

1 ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
TAYLORVILLE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
2 TAYLORVILLE, ILLINOIS

3
4 CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE
OF A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT/PSD APPROVAL TO
CHRISTIAN COUNTY GENERATION
5 IN TAYLORVILLE, ILLINOIS

6
7
8 PUBLIC HEARING

9
10 DECEMBER 1, 2011

11
12
13 Hearing panel:

14 Mr. Dean Studer, Hearing Officer
15 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
16 Mr. Bob Smet, Permit Engineer
17 IEPA Bureau of Air

18
19 Mr. Chris Romaine, Manager of Construction
20 IEPA Air Permit Section

21
22 Court Reporter: Rhonda K. O'Neal, CSR/RPR

23
24 (Starting time of hearing: 7:04 p.m.)

I N D E X

1

Speakers: Page

2 Dean Studer.....3

Bob Smet.....10

3 Chris Romaine.....12

Larry Carson.....13

4 Eric Kahle.....18

5 Alan Lauher.....19

6 Greg Brotherton.....20

7 Dick Adams.....24

8 Patricia Rykhus.....28, 72

9 Will Reynolds.....33

10 Joyce Blumenshine.....37

11 Amy Allen.42

12 Olivia Webb.....44

13 Katie Mimnafugh.....46

14 Suhail Barot.....48

15 Michael Murphy.....50

16 Alan Rider.....53

17 Jim Deere.....56

18 Phil Gonet.....58

19 Brian Perbix.....65

20 John Curtin.....69

21 Pat Peterson.....70

E X H I B I T S

22

23

24 (None.)

1 (On the record at 7:04 p.m.)

2 MR. STUDER: Good evening. My name is Dean
3 Studer, and I'm taking it you can all hear me in the
4 back? Okay. Too loud for anybody? No? Okay.

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

11 This is an informational hearing for the
12 Illinois EPA regarding the proposed issuance of an air
13 pollution control construction permit and PSD approval
14 for the Taylorville Energy Center. The permit that is
15 the subject of tonight's hearing will take the place
16 of the original construction permit issued for the
17 Taylorville Energy Center. The draft permit also
18 replaces a previous draft permit that would have
19 extended the original construction permit. In this
20 regard, the current proposal for the Taylorville
21 Energy Center and the current draft permit address a
22 plan that we produce substitute natural gas and
23 generate electricity.

24 The Illinois EPA has reviewed Christian

1 County Generation's current application for the
2 Taylorville Energy Center and has made a preliminary
3 determination that the application for the project
4 meets the requirements for obtaining a permit and has
5 prepared a draft permit for review. Due to the
6 significant interest in this project, the Illinois EPA
7 is holding this hearing for the purpose of explaining
8 the draft permit and accepting comments from the
9 public on the draft permit prior to actually making a
10 final decision in this matter.

11 This public hearing is being held under the
12 provisions of the Illinois EPA's procedural -- excuse
13 me -- procedures for informational permit hearings
14 which can be found at 35 Illinois Administrative Code,
15 Part 166, Subpart A. Copies of these procedures can
16 be accessed on the website for the Illinois Pollution
17 Control Board at www.ipcb.state.il.us or can be
18 obtained from me upon request.

19 I would like to explain how tonight's
20 hearing is going to proceed. First, we will have the
21 Illinois EPA staff introduce themselves and if they so
22 desire, make a brief statement. Following this, Larry
23 Carson, Director of Air Programs for Tenaska, will
24 make a statement for Christian County Generation. I

1 will then allow the public to provide comments.

2 You are not required to provide your
3 comments orally. Written comments are given the same
4 consideration and may be submitted to the Illinois EPA
5 at any time during the comment period which will end
6 at midnight on December 31, 2011. All comments
7 submitted by mail must be postmarked no later than
8 December 31, 2011. Although we will continue to
9 accept comments through that date, tonight is the only
10 time that we will accept oral comments.

11 The tentative target date for a final
12 decision in this matter is March 1, 2012. The actual
13 decision date will depend upon the number of comments
14 received, the substantive content of those comments,
15 as well as other factors.

16 Those wishing to make oral comments tonight
17 should indicate on their registration card that they
18 would like to comment. If you have not completed a
19 registration card at this point or if you desire to
20 speak at this hearing and did not indicate so on your
21 card, please see Brad Frost at the registration table.

22 All those registering tonight will be
23 notified of the final decision in this matter and will
24 be told how they may obtain a copy of the

1 responsiveness summary in this matter. If you have
2 lengthy comments or questions, it would be helpful to
3 submit them to me in writing before the end of the
4 comment period, and I will ensure that they are
5 included in the hearing record as exhibits.

6 Please keep your comments and questions
7 relevant to the issues at hand. If your comments fall
8 outside the scope of this hearing, I may ask you to
9 proceed to another issue. All speakers have the
10 option of directing questions to either the Illinois
11 EPA's panel, or they may make general comments, or
12 they may do both.

13 The permit applicant, Christian County
14 Generation, is also free to answer questions if
15 willing to do so, but I am not in a position to
16 require them to answer questions. Our panel members
17 will make every attempt to answer the questions
18 presented, but I will not allow the speakers to argue
19 or engage in prolonged dialogue with our panel.

20 For the purpose of allowing everyone to
21 have a chance to comment, I'm asking that comments be
22 held to four minutes. Groups, organizations, and
23 associations should consider appointing one
24 representative to initially ask questions and make

1 comments. This should give everyone who desires to
2 speak that opportunity. Once the opportunity to speak
3 has been extended to all who have indicated their
4 desire to do so on the registration card, I will ask
5 if there are others who have not spoken that would
6 like to do so, provided that time allows. After
7 everyone has had an opportunity to speak, and provided
8 that time still allows, I will allow those who either
9 ran out of time during their initial comments or who
10 have additional comments to speak.

11 In addition, I'd like to stress that we
12 want to avoid unnecessary repetition. If anyone
13 before you has already presented testimony that is
14 contained in your written or oral comments, please
15 skip over these when you speak. Please remember, all
16 written comments, whether or not you say them out
17 loud, will become part of the official record in this
18 matter, and they will be considered.

19 In the responsiveness summary for tonight's
20 hearing, the Illinois EPA will attempt to answer all
21 relevant and significant questions that were raised at
22 this hearing or submitted to me prior to the close of
23 the comment period. Again, the written record in this
24 matter will close on December 31, 2011. I will accept

1 written comments as long as they are postmarked by
2 that date.

