. SABO: So correct me if I'm wrong,
21 but the air pollution regulations for NOx and PM and
22 carbon dioxide, there's also a section in there for
23 radionuclide emissions; correct?.

24 MR. ROMAINE: That's correct.

25 MR. SABO: Did you take into -- I guess

1 I'm wondering when you were comparing whether or not
2 you're reaching the threshold on that, obviously, you
3 know, pet coke and coal are sources in the norm. I
4 was wondering what samples you used for those, the
5 outputs from those fuels.

6 MR. ROMAINE: At this point, the
7 standards for radionuclides do not apply to
8 commercial fuels. The USEPA has not found it
9 necessary to develop standards for use of commercial
10 fuels.

11 MR. SABO: Okay. So basically, any
12 radon emitted from this site is treated differently
13 from the same quantity that would be emitted from a
14 nuclear power plant then, because it's a different
15 set of regulations; is that correct?

16 MR. ROMAINE: Yes. That's the simple
17 answer.

18 MR. SABO: That's great.

19 MR. ROMAINE: Obviously, radioactive
20 power plants have radioactivity in substantial
21 quantities and are appropriate for regulation to
22 assure that radioactivity is not released to the
23 environment. That risk or those circumstances are
24 not present with a conventional power plant or
25 conventional use of --

1 MR. SABO: So the quantities released
2 by this facility will not be maintained on an
3 inventory or anything like that?

4 MR. ROMAINE: I don't think so, no.

5 MR. SABO: Well, I think that answered
6 my questions. Thank you so much.

7 MR. STUDER: Very good. Thank you.
8 Steve, is it Castleberry?

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He just stepped out.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He went to the
11 restroom.

12 MR. STUDER: Okay. I'll put him one
13 card back, and we'll come back to him. It looks like
14 Chris, is it Melton?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think that's
16 Martin.

17 MR. STUDER: Okay. I apologize for
18 that. I couldn't quite read it.

19 MR. CHRIS MARTIN: No. It's actually
20 my printing. Thank you. My name is Chris Martin,
21 M-A-R-T-I-N. I'm the coordinator for Randolph County
22 Economic Development under the auspices of the
23 Randolph County Progress Committee. I just wanted to
24 say this evening that we're all about jobs. And we
25 know that this will create long-term 30 plus or minus

1 jobs, in the short-term 100 jobs, and that's what
2 we're about is creating jobs.

3 We're also about creating wealth in the
4 community, and that truly only happens when you have
5 a manufacturing or a mining process, and this is a
6 mining process. And we know that this money will
7 turn over in this community three to five times
8 before it leaves the community. And that will
9 greatly benefit Prairie Du Rocher and Randolph
10 County. And I appreciate your allowing me to speak
11 this evening. Thank you.

12 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Did Mr.
13 Castleberry come back?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Here he comes.

16 MR. STEVE CASTLEBERRY: My name is
17 Steve Castleberry, C-A-S-T-L-E-B-E-R-R-Y. I'm the
18 environmental compliance manager for Mississippi Lime
19 Company. I've worked for industry for over 31 years
20 and have been doing environmental work for 25 years.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear him.

22 MR. CASTLEBERRY: Sorry. I have
23 assisted in the preparation and review of this permit
24 application and believe the draft permit as presented
25 is protective, appropriate, stringent, and

1 economically feasible. I assure you, Mississippi
2 Lime will comply with all permit conditions and
3 monitoring requirements.

4 Now I want to change hats. My name is
5 Steve Castleberry. I'm a resident of Glen Carbon,
6 Illinois. I've lived in the state for over 17
7 years. My great grandparents homesteaded in
8 Springfield, Illinois, and I've reason to believe I
9 have relatives buried here in Prairie Du Rocher.

10 My children were educated in Illinois,
11 and they've since moved on in search of employment
12 elsewhere. And I want to just conclude, as a private
13 citizen, saying this project will bring jobs to this
14 community and provide sustained benefits over the
15 life of the project. Thank you.

16 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr.
17 Castleberry. Okay. That concludes the first round
18 of those that had registered to speak. Is there
19 someone that registered to speak or, for that matter,
20 didn't register to speak and has not spoken that
21 would like to speak this evening?