3 While the record is open, all relevant
4 comments and documents or data will be placed into the
5 hearing record as exhibits. Please send all written
6 documents to my attention. You can send them to Dean
7 Studer -- that's D-e-a-n, last name is S-t-u-d-e-r --
8 Hearing Officer, Office of Community Relations,
9 regarding Christian County Generation, Illinois EPA,
10 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276,
11 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276. This address is
12 also listed on the public notice for tonight's
13 hearing.

14 I would like to remind everyone that we
15 have a court reporter here who will be taking a record
16 of these proceedings for the purpose of putting
17 together our administrative record. Therefore, for
18 the benefit of the court reporter, please keep the
19 general background noise in the room to a minimum so
20 that she can hear everything that is said.

21 Please keep in mind that any comments from
22 someone other than the person who is up front may not
23 be recorded by the court reporter. If you speak over
24 someone else, the court reporter will not be able to

1 take down everyone's comments. Comments are to be
2 addressed to the hearing panel, and that's the three
3 of us sitting up front.

4 When it is your turn to speak, please state
5 your name and if applicable, any governmental body,
6 any organization, or association that you represent.
7 If you do not represent any governmental body,
8 organization, or an association, you may simply
9 indicate that you are a concerned citizen. For the
10 benefit of the court reporter, I will also ask that
11 you spell your last name. If there are alternate
12 spellings for your first name, you may choose to spell
13 your first name as well.

14 Those who have requested to speak will be
15 called upon in the order that I will lay out based
16 upon the cards that I have before me. After I have
17 gone through the cards, and assuming that there is
18 time, if anyone else wishes to comment, I will allow
19 them to do so at that time.

20 Are there any comments on how we will
21 proceed during this hearing tonight?

22 (None.)

23 For the record, indicate that no one raised
24 their hand.

1 I'll now ask the Illinois EPA staff to
2 introduce themselves, and if they would like to make
3 short opening statements, they may do so at this time.
4 This will be followed by Christian County Generation
5 making a brief statement.

6 MR. SMET: Good evening. My name is Bob
7 Smet, and I am a permit engineer in the Illinois EPA's
8 Bureau of Air. I will be giving you a brief
9 description of the project and pending application.

10 Christian County Generation has applied to
11 the Illinois EPA for an air pollution control
12 construction permit for the Taylorville Energy Center.
13 This plant would produce substitute natural gas to be
14 put into natural gas pipelines and generate
15 electricity to be put out onto the grid. The plant
16 would use Illinois coal as a feedstock. It would be
17 located roughly two miles northeast of Taylorville.

18 The core of the plant is the gasification
19 block, which produces the substitute natural gas. The
20 gasification block consists of a series of processes
21 that convert coal feedstock into a raw syngas and
22 clean up and convert that syngas into substitute
23 natural gas. Coal gasification, with its syngas
24 cleanup processes, is very effective in removing

1 sulfur and ash from the substitute natural gas that it
2 produces.

3 Electricity would be produced by two
4 combustion turbines in the power block at the plant.
5 The turbines would combust substitute natural gas that
6 is produced at the plant, or natural gas.

7]The emissions of the plant would be
8 controlled with Best Available Control Technology.

9 For the gasification block, several control
10 devices and techniques must be employed. Vent gases
11 during startup, shutdown and upsets must be controlled
12 by flaring. Oxidizers for the control of organic
13 compounds and carbon monoxide must be used in the vent
14 streams from the acid gas recovery unit. For the
15 sulfur recovery unit, a thermal oxidizer followed by a
16 caustic scrubber must be used during startup, shutdown
17 and upsets to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide.

18 For the turbines, Low-NOx combustors and a
19 selective catalytic reduction unit will be used to
20 control emissions of nitrogen oxides. Use of
21 substitute natural gas and natural gas as fuel in the
22 combustion turbines will minimize emissions of sulfur
23 dioxide and particulate matter. Emissions of
24 greenhouse gases will be controlled by the design

1 efficiency of the turbines.

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

5 The air quality analysis for the project
6 submitted by Christian County Generation shows that
7 the project would not cause or contribute to
8 violations of ambient air quality standards.

9 The permit contains limitations on and
10 requirements for operation of the plant. The permit
11 also establishes appropriate testing, monitoring,
12 recordkeeping, and reporting requirements. This
13 includes continuous emissions monitoring for the
14 combustion turbines' emissions of nitrogen oxides and
15 carbon monoxide.

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

21 MR. ROMAINE: Good evening. My name is
22 Chris Romaine. I'm manager of construction in the air
23 permit section. I just want to make sure that you are
24 aware of a recent development, in the likely event you

1 are not, that has occurred since we released the draft
2 permit.

3 On this Wednesday, Senate Bill 678 was
4 approved by the Illinois Senate, and it will now be
5 going before the Illinois House. This is a bill that
6 would make or set forth the process by which the
7 Taylorville Energy Center could become a clean coal
8 facility for purposes of the Illinois Clean Coal
9 Portfolio Standard.

10 If this bill is adopted and becomes law and
11 Christian County Generation proceeds under the
12 Illinois Clean Coal Portfolio Standard, it would have
13 important consequences for sequestration of carbon
14 dioxide. In particular, under state law, Christian
15 County Generation would have to sequester at least 50
16 percent of the carbon dioxide generated by the
17 gasification block starting with the plant it is to
18 operate. Thank you again for coming to this evening.

19 MR. STUDER: Thank you. And we will now
20 have opening statement from Tenaska.

21 MR. CARSON: Thank you. On behalf of
22 Christian County Generation, I'd like to thank IEPA
23 for being here tonight and for setting up and running
24 this hearing. I'd also like to thank all of you for

1 being here tonight. We appreciate your efforts. We
2 continue to think we have a very exciting and good,
3 great project here and would like to hear comments on
4 how we might make this a better project with respect
5 to the air quality permit.

6 So without going into a lot of background,
7 how did we get here this evening? The draft permit
8 that's currently undergoing public comment reflects an
9 update to a previously-issued permit that reflects
10 several design changes necessitated by the Illinois
11 Clean Coal Portfolio Standard law that Mr. Romaine
12 just discussed. Several of these design changes are
13 important to note tonight.

14 The first one I'd like to talk about is the
15 addition of equipment necessary to capture greater
16 than 50 percent of the carbon dioxide that would
17 otherwise be emitted. This equates to greater than
18 2.5 million tons per year or in units that others are
19 apparently more familiar with, that's over 5 billion
20 pounds of carbon dioxide that would be sequestered
21 each year.