22 MR. GEORGE CHRISTIANSEN: George
23 Christiansen, C-H-R-I-S-T-I-A-N-S-E-N. Whether for
24 or against this project, as a concerned citizen and
25 resident, what impact does our questions, comments,

1 and concerns have upon the Illinois EPA in your
2 decision giving this permit or not giving this
3 permit? That's it.

4 MR. ROMAINE: Want me to take that?

5 MR. STUDER: Yes.

6 MR. ROMAINE: What we're here for
7 tonight is obviously we're addressing concerns simply
8 pro and con, jobs, whatever. What we're really
9 concerned about is technical issues raised about the
10 proposed project and whether it will comply with the
11 applicable regulations, whether we've done our job
12 properly in terms of evaluating the project and
13 assuring compliance with applicable emission
14 standards and requirements.

15 The comments that are made tonight
16 about economic development really don't sway us very
17 much. We're much more interested and I heard
18 comments with regard to more monitoring stations,
19 independent periodic testing, other substantive
20 issues. That is what we're really listening to hear,
21 'cause those are the things that can affect our
22 decision or influence the content of a permit if we
23 decide the permit is warranted, but there are
24 additional features that should be included in that
25 maybe.

1 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Is there
2 anyone else that has not spoken this evening that
3 would like to do so?

4 MS. JUDY POUR: Hi. My name is Judy
5 Pour, P-O-U-R. My question is, what about the
6 families that are only about 3 to 400 yards from
7 there? How will it affect them?

8 MR. ROMAINE: The analyses that are
9 done with the monitoring, in fact, address off-site
10 impact, so we do not do monitoring to address on-site
11 impacts, which are the responsibility of OSHA. But
12 our analysis starts at the fenceline or in a location
13 where a member of the public would be living or, you
14 know, present, hunting, walking, or whatever.

15 MS. POUR: So there was no analysis
16 done for people that are that close?

17 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, that's what I'm
18 saying, because they would be beyond the fenceline.
19 Those are exactly the people that we've addressed.

20 MS. POUR: Okay.

21 MR. STUDER: Sir, if you'd come forward
22 and state your name and spell your last name,
23 please.

24 MR. RONNY INMAN: I didn't have a card,
25 and I've listened to some of these people's

1 concerns. My name is Ronny Inman, I-N-M-A-N. I've
2 lived in St. Genevieve for 31 years. When I came to
3 -- I run a business, manage a business, a rock
4 quarry. I also am president of the Chamber of
5 Commerce and president of the New Bourbon Port
6 Authority, which owns the ferry.

7 When I was given the opportunity to
8 come to St. Genevieve 31 years ago, I had kids in
9 grade school and high school -- for people concerned
10 about their health -- and was given the opportunity
11 to live within a 50-mile radius. Knowing that
12 Mississippi Lime was already there, looking at the
13 schools and looking at Mississippi Lime, I brought
14 four children from grade school into high school.

15 Three of my children still live there.
16 My oldest son, both my sons worked at the quarry.
17 One still does. Both have college degrees. They've
18 raised their children. I've got grandchildren from
19 grade school up into high school and college that was
20 all raised in St. Genevieve.

21 I'll be 68 years old in less than ten
22 days. Still healthy. I live on the bluff within a
23 quarter of a mile where Mississippi Lime loads their
24 limestone, south of that. And I have not experienced
25 any health problems. I can understand their

1 concerns, but they've been a competent company. I
2 think they'd be pleased to have them as a neighbor.

3 MR. STUDER: Thank you. One more time,
4 is there anyone else that has not spoken that would
5 -- sir?

6 MR. GERALD MELLIERE: My name is Gerald
7 Melliere, M-E-L-L-I-E-R-E. What Mississippi Lime has
8 in Missouri, that's not what they're gonna' put here;
9 right? What you're developing here is different than
10 what they got over there. All they got is a quarry
11 over there; right? They're not building -- that's
12 not what you're proposing to build here. That's
13 different; right?

14 MR. ROMAINE: I'm not familiar with the
15 operations across the river. Does Mississippi Lime
16 wish to comment?

17 MR. GERALD MELLIERE: They don't have
18 the kilns over there, do they, like they're gonna'
19 build here?

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

21 MR. GERALD MELLIERE: They've got these
22 big vats?

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just saw them last
24 Saturday.