22 In support of the implementation of carbon
23 capture sequestration are two new rules I'd like to
24 briefly mention that have been recently promulgated,

1 the first of which is a rule under the Safe Drinking
2 Water Act, the Underground Injection Control program.
3 EPA recently developed a new well type, Class 6 wells,
4 specifically for geologic sequestration. So these
5 rules would govern the sequestration of carbon dioxide
6 underground specifically as opposed to other more
7 general well types.

8 The second rule I'd like to mention is
9 under the Clean Air Act, the Greenhouse Gas Reporting
10 Rule. EPA recently promulgated a separate subpart
11 under CFR Part 98 for the geologic sequestration of
12 carbon dioxide which will, sets out the monitoring and
13 recordkeeping and reporting requirements for doing so.

14 The other design change that's very
15 important to mention this evening is the addition of a
16 methanation (sp) step in the gasification process
17 which converts synthetic natural gas, syngas, into
18 cleaner substitute natural gas or SNG. These design
19 changes result in a couple things. The first is
20 operational flexibility. What this does is it
21 de-couples the gasification and power blocks which
22 allows them to operate independently of each other.

23 The SNG produced in the gasification block
24 will now be able to be consumed either on site in the

1 power block, or if, when the power block is not being
2 dispatched, can be sold into existing commercial
3 pipelines. The power block now becomes fuel-flexible
4 in that it can operate on SNG produced on site in the
5 gasification block, or if the gasification block is
6 down for preventive maintenance, it can also be fired
7 on pipeline natural gas.

8 These design changes, more importantly,
9 also result in significant air quality benefits. In
10 addition to the CO2 that will be sequestered, this
11 design change results in overall reduction in
12 facility-wide air emissions of greater than 340 tons
13 per year or about 12 percent over the previous design
14 and previous permit.

15 I'd also like to mention that we recently
16 requested from the EPA a 90 percent reduction in
17 mercury emissions allowed from what's currently in the
18 draft air permit. That would result in the final
19 permit authorizing only 20 pounds per year. This is
20 an 85 percent reduction from the original air permit.

21 I would also like to thank IEPA for their
22 comprehensive one-and-a-half-year review process for
23 this application that resulted in the 138-page draft
24 permit currently out for public comment.

1 I also wanted to mention that the draft air
2 permit contains Best Available Control Technology
3 limits for all applicable pollutants including the new
4 requirements to greenhouse gases.

5 And then I think it's important to note, if
6 I'm not mistaken, this is the first and only
7 power-generating facility in the state of Illinois
8 that has greenhouse gas limits in its air permit.

9 So with the reduction, 90 percent reduction
10 in mercury emissions and the two and a half million
11 tons of CO2 to be sequestered each year, no electric
12 generating facility operating anywhere in the world
13 utilizing coal as the primary feedstock meets or
14 exceeds the proposed emission performance of this
15 facility design.

16 Before I close, I'd like to mention that I
17 have a letter of support here from Congressman Shimkus
18 that I'd like to enter into the record. And with
19 that, I'd like to again thank IEPA for being here and
20 all of you, and I look forward to hearing your
21 comments. Thank you.

22 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Carson. Okay.
23 We are ready -- when I call your name to come forward,
24 if you'd come forward to the podium, and then if you'd

1 say your name, spell your last name, and let us know
2 if you're representing any governmental body,
3 association, or organization. The first person that I
4 have is Eric, it looks like Kahle.

5 MR. KAHLE: Thank you very much for the
6 opportunity. My name is Eric Kahle, K-a-h-l-e. I'm
7 here representing the Greater Taylorville Chamber of
8 Commerce, and we're here because we're excited about
9 the opportunities the construction of this power plant
10 will bring to our community. \$350 million in
11 expenditures in our community and a \$3.5 billion
12 project will mean more jobs, more business, increased
13 tax revenue, and increased economic spending.

14 As a member of the business community, we
15 also understand the need for clean fuel, clean
16 utilities, and higher emitting facilities that will
17 replace those that are causing more pollution. This
18 project has been well-considered and well-received in
19 the area, and we firmly believe it will be one of the
20 cleanest energy projects in the world. We appreciate
21 the IEPA's speedy consideration and approval of the
22 Taylorville Energy Center air quality permit. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Kahle. Next

1 person is Alan, looks like Lauher.

2 MR. LAUHER: Good evening. I'm Alan
3 Lauher, L-a-u-h-e-r. I am president of the Central
4 Illinois Building and Construction Trades Council. On
5 behalf of the 9,000 craftsmen and women we represent,
6 I urge the EPA to extend the permits and approve them
7 quickly for the Taylorville Energy Center. This
8 project can, so this project can move forward for the
9 benefit of Taylorville, Christian County, and all of
10 central Illinois.

11 The working men and women of central
12 Illinois desperately need good-paying jobs that
13 provide benefits for their families. Taylorville
14 Energy will provide these jobs. Not just construction
15 jobs, but mining jobs, jobs in transportation, real
16 estate, restaurants, and all segments of our economy
17 here in central Illinois. Taylorville and central
18 Illinois need this boost of this project and the jobs
19 it will bring.

20 Once again, we ask that the EPA quickly
21 approve the permitting process. I believe Tenaska and
22 Taylorville Energy Center has thus far met all
23 requirements that have been asked of them, have done
24 the necessary engineering and design changes to stay

1 current with all state law and provisions of the air
2 quality standards. We ask that you move this forward
3 so that we can bring jobs here, we can bring jobs
4 here, and we can bring jobs for the future for
5 Taylorville and for Christian County and central
6 Illinois. Thank you.

7 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Lauher. Next
8 person will be Greg Brotherton, and that will be
9 followed by Dick Adams.

10 MR. BROTHERTON: Thank you. First name is
11 Greg, G-r-e-g; last name is Brotherton,
12 B-r-o-t-h-e-r-t-o-n. And I'm currently serving as
13 mayor of the city of Taylorville. I've lived in this
14 city most of my life, over 48 years. I grew up here,
15 I met and married my wife here, I raised my kids here,
16 and a few years ago, I buried my father here. This is
17 my home. And I only want the best for it and its
18 citizens.

19 By now it should be no surprise to anyone
20 that the city of Taylorville supports the Taylorville
21 Energy Center project. The residents of the city want
22 the Taylorville Energy Center to become a reality.
23 Hardly a day goes by without someone stopping me to
24 ask, you know, what's the latest on the Energy Center?

1 Is it going to come? Is it really going to be here?

2 Have you heard anything new?

3 See, this project means more than just some
4 new jobs for our citizens. It represents hope for the
5 city and the surrounding county, hope for a new
6 industry and a revival of our economy, hope for a
7 brighter future for our sons and daughters. It also
8 represents the possibility of a more secure and
9 affordable energy future for our state. We truly
10 believe that the Taylorville Energy Center will be a
11 catalyst for growth not only within the city but in
12 the surrounding area as well.

13 One of our local authors, a Carl Oblinger,
14 a few years ago wrote a book called Divided Kingdom.
15 In one statement in it he said the coal fields of
16 central Illinois formed the backbone of a strong
17 regional economy for the first half of the 20th
18 century. These coal mines shaped the identity of
19 society within the region. The values of those
20 families and communities are still exhibited today in
21 their work ethic and family ideal.

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

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

7 After suffering through decades of a local
8 economic downturn which was due in large part to the
9 area coal mine shutting down, the idea that a new
10 technology may once again allow this relatively
11 abundant resource to be utilized is something that's
12 definitely exciting for us and the country as a whole.
13 We all are aware that this country is currently too
14 dependent on energy sources located outside of its own
15 borders.

16 Our citizens are willing and eager to
17 embrace those opportunities that will allow us to gain
18 a greater degree of energy self-sufficiency. Clean
19 coal technology can move us in that direction. We are
20 encouraged that our federal government has shown that
21 it recognizes the need for the development of clean
22 energy technologies by including loan guarantees in
23 the Energy Policy Act of 2005. These guarantees will
24 help make the implementation of the new technologies

1 possible and in turn benefit all of us.

2 We feel confident that this proposed
3 facility will be built and operated within all the
4 health-based federal and state environmental
5 standards. No one is more concerned about those
6 issues than we are here locally. After all, it's our
7 community, our environment that's being impacted, and
8 our quality of life that we believe will be bettered.
9 Our confidence is based on the fact that we know the
10 developers of the project, and they have proven to be
11 conscientious neighbors in the places where they
12 currently have other facilities.

13 This belief has been reinforced by our own
14 experience in working with them on this local project.
15 I can assure you that the city of Taylorville fully
16 supports this project. Its citizens and their elected
17 officials will do anything they can to help bring this
18 project to fruition. The Taylorville City Council has
19 demonstrated its support for the project for many
20 years now. Many of those council members are here
21 tonight.

22 We have worked and will continue to work
23 hand in hand with the developers to ensure that the
24 Taylorville Energy Center has what it needs from our

1 city, and now we are asking the EPA to give the
2 facility what it needs to become a reality. Thank you
3 very much.

4 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mayor Brotherton.
5 The next person will be Dick Adams, and that will be
6 followed by Patricia Rykhus.

7 MR. ADAMS: Good evening. My name is Dick
8 Adams, and I'm currently the president of the
9 Christian County Economic Development Corporation.
10 I've lived in Taylorville for about 59 years, and I've
11 had an opportunity to be involved in Taylorville and
12 Christian County's economic development activities
13 over the past 25 or 30 years. I've also had the
14 opportunity to serve two four-year terms as mayor of
15 the city of Taylorville, and from those experiences I
16 can tell you that Taylorville is indeed a great place
17 to live, to work, and to raise a family.

18 Taylorville's a community that has its
19 heart and soul deeply embedded in agriculture and
20 manufacturing. We're richly blessed with excellent
21 educational opportunities, health care resources, and
22 an adequate supply of skilled workers who still
23 believe and live by the values of hard work, honesty,
24 integrity, and showing up on time.

1 During the past 25 to 30 years, like other
2 communities, Taylorville has suffered through the loss
3 of major employers, specifically the Peabody Coal
4 Mine, Georgia Pacific, Ingersoll Rand, and three major
5 grain bin manufacturing companies. Those companies
6 all provided competitive wages, health insurance, and
7 retirement benefits.

8 Thanks in large part to the long-term and
9 sustained effort of our economic development group,
10 some of those lost jobs have been replaced. However,
11 the majority of new employers that we've been able to
12 attract to this area have typically paid less in wages
13 and offered reduced health insurance and retirement
14 benefits. So from a retention of quality jobs
15 perspective, we've actually lost ground in the last 25
16 to 30 years.

17 The Christian County Economic Development
18 Corporation is supporting this project primarily for
19 two reasons. First, the project will help us replace
20 some of those jobs that we've lost that I just
21 described. The economic impact on our city, county,
22 and state will be very significant and very
23 substantial. Number two, the project, in our view, is
24 an environmentally responsible project.

1 I was reading a New York Times editorial
2 article the other day that was co-authored by Senator
3 John Kerry and Senator Lindsay Graham. The article
4 said -- and I'm kind of paraphrasing and quoting here
5 just a little bit, but it says, if as a nation our
6 goals are to, A, reduce our dependence on foreign oil,
7 and, B, to encourage reduction in the emissions of
8 carbon gases that cause climate change, then we need
9 to provide new financial incentives for companies that
10 develop carbon capture and sequestration technology,
11 end of quote.

12 I don't know about you, but I can't really
13 think -- we've got kind of a liberal Democrat from
14 Massachusetts and kind of a conservative Republican
15 from I think South Carolina or North Carolina. I
16 can't imagine that they agree on very much, but I
17 think on this particular issue they share a common
18 vision of our country's way forward regarding energy
19 production.

20 In summation, Taylorville Energy Center's
21 positioned to be among the first commercial power
22 plants built in the United States to capture at least
23 50 percent of its carbon dioxide emissions. The
24 Taylorville Energy Center project will create new jobs

1 for the people of Taylorville and Christian County and
2 for the state of Illinois during the four-year
3 construction project and with the permanent employment
4 opportunities when the construction is complete.

5 The Taylorville Energy Center project,
6 importantly, will use 1.5 million tons of Illinois
7 coal annually from Illinois mines, a natural resource
8 that we have an abundance in this area and in the
9 entire state of Illinois. So this project, in my
10 version of things, is critical not only for the people
11 of Taylorville and Christian County, but it's critical
12 for all of the people of the state of Illinois.

13 Finally, the Taylorville Energy Center
14 project will empower Illinois to become more
15 self-sufficient, more self-reliant, and more
16 environmentally responsible regarding its capacity for
17 energy production. Those are the reasons that the
18 Christian County Economic Development Corporation is
19 supporting this project. As a community, we're asking
20 the EPA to approve the Taylorville Energy Center's
21 permit extension and help pave the way for its
22 construction here in Christian County. Thank you very
23 much for coming to Taylorville tonight, and thank you
24 very much for your kind attention.

1 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Adams. For the
2 record, that's A-d-a-m-s. Next person is Patricia
3 Rykhus, and that'll be followed by Will Reynolds.