25 MR. GERALD MELLIERE: Then why do they

1 need one here, if there's one that close?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You need to ask
3 someone that's here, let him explain that.

4 MR. STUDER: Okay. It's going to be
5 really difficult for the court reporter to take down
6 what's said if we start going in this manner. So if
7 someone --

8 MR. GERALD MELLIERE: Well, I just want
9 to make -- if this is the same thing that they got,
10 that's gonna' be built here, that St. Genevieve's
11 got, is that what they're gonna' build here?

12 MR. STUDER: And I think we've said
13 that we're not familiar with what they've got on that
14 side, so we can't answer that question.

15 MR. KEITH ESPELIEN: I can interrupt
16 and clarify that --

17 MR. STUDER: If you'd come forward.

18 MR. ESPELIEN: -- off the record or on
19 the record. Keith Espelien, E-S-P-E-L-I-E-N. Can
20 you rephrase the question for me one more time? It
21 sounded like, is the plant that we're building or
22 would like to build here the same as we've got in St.
23 Genevieve? The plant in St. Genevieve is a very
24 large operation with a lot greater capacity than what
25 would be here in Prairie Du Rocher.

1 We have an underground mine in St.
2 Genevieve. We would have an underground mine here in
3 Prairie Du Rocher. We have many, many kilns on the
4 surface in St. Genevieve. Here the permit
5 application is for two kilns and a hydrating system.
6 So it's a much smaller operation than what we have in
7 St. Genevieve.

8 There were a couple of questions about
9 why here, and someone addressed that with a comment
10 about this was where the reserve is. These type of
11 limestone reserves are not prevalent throughout the
12 entire United States. So you go where the stone is.
13 Some companies have to ship the stone in from long
14 distances away, and that makes having a viable
15 operation very difficult.

16 Other lime businesses, like many
17 businesses that we're in today, it's a challenge.
18 You work hard to make money, whether you're out in
19 the plant, or in the mine, or in the office. And so
20 you look for the areas where you can develop an
21 operation, support a business, and grow along with
22 the community. That's why we're here asking for this
23 in Prairie Du Rocher. This is where the stone is.

24 The growth that we're looking to supply
25 is north and east of here primarily. Being on this

1 side of the river has logistical advantages. Believe
2 it or not, we can work really hard all day long, all
3 night long, and it'll cost more to ship the product
4 than we sell it for.

5 So getting a little bit of a logistical
6 advantage on truck freight, rail freight, barge
7 freight, helps us make a go of it in the world. So
8 that's why we're interested in building something in
9 this area. This is where the stone is. Thank you.

10 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Is there
11 anyone else that has not spoken this evening that
12 wants to speak? Okay. With that, we have one person
13 that I believe ran out of time. So Kathy Andria, if
14 you'd like to come forward.

15 MS. KATHY ANDRIA: I wanted to first of
16 all address the people, the concerned citizens who
17 expressed concern about health. You do have reason
18 to worry about the health. This plant, as one person
19 suggested, would emit 283 tons of sulfur dioxide,
20 1,500 tons of nitrogen oxide, 1,000 tons of carbon
21 monoxide, 106 tons of fine particulates. There are
22 carcinogens. There are all kinds of things.

23 Google these chemicals and find out
24 what the health impacts are. Go to the library, and
25 you'll find out. Fine particulates cause heart and

1 lung disease and premature death. They had did a
2 study with what Diamond G at Baldwin was emitting and
3 how many deaths were caused. Those are a lot of
4 statistics that you need to know, and you should be
5 concerned about your children.

6 I'm curious. I have a lot of quick
7 questions. One of the questions, you said that you
8 weren't going to use natural gas because the cost was
9 excessive. Well, I wondered when that had been
10 evaluated, at what point, because natural gas is
11 pretty darn cheap right now. In fact, a coal plant
12 in Ohio just announced today that it was closing,
13 because natural gas was so cheap. So when was that
14 evaluation done? What was the price of natural gas?

15 MR. ROMAINE: The evaluation was, our
16 evaluation was completed shortly before we released
17 the draft permit for review. The assumption was that
18 natural gas would only cost \$3 more per million BTU
19 than coal.