4 MS. RYKHUS: Good evening. My name is
5 Patricia Rykhus. I'll spell the last name. It's
6 R-y-k-h-u-s. I want to thank you for holding this air
7 permit hearing tonight. And really what it comes down
8 to is the safety, health, the environment, our town,
9 our neighborhood, us, and our children. When the talk
10 of Tenaska coming to town, coal gasification plant, I
11 started doing some research.

12 I have personally talked to and visited
13 with people living around the SG Solutions plant in
14 West Terre Haute, Indiana, which is a coal
15 gasification plant. I have communicated with
16 community members in Beulah, North Dakota about their
17 Great Plains Synfuel plant. And I've spoken with
18 residents in Edwardsport, Indiana in regard to the
19 Duke Edwardsport coal gasification plant that's
20 currently under construction.

21 In my research, I looked at public records
22 of the cities and counties, I looked at the real
23 estate trends, property value, census data,
24 environmental records as far as emissions enforcements

1 and compliance. I've also studied the industry
2 trends, business and corporate structures, life cycle
3 of coal gasification plants in the U.S. and around the
4 world. I've attended meetings here in Illinois at the
5 Industrial Commission. I've attended most of the
6 local Tenaska meetings. I have been active in the
7 legislation process, and now here we are at the
8 Illinois EPA permit hearing.

9 As I read the permit, looked over the
10 summary, first off, I wanted to see if you would
11 clarify the location of the plant a little more
12 clearly now that Taylorville has moved city limits out
13 so this plant is actually within city limits. While
14 it appears to be out in a rural area two miles out of
15 town, it's actually in city boundaries. Which
16 surprised a lot of the legislators that I talked to.

17 When they wanted to know how far outside
18 town it was, and when I told them it was inside city
19 limits, they were surprised. And I'd also like to see
20 a better definition of the plan. In the permit, there
21 were 4,000 or so references to it, but it's still
22 unclear to me as I'm looking at waste streams, both
23 air, liquid, solid, I was still a little confused.

24 When I attended the ICC hearings, there was

1 great care to try to exclude the air separation unit
2 from being defined as part of the plant there. They
3 didn't want to record the massive energy requirements
4 in their calculations, saying that, and I'll quote, in
5 the ICC Exhibit 2.0, the feed study summary, page 6,
6 an air separation unit will be owned and operated by a
7 third party that's to be located on site.

8 So I guess my questions to the permit on
9 these issues is I would like to see a better
10 definition of the Taylorville Energy Center, the plan
11 components and ownership. And as I speak a little
12 further, that will kind of fall into place of why I'm
13 asking that question. And I'd also like to hear a
14 response from the IEPA on whether the ASU should or
15 should not be included in this permit or an additional
16 permit or separate permit if the ownership is not
17 going to be Tenaska.

18 MR. ROMAINE: The provisions of air
19 permitting are different than the actions of the
20 Illinois Commerce Commission. If there were an air
21 separation unit, and there will be, the only reason
22 for it to be at the plant would be to support the
23 operation of the plant; therefore, at this time, my
24 off-the-cuff response would be that it is appropriate

1 for this department to recognize the fact that there
2 will be an air separation unit at the facility. I'm
3 not commenting whatsoever on how the Illinois Commerce
4 Commission should address that.

5 MS. RYKHUS: But I hope you can understand
6 my confusion on it when one Illinois state regulator
7 is told something and another agency is told something
8 else of the confusion. Also, I mean, not only
9 confusion about the plant, but the ownership of the
10 different units and the Tenaska business structure.
11 As I was looking and doing some research, I went to
12 the Illinois Secretary of State website and trying to
13 get a feel of the corporate umbrella for Tenaska as it
14 applies here in Taylorville.

15 And I saw that Tenaska LLC had originally
16 sent in an application but then withdrew it.
17 Currently at the site, Tenaska -- corporations that I
18 see underneath the Tenaska umbrella are Tenaska
19 Biofuels LLC, Tenaska Energy Management LLC, Tenaska
20 Gas Storage LLC, Tenaska Power Services Company,
21 Tenaska Storage Company, Tenaska Taylorville LLC, and
22 Christian County Generation.

23 And the reason I bring this up in this
24 hearing is as we look at the air permitting and

1 emissions and the further development that can occur
2 at this site, I have another question for the EPA
3 board. And is, if multiple producers of air emissions
4 are in the same geographic area, how is that handled
5 as far as accountability? I don't understand. And as
6 I talk more about the coal gasification expandability
7 in our area, as an area homeowner and landowner, I
8 don't understand how you can measure these things that
9 aren't independently downwind if you've got multiple
10 producers. Thank you.

11 MR. SMET: The rules under PSD require that
12 regardless of ownership of one piece of equipment over
13 some operations within a plant, it's considered to be
14 a support activity to the overall plant. So overall,
15 it's the primary activity at the site that dictates
16 who the owner and operator is, and that is just
17 Tenaska. So there's no way in which a company can
18 separate themselves off from the rest of the plant and
19 be considered a separate and -- because it's all under
20 the umbrella of Tenaska.

21 MS. RYKHUS: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. STUDER: We've gone the time limit, but
23 if you have another quick question yourself --

24 MS. RYKHUS: I have more if you want to

1 call me back at the end.

2 MR. STUDER: If time allows, we'll
3 certainly do that. I'll keep your card here.

4 Will Reynolds. And that'll be followed by
5 Joyce Blumenshine.

6 MR. REYNOLDS: Hello. My name's Will
7 Reynolds, R-e-y-n-o-l-d-s. I'm representing the
8 Sierra Club. The Sierra Club is the nation's largest
9 and oldest environmental organization and we'll be
10 presenting written comments later, but I'd like to
11 make a few short verbal comments at the hearing today.
12 As the permit says, this would be a major new source
13 of pollution including a number of pollutants that
14 pose a significant public health threat.

15 And for some pollutants, the levels will be
16 higher than another plant built recently in
17 Springfield. In particular, there's high levels of
18 mercury included in this permit, which is a powerful
19 neurotoxin linked to birth defects in newborns
20 including learning disabilities, late walking, and
21 late talking. Illinois -- the nation recently passed
22 new mercury standards that will soon go into effect,
23 and Illinois enacted before that passing higher
24 mercury rules to limit these toxins.

1 I hope that the EPA will enforce these new
2 strict guidelines and not take Illinois a step
3 backward in its levels of mercury pollution throughout
4 our state and waterways. This permit does not require
5 that any carbon be sequestered. It's my -- and I'd
6 like to ask: It's my understanding that the permit
7 found that the current options for sequestering carbon
8 were not economically or scientifically feasible
9 enough to be enforced in the permit; is that correct.

10 MR. ROMAINE: I think you're simplifying
11 it. We're saying that sequestration is still under
12 development, and it's currently not a technologically
13 available method of controlling CO2 that can be
14 required under a federal permit pursuant to the Clean
15 Air Act.

16 MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you. I see no
17 demonstrated need for this plant. Demand for power
18 has dropped in Illinois. Illinois is already an
19 energy exporter. Much of what we produce is sent to
20 other states. In addition to demand dropping, there's
21 a new energy efficiency portfolio standard in Illinois
22 that will limit how much energy demand rises in the
23 future. Illinois is also a very fast-growing wind
24 state. We've had a large amount of new wind power

1 going online, which makes this additional plant
2 unnecessary.

3 It's the fastest -- wind is the
4 fastest-growing power source in America, and as the
5 Illinois Commerce Commission found, wind power
6 produced in Illinois would be cheaper than power
7 produced by this coal plant. This company is seeking
8 mandatory 30-year contracts, which means 20 and 30
9 years from now when Illinois has a great deal of
10 cheaper and cleaner power built and online, the entire
11 state will still be required to buy overpriced dirty
12 energy from this facility regardless of the cost.

13 I would like to talk -- central Illinois
14 does have a long history with coal both good and bad,
15 and I'd like to say a little something about that. My
16 own family has been farming and mining in central
17 Illinois for over 150 years. One of my ancestors came
18 back from the Civil War and was a coal miner at that
19 time. He was a blacksmith. One of the things
20 blacksmiths did at coal mines in the 19th century was
21 help to put mule teams.

22 They would send mule teams down to haul
23 coal around for weeks or even months at a time. And
24 when they brought them up, they, the mules would go

1 blind. They used to think it was from being down in
2 the dark for so long for such extended periods, but it
3 was actually the sudden exposure to sunlight that made
4 them go blind suddenly. So when they first came up
5 out of the ground, they would put blinders on the mule
6 teams for a while to slowly adjust them to being back
7 in the light again.

8 And I point this out just to say how much
9 the coal industry has changed over the years, how much
10 technology has changed. We don't need -- you know,
11 part of that change is that far fewer people are
12 employed in coal mines. We don't need blacksmiths, we
13 don't need mule teams, we don't need a lot of the
14 other jobs that used to be included in the coal
15 mining. So even if the mines reopen, they won't
16 employ nearly as many people as they did 20 or 30
17 years ago.

18 The new mine mechanization methods mean
19 that far more coal can be extracted with far fewer
20 workers. We don't need mule teams. We don't need
21 that 19th century mode of transportation anymore, and
22 I would argue that we don't need the 19th century
23 power source like coal anymore. We have moved beyond
24 that. I would argue that it's time to take off the

1 coal blinders, embrace a new energy future that will
2 provide cleaner and cheaper energy and provide more
3 jobs than the coal industry ever can again. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.
6 Joyce Blumenshine is next, and that will be followed
7 by Amy Allen.

8 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. Good evening.
9 My name is Joyce, J-o-y-c-e; last name Blumenshine,
10 B-l-u-m-e-n-s-h-i-n-e. I want to thank the IEPA for
11 this hearing tonight. It is very important for the
12 Democratic process and for the opportunity for the
13 public to share their concerns of what could be a
14 longtime burden to the area. I am a volunteer and
15 member of Illinois Chapter Sierra Club.

16 As a Sierra Club volunteer and a concerned
17 citizen, I feel our main focus is the overall impact
18 of this plant for our families and the future and the
19 impacts on the environment that will be here for
20 future generations. I am very concerned about the 20
21 pounds approximately of mercury per year that this
22 plant will inflict on this area. And as Mr. Reynolds
23 mentioned about the health impacts, I don't understand
24 how any amount of mercury discharges could be

1 tolerated as in the future in time because the
2 historic and known current impacts are vividly real to
3 us in minute amounts and have a devastating impact.

4 So I do protest that this plant is allowed
5 to have that much mercury discharge. This is by no
6 way something that should be inflicted on this area,
7 this area of Taylorville that does know from its own
8 history of neuroblastoma in children and lawsuits
9 regarding that that there are serious health impacts
10 from coal residue. And the longer that is ignored and
11 the longer that companies like Tenaska inflict that on
12 the public and we pay the cost with our health and
13 children's health and the health of the environment,
14 the weaker we are as a nation.

15 I had a couple questions, please. I am
16 very concerned about the flaring, and I just wonder if
17 there's any limitations as far as the number of flares
18 that can be done within a certain amount of time,
19 let's say, in a 24-hour period.

20 MR. SMET: They're not limited in terms of
21 in any given time period. It's just in terms of
22 emissions.

23 MS. BLUMENSHINE: So there are some in
24 terms of emissions? Did I hear that correctly,

1 please?

2 MR. SMET: Yes.

3 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Okay. So there are some
4 controls on the amount of emissions from the flaring.
5 So if those emissions would be exceeding certain
6 levels within a certain time period, that flaring
7 could be stopped; is that correct? Or could be
8 required to be stopped at any point in time?

9 MR. ROMAINE: Not in those terms. Because
10 when a flaring event occurs, it is necessary for the
11 safety of the plant, safety of workers, safety of the
12 general public. It certainly would have complications
13 or implications for further operation of the plant and
14 actions that would have to be taken to reduce similar
15 flaring events in the future. So it would not be
16 something that if unacceptable levels of flaring were
17 reached that would be allowed to continue on.

18 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. I do realize
19 that flaring is critical for operations, but a
20 high-humidity day with other air problem conditions in
21 this area, I am just concerned that flaring could add
22 significantly to health factors for the public.
23 Because this plant isn't in the city where wind
24 conditions, and I just add that to my comments as a

1 concern.

2 I did also want to ask, please, in the
3 write-up it said alternative feedstocks were
4 considered in the BACT determination for the plant.
5 Am I to infer from that were Illinois feedstocks
6 specifically considered in the BACT determination, or
7 were they alternative feedstocks? What was the BACT
8 based on? Illinois coal or other coal?

9 MR. SMET: Low-sulfur coal was examined.
10 We looked at low-sulfur coal.

11 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Low-sulfur? I'm sorry.
12 I couldn't hear you.