20 MS. ANDRIA: And I also wanted to
21 address Mr. Romaine's statement that you didn't have
22 to worry, as one citizen was worried about the
23 assurances that the air be clean, and Mr. Romaine
24 said, well, they're in the business of giving
25 permits, so that, and the permits will comply with

1 IEPA regulations and air quality standards.

2 I come from Granite City. IEPA's given
3 a whole bunch of permits up there. The air is not
4 clean. We have really serious problems. We have an
5 abundance of children with asthma from the fine
6 particulates. From the Granite City Steel, we have
7 all kinds of people who have cancer. We have lots
8 and lots of cancer, heart disease. And they've even
9 done a study that just was released about diabetes
10 and fine particulates.

11 So go to the library, Google these
12 things, go to the American Lung Association site.
13 Find out about these things. You have a right to be
14 concerned. But don't rely on their assurances that
15 your air is gonna' be clean. It will never be the
16 same once a plant like this starts running.

17 And you have such a lovely town here,
18 and it's a tourist attraction, and people come here
19 to nature preserves, come here to the fort, come here
20 for all kinds of things. So be active and get
21 involved. And if anybody wants to talk to me after
22 the meeting, I'd be happy to. Because USEPA has
23 announced and the Supreme Court decision said that
24 the greenhouse gases are a pollutant, why are you
25 continuing to refuse to do a greenhouse gas BACT?

1 MR. ROMAINÉ: Greenhouse gases are not
2 yet a regulated pollutant.

3 MS. ANDRIA: What if they are in two
4 months? Then what?

5 MR. ROMAINÉ: Then in two months, we
6 would have to do a BACT analysis.

7 MS. ANDRIA: But this would be
8 grandfathered in.

9 MR. ROMAINÉ: The only difference would
10 be that there would be a formal analysis for
11 greenhouse gases. This plant is being developed to
12 use pre-heaters, which are the technology that
13 maintains, you know, that reduces fuel consumption,
14 which is the technique that would be used to minimize
15 emissions of greenhouse gases from a lime plant.

16 MS. ANDRIA: I looked at this permit,
17 and I didn't go through the whole permit, but I
18 looked at it, and I compared it to the Vulcan permit,
19 which is also a lime processing plant, and I'm a
20 little confused about it. The PM emissions for this
21 plant are twice as much as Vulcan's, while other of
22 the lime emissions are lower. Can you explain why?

23 MR. ROMAINÉ: That's an incorrect
24 understanding. The difference between this permit
25 and the Vulcan permit is this permit -- it's a plan

1 for another proposed lime plant in Northern Illinois
2 -- is that the Best Available Control Technology
3 limits for the Vulcan plant are expressed per ton of
4 limestone input into the lime kiln, whereas the BACT
5 limits for this plant are proposed to be set in terms
6 of tons of lime output from the kilns. So it's a
7 difference between emission units based on output
8 versus emission limits based on input.

9 In fact, the lime output from a kiln is
10 about half the limestone input. So if you compare
11 them appropriately, you'll see that this plant has
12 emission limits that are similar or slightly better
13 than the limits that are proposed for Vulcan, which,
14 again, is a different location, different size,
15 producing a different quality of limestone.

16 MS. ANDRIA: Particulate -- your chart
17 on annual emissions has three different problems for
18 particulates. One that just says PM, another says
19 PM10, and a third says PM2.5. Could you explain the
20 differences, and is there a total of 250 something
21 tons?

22 MR. ROMAINE: This is referring to page
23 3 of the project summary that we prepared. Those are
24 separate listings for each form of particulate
25 matter. The potential emission, that is the amount

1 of particulate matter emissions looking at all
2 particulates regulated would be 107 tons. That would
3 be the same number for particulate matter 10. The
4 particulate matter 2.5, which is of particular
5 concern and has been mentioned, would only be
6 potential emissions of particulate matter 2.5 would
7 only be 53.2 tons. Those numbers are not added.

8 MS. ANDRIA: PM2.5 is the kind of
9 pollutant, that particulate that bypasses, it goes
10 deep into the lungs and can even go into the
11 bloodstream and the heart. So I just wanted to
12 know. That's 52 tons per year. Did you model
13 compliance with one-hour NOx and SO2 according to EPA
14 guidance?

15 MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

16 MS. ANDRIA: Did you set one-hour
17 limits, rather than average over more than an hour?

18 MR. ROMAINE: Do you have that on the
19 top, Minesh? The limit that would be proposed as set
20 for nitrogen oxides is a three-hour average.

21 MS. ANDRIA: We elicit comments on
22 that. We would request that it be on a one-hour.
23 The permit assumes that BACT is equal to a case by
24 case BACT. Are there end units subject to a case by
25 case BACT, and if so, which ones?

1 MR. ROMAINÉ: I didn't follow the
2 question.

3 MS. ANDRIA: Are there any units
4 subject to a case by case BACT?

5 MR. ROMAINÉ: Yes.

6 MS. ANDRIA: Which ones?

7 MR. ROMAINÉ: The ones that are not
8 subject to emission standards pursuant to USEPA's
9 adopted regulations for hazardous air pollutants. So
10 it includes things, lime handling, for example, that
11 would be an example.

12 MS. ANDRIA: Is there a scrubber for
13 SO₂?

14 MR. ROMAINÉ: There is not an add-on
15 scrubber for SO₂. The kiln would be processing high
16 calcium limestone. High calcium limestone provides
17 very good levels of inherent dry scrubbing from the
18 limestone dust and the lime dust that's formed in the
19 kiln that's then caught in the baghouse.

20 MS. ANDRIA: The gentleman who referred
21 to the meteorology about the modeling that you've
22 done and this being a valley, that's a very important
23 thing that you make sure that you've done the right
24 modeling, because the whole thing, the American
25 Bottom is in a valley, and we do have temperature

1 inversions. And I know the air better up north from
2 here, and it just sits on top of people. And so you
3 have, and the air isn't moving, so you're breathing
4 really heavily for several days, especially in the
5 summer. Are there any proposed regulations that have
6 not yet gone into effect, but that you know are
7 coming, that would impact this permit?

8 MR. ROMAINE: Not that I'm aware of,
9 no.

10 MS. ANDRIA: Isn't there a new
11 regulation?

12 MR. ROMAINE: You've already mentioned
13 greenhouse gases, but other than that, no.

14 MS. ANDRIA: I know that there are new
15 regs coming for cement kilns, but that's not --

16 MR. ROMAINE: Lime kilns are not cement
17 kilns.

18 MS. ANDRIA: Did the agency check all
19 of the modeling that the company did? Did your
20 modeling staff check, or did you accept their word
21 for the modeling that was submitted?

22 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have the answer
23 for that.

24 MS. ANDRIA: I would request that
25 answer.

1 MR. ROMAINE: Okay.

2 MS. ANDRIA: And if your modeling unit
3 hasn't verified the accuracy of the modeling, which I
4 mean, modeling to me is all smoke and mirrors
5 anyway. I don't believe it, and you all get the
6 results because you put in what you want to get out
7 of it. But we would request that any modeling that
8 they've handed in, that it be verified by the
9 agency.

10 You didn't know how much mercury, but
11 do you know how much lead will be emitted?

12 MR. ROMAINE: Do we have a number for
13 lead?

14 MR. PATEL: Yeah. On a yearly basis,
15 it's 0.0008.

16 MS. ANDRIA: Tons; right? 0.008, three
17 zeros?

18 MR. PATEL: Four zeros.

19 MS. ANDRIA: No. Zero point, and then
20 four zeros or just three?

21 MR. PATEL: Four zeros then 8.

22 MS. ANDRIA: How much is that in tons?
23 Can you tell me?

24 MR. PATEL: That is in tons.

25 MS. ANDRIA: No. I mean in pounds.

1 I'm sorry. I'm not a mathematician.

2 MR. STUDER: We don't have a calculator
3 here. We'll respond to that.

4 MS. ANDRIA: Well, he's an engineer.

5 MR. ROMAINE: It's less than a pound.

6 MS. ANDRIA: Is it really? Okay. I'm
7 very surprised at that.

8 MR. PATEL: 1.6.

9 MR. ROMAINE: 1.6.

10 MR. STUDER: He says 1.6. He did it
11 longhand.

12 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. Thank you. And the
13 lime kiln dust is used for the control of SO₂; is
14 that what you said?

15 MR. ROMAINE: Yes.

16 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. Is there an
17 alternative control for that?