13 MR. SMET: Yeah. We looked at low-sulfur
14 coal from out of state or lower sulfur content.

15 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. I appreciate
16 the IEPA answering that question. I specifically
17 would like to point out that if the Illinois House
18 passes the legislation and this plant is required to
19 use Illinois high-sulfur and high-chlorine coal, that
20 the BACT analysis should be redone completely because
21 it should be based on -- shouldn't it be based on the
22 coal stock that the plant is going to use?

23 And I ask you right now as our regulated
24 agency for comparative purposes, shouldn't you require

1 this plant to do BACT analysis on Illinois coals so
2 you can get a more realistic handle? I mean, I'm just
3 a member of the public, by I am concerned that there
4 could be some, you know, differences here.

5 MR. SMET: Well, the examination of fumes
6 is part of the BACT analysis. And so you can take a
7 look at the energy, environmental, and economic
8 contribution, the role of those three into the
9 determination of what we could use.

10 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. And I'm
11 almost finished. I appreciate your consideration. I
12 do want to point out that for those of us who are in
13 the environmental concerns, that coal mining in our
14 prime farmlands, which is south of Christian County --
15 I'm sorry -- next door in other areas is a burden on
16 the environment, so I don't think it's a point of
17 pride that we are dropping the surface of our prime
18 national heritage farmlands due to more coal mining
19 five feet or more which will inflict at some point
20 real problems to our water quality or to the nation.

21 And if you go to Hillsboro and you drive
22 down Route 185 and you see all the farmsteads that are
23 empty and the farm homes that have been torn down by
24 the coal companies and the historic farm families that

1 now are no longer on the land that is corporate-owned
2 and you were a farmer like my dad and his family was,
3 you would think that the destruction of rural America
4 is due to coal mining.

5 So I end with that comment that this is not
6 the direction. Truly clean energy, not the misnomer
7 falsehood of clean coal which is no such thing as
8 clean coal. You destroy the land and water when you
9 mine it. That we should turn to other energy sources
10 and energy efficiency and that our state agency should
11 require in helping that. Thank you.

12 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Blumenshine.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. STUDER: Okay. I'm not going to allow
15 applause in tonight's hearing, so please keep that in
16 mind. The next person is Amy Allen, and that'll be
17 followed by Emily Cross, please.

18 MS. ALLEN: Hello. Thank you for the
19 opportunity to give comments here. I am a citizen
20 concerned about our environmental, energy, and
21 economic future. Tenaska is costly and dangerous to
22 the state and should not receive a permit. It will
23 add 6.5 million tons of CO2 to the atmosphere annually,
24 1.5 (inaudible) times that of even a conventional coal

1 and natural gas plant as well as significant amounts
2 of mercury and other harmful pollutants.

3 The Taylorville Energy Center would cost
4 taxpayers 286 million annually and is estimated to
5 kill 15 to 30,000 jobs in Illinois per year as a
6 result of higher utility rates and their impact on
7 commerce and small businesses. In total, taxpayers
8 would pay 3 billion in state and federal subsidies,
9 and ratepayers would be responsible for one-third of
10 the cost overruns which will amount to as much as 1.1
11 billion in used energy, Edwardsport plant in Indiana.

12 Other coal gasification plants indicate the
13 very dangerous impacts that Tenaska could have if it
14 is built. As the Illinois Commerce Commission has
15 demonstrated, much more efficient, cleaner, and
16 renewable sources of energy exist that the state
17 should be investing in such as wind power that will
18 increase jobs and bring businesses to Illinois and not
19 subsidize the future of coal. Tenaska will kill jobs,
20 increase utility costs on working families and small
21 businesses, and significantly increase greenhouse gas
22 emissions and should not receive a permit.

23 MR. STUDER: Thank you. The next person is
24 Olivia Webb, and that'll be followed by -- if I can

1 pronounce the last name -- Katie Mimnafugh. Olivia
2 Webb is next though.

3 MS. WEBB: I'm an agriculture engineer at
4 the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and while
5 I believe that the Taylorville Energy Center is an
6 admirable idea to build an environmentally responsible
7 energy plant that takes advantage of Illinois
8 resources, I can't deceive you. We do not see this
9 goal as admirable because we -- while I and other
10 concerned students have this goal as well, the ways
11 that we want to achieve this goal are so vastly
12 removed as to make it completely dissimilar and
13 therefore remove all support unfortunately.

14 The plant is proposing technology to burn
15 coal clean. Again, I can't deceive you. We cannot
16 see this goal as noble. It is weakly supported by
17 those who propose it, and only cleans or greens a
18 fraction of the system of coal mining and generation
19 of electricity. Our example of the Edwardsport coal
20 gasification plant next door in Indiana quickly
21 overran its budget, but the first thing to go was the
22 carbon sequestration plant.

23 Now, the proponents of renewable energy
24 especially understand that new technology tends to be

1 financially risky. But it does not appear that
2 environmental protection is the main concern here.
3 Especially, as we said, that the technology for carbon
4 sequestration is not yet realized, how much more risky
5 will that be? Yet they have not given me much trust
6 in the environmental concerns of these coal plants
7 especially since they seem to ignore many aspects of
8 turning coal into electricity.

9 The mining aspect. Longwall mining is
10 flooding farmlands and is creating waste piles that
11 are some of the only mountains in Illinois. It
12 doesn't seem that Taylorville Energy Center can do
13 anything about these problems which constitute a great
14 deal of the problems with coal. They are not
15 addressing the majority of coal problems. Now, coal
16 is a 100 percent Illinois resource, yes. It belongs
17 to us, that's wonderful. But pride in Illinois coal
18 was once called a virtue. It is no longer. It is now
19 a blinding vice, I believe.

20 If we had hundreds of thousands of tons of
21 used (inaudible) below our realm, that would not be a
22 reason to use it. Just because we have this resource
23 does not mean that it will always be the best idea for
24 Illinois' future. Coal is being quickly revealed as

1 toxic at every or nearly every point in its conversion
2 to electricity, and to support it, I believe, is to
3 waste our time, time that could be valuably used to
4 take Illinois to a new future, a new cleaner future.

5 We, the students of the University of
6 Illinois Urbana-Champaign also want to support
7 Illinois resources. We believe that we put some of
8 that in our farmland. Vast (inaudible) that we have
9 in corn, soybeans, all the lifeblood in Illinois. But
10 we are sacrificing it to continue to use this outdated
11 energy source.

12 I say all this because I and other
13 concerned students cannot be satisfied with this
14 proposed coal gasification technology and, in fact,
15 will become more incensed with being tied for 30 years
16 to what we see as outdated and unnecessary technology.
17 We will continue to oppose the support of coal in
18 opposition to renewable energy in Illinois.