18 MR. ROMAINE: For SO₂? No.

19 MS. ANDRIA: How many tons is there a
20 limit per day? I was a little confused about that.
21 Is it 2,400?

22 MR. PATEL: For?

23 MS. ANDRIA: Tons per day of lime,
24 limestone.

25 MR. ROMAINE: Yes, the production limit

1 would be 2,400 tons per day monthly average.

2 MS. ANDRIA: And I know that Mr. Sabo
3 was talking to Mr. Studer. I thought that they had
4 gotten the NPDES.

5 MR. STUDER: I'm not aware that it has
6 been gotten. I don't honestly know if there is an
7 application in-house.

8 MS. ANDRIA: Maybe they could answer.
9 They have an engineer here.

10 MR. STUDER: If they want to answer,
11 they can answer on the NPDES. If they don't want to
12 answer, I can't compel them to answer.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We've received our
14 permit already.

15 MR. STUDER: Okay. They've got their
16 NPDES permit, you are correct.

17 MS. ANDRIA: Yeah. I agree with Mr.
18 Sabo, it's a shame that people didn't know about it,
19 'cause I'm sure people would be very interested in
20 commenting on that. And I don't know -- I know that
21 NPDES permits are -- I don't know where they, you
22 find out about them. I go on the EPA website to find
23 out.

24 MR. STUDER: All of them are posted on
25 the web page when they are on public notice.

1 MS. ANDRIA: But this was before people
2 even knew there was gonna' be a plant, an air permit,
3 so they wouldn't have known.

4 MR. STUDER: We have to take action on
5 an application when we get it. We can't necessarily
6 time it based on some outside criteria, so --

7 MS. ANDRIA: I would encourage the
8 agency to try to expand the use of some way of
9 notifying the public, the interested public, the
10 affected public.

11 MR. STUDER: Sure. If you have
12 suggestions, we'd be glad to see those, if you have
13 suggestions, Kathy.

14 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. When will the
15 transcript be posted on the website?

16 MR. STUDER: We are anticipating
17 receiving the transcript in about two weeks, so I
18 would say two to two and a half weeks is what our
19 target is. It may be slightly later than that
20 depending on, you know, because it falls over the
21 holidays, but that's what we're targeting for.

22 MS. ANDRIA: Could you tell the people
23 how to --

24 MR. STUDER: I will do that before we
25 close tonight.

1 MS. ANDRIA: -- go to the website, so
2 that they can read --

3 MR. STUDER: Yes. I will explain where
4 the transcript will be located.

5 MS. ANDRIA: Terrific. And I agree
6 with the gentleman who had concerns about what
7 recourse, if the air is bad. Because once they're
8 up, they're up, and it takes an act of God or
9 something to close them. So, you know, take on
10 notice and find out what you can and submit your
11 comments. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

12 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Andria.
13 Kathy brought up a question --

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I make one more
15 statement later before it's over?

16 MR. STUDER: Yes. You have to come
17 forward, too.

18 MR. ROGER MELLIERE: Roger Melliere.
19 One statement I want to make again before you guys
20 leave, before you guys make your decision. In this
21 town, basically in this bottoms, we have very heavy
22 air a lot of times. When people burn leaves in this
23 town, you'll see it get about bluff level, and it'll
24 hang all the time. Before you make your decision,
25 please come around that time when somebody's burning

1 leaves and you'll see how the air really travels in
2 this area. And I think we'll have that same problem
3 with this plant. We'll have the air, and it'll hang,
4 and it'll drop. This air in these bottoms is
5 different than above the bluff.

6 And also, before you make your
7 decision, make it upon hopefully if you were to live
8 next to it, would you really want to live next to
9 it? You know, don't, please don't let big money talk
10 you into it, you know. Please make your decision on
11 if you wanted to be next to it the rest of your
12 life. Thank you.

13 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Before I make
14 the announcement about where you can find the
15 transcript, I'll do that right now, just so that
16 everyone has that. If you go to the Illinois EPA web
17 page, and that is www.epa.state.il.us. And that is
18 the generic web page for Illinois EPA.

19 On the front page of the web page, as
20 you scroll down the front page, you'll come to a
21 place that says "Public Notice." And if you click on
22 "Public Notice," it'll take you to our general
23 public notices. The transcript will appear on the
24 second page when you click on "Public Notice," when
25 it is put on the web page.

1 It'll be a date, and it'll say the
2 Mississippi Lime Company transcript. And if you
3 click on that, it will take you to the transcript
4 itself.

5 I also point out that in the same
6 manner, when we complete and take final action on
7 this, our responsiveness summary will also be posted
8 on that web page. Those of you that have registered
9 this evening will receive notification, and we will
10 let you know of the availability of the
11 responsiveness summary and what our final decision in
12 this matter is.

13 I remind everyone that the record is
14 open for an additional 30 days, and we welcome
15 written comments. Even if you have spoken this
16 evening and you would like to file comments in
17 writing, you are certainly free to do that, and we
18 will consider those comments before we take final
19 action in this matter. Is there anyone this evening
20 that would like to speak?

21 MS. ANDRIA: I have a question.

22 MR. STUDER: Yes, Kathy.

23 MS. ANDRIA: Since they're going to be
24 using coal, where would the coal ash go? Is that
25 going to be stored on site?

1 MR. ROMAINE: Do you recall, Minesh?

2 MR. PATEL: The permit does not allow
3 coal to be stored at, coal ash to be stored at the
4 plant, so I'm thinking it would be going out.

5 MS. ANDRIA: So they will have to, if
6 EPA, which is currently accepting comments until
7 Friday, about the coal ash will be, could be a
8 hazardous waste, then they will have to, whether they
9 do it under C or D, they have to put it somewhere
10 else? Is that what you're saying? It's not gonna'
11 be on site?

12 MR. ROMAINE: The permit that we're
13 proposing to issue does not address on-site disposal
14 of ash, so it would have to be appropriately handled
15 by sending it to an appropriate off-site disposal
16 facility.

17 MS. ANDRIA: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. STUDER: Thank you.

19 MS. JUDY POUR: I have one more
20 question. Are you aware that the piece of property
21 that I was saying 3 or 400 yards, that Mississippi
22 Lime will own everything around it, the 15 acres?
23 Those people will be affected one way or another.
24 And how tall will the towers be?

25 MR. ROMAINE: How high are the stacks?

1 MS. POUR: Yes.

2 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have that at my
3 -- it'll be obviously tall. That's part of the
4 approach to addressing --

5 MS. POUR: Well, it's gonna' determine,
6 like you said, when you have, depending on how tall
7 they are, and when you have the bluffs. And again, I
8 lived across from this all my life. I played over
9 there. My brother did, as well. So we know, you
10 know, what it's like, you know, 300 400 yards from
11 there. But again, it's going to affect, 'cause if
12 it's not too tall, it's going to hover. So it will
13 affect people, and, you know --

14 MR. ROMAINE: And I guess I'm not sure
15 I answered your previous question. What I was trying
16 to say is that we look for everybody off the
17 property. We start at the property line and work our
18 way further away from the plant. You know, if we see
19 the highest impacts a foot, you know, right off the
20 property line, that's where they have to show
21 compliance with the air quality standards. If it
22 happens to be further distance away, that's where
23 they have to show compliance with the air quality
24 standards.

25 The only place that we're not looking

1 for the quality of the air with this plant would be
2 on the actual fenceline where the public couldn't
3 go. But where the public could go is where we're
4 obligated to protect air quality.

5 MS. POUR: It's still stuck in the
6 middle, so --

7 MR. STUDER: I thank you for your
8 attendance this evening, and I again remind everyone
9 that the record is open for an additional 30 days to
10 accept written comments. Thank you. This hearing is
11 adjourned.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)

2)

3 COUNTY OF JACKSON)

4

5

6 I, Sharon Valerius, a Freelance Court
7 Reporter for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify
8 that I reported in machine shorthand the EPA Public
9 Hearing held on November 18, 2010, from 7:00 p.m.
10 till 8:50 p.m., at the Prairie Du Rocher Elementary
11 School Gymnasium, 714 Middle Street, Prairie Du
12 Rocher, Illinois; that I thereafter caused the
13 foregoing to be transcribed into computer-aided
14 transcription, which I hereby certify to be a true
15 and accurate transcript of the same.

16

17 Dated this 25th day of November, 2010.

18

19

20

21

22

FREELANCE COURT REPORTER

23

24

25