19 MR. STUDER: Thank you. And for the
20 record, that was Olivia W-e-b-b. Thank you.

21 I'll let you pronounce your last name
22 because I think I just totally butchered it, and
23 she'll be followed by Suhail Barot. Go ahead.

24 MS. MIMNAFUGH: My name is Katie Mimnafugh,

1 M-i-m-n-a-f-u-g-h. I'm from the UIUC Beyond Coal
2 Campaign. I not here to take up much of your time
3 today, but I just wanted --. The campaign is to get
4 the University of Illinois to tell students as a whole
5 where they're investing their money because it's not
6 public knowledge right now.

7 So we would like them to make that public
8 knowledge, and we would like them to invest in
9 renewable energy. So what I wanted to say is the
10 students on our campus and in Illinois as a whole are
11 aware of the damage and the pollution that is caused
12 by coal mining and coal burning. Mining techniques
13 destroy farmland that can be used long-term for
14 growing agriculture.

15 The burning of coal will result in hundreds
16 of gallons of toxic waste that needs to be disposed
17 of. The Energy Center will result in an increased
18 price of electricity in Illinois during a time of
19 economic hardship. So I want to tell you that the
20 state of Illinois as a whole will suffer as a result
21 of this industry. We students would like Illinois to
22 invest in clean renewable energy future that does not
23 include coal or synthetic natural gas. Thank you.

24 MR. STUDER: Thank you. For the record,

1 the first name was K-a-t-i-e. I think next is Suhail
2 Barot. If you would come forward to the podium, and
3 that'll be followed by Michael Murphy.

4 MR. BAROT: Good evening. My name is
5 Suhail Barot. I am a student from the University of
6 Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

7 MR. STUDER: Can you spell you first name
8 and last name for the record, please.

9 MR. BAROT: S-u-h-a-i-l and B-a-r-o-t.

10 MR. STUDER: Thank you.

11 MR. BAROT: At the University of Illinois,
12 we have recently completed adoption of a climate
13 action plan which will require the University of
14 Illinois to phase out the use of coal on campus by
15 2017. At this year for the first time, the University
16 of Illinois did not utilize coal over the summer.
17 This is an important step and represents leadership
18 from the University of Illinois in moving past one of
19 the most toxic forms of energy that human beings have
20 ever used.

21 This is the similar sort of leadership that
22 our state should be showing, and for that reason, we
23 request that the IEPA deny this air permit to the
24 Taylorville Energy Center. The funding being utilized

1 for this plant could be utilized to build five times
2 the equivalent amount of wind capacity in the state.
3 It is completely unconscionable that we are utilizing
4 that this plant would be built, would massively burden
5 Illinois businesses and industries at a time of
6 significant economic hardship during this and would
7 destroy jobs far more than any that would be created
8 during, that would temporarily be created during
9 construction and later during operation of this plant.

10 The impacts of this plant through the air
11 permit should, as evaluated, should consider many
12 upcoming USEPA regulations including the new source
13 standards that will come through once the EPA
14 finalizes the regulations that will accompany the
15 major finding on carbon dioxide. And this plant, if
16 it claims to be carbon-sequestration ready, should
17 actually require carbon sequestration within the
18 effort.

19 Otherwise, I heard earlier today that the
20 equivalent of building this plant and saying that it's
21 carbon-sequestration ready without actually requiring
22 the carbon sequestration is the equivalent of having a
23 garage and saying that it's Ferrari ready as though I
24 had a Ferrari in my garage. It's absolute nonsense.

1 Either require the carbon sequestration or don't say
2 that it has anything to do with carbon sequestration.

3 This is one of the largest new sources of
4 carbon dioxide and other pollution that this state
5 will seek. And for it to be filled (sp) with
6 inadequate pollution controls of this kind when we are
7 all aware of the impacts that climate change is having
8 is simply unacceptable. We ask you to take the
9 necessary steps to protect the health and welfare of
10 citizens of the state of Illinois. Thank you.

11 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Barot. Michael
12 Murphy is next, and that'll be followed by Alan Rider.

13 MR. MURPHY: Thank you for giving me this
14 opportunity to once again come to Taylorville and talk
15 about the Taylorville Energy Center. My name is
16 Michael Murphy, M-u-r-p-h-y. I'm the manager of coal
17 programs for the Office of Coal Development,
18 Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. It's
19 the mission of our office to facilitate not only the
20 mining of coal but advances towards clean coal
21 technology development and the ultimate employment of
22 zero emissions at coal facilities.

23 This project comes in at a level of
24 advancement in terms of our mission as established by

1 statute at nearly the center point in strategy that
2 we've been pursuing to bring clean coal projects to
3 Illinois for at least the last 10 years. It includes,
4 if you don't choose to ignore some of the
5 technicalities, for this project to be funded by the
6 ratepayers to some degree as it is proposed will
7 require the capture and sequestration of carbon
8 dioxide and/or other disposal of it via pipeline to a
9 greater extent than done anywhere in the United States
10 that we're aware of. If that's not a worthwhile
11 purpose, more worthwhile advancement, I guess I would
12 like to see what we should be doing regarding this.

13 I meant to start off without being --. One
14 of the things first off, I've been at a number of
15 these hearings and made similar statements. This
16 project would be long gone were it not for some of the
17 talent, professionalism, and stick-to-itiveness of the
18 people in the Taylorville and Christian County
19 communities. And a lot of them are here tonight. You
20 all have a role in this, but John Curtin, Mayor
21 Brotherton, Mary Renner (sp), the folks from Tenaska
22 that have remained close to this community and tried
23 to be close to this community, have a stake in what
24 goes on here.

1 They're offering an investment that would
2 be the envy of any other coal development office in
3 any state. And I believe that their willingness to
4 advance clean coal technology towards zero emissions
5 is amplified by the changes that they proposed even
6 most recently.

7 Anyone that talks about coal as a valued
8 resource anywhere in the United States -- and there
9 are those who believe that it is and will be -- have
10 to have as a goal and a fairly near-term goal zero
11 emissions technologies to deal with that coal and to
12 retrieve its energy value. We could import power from
13 out of state if that's the case. It might or might
14 not be cheaper for a while, but I can only call on you
15 to realize where else we import other types of energy
16 and fuel from, and there's a risk associated with
17 that.

18 So again, thank you. I know that the
19 Illinois EPA will do the right thing here in their own
20 way in their own time, but this is a project for
21 tomorrow. We should do it.

22 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Murphy. The
23 next person will be Alan Rider, and that will be
24 followed by Jim Deere.

1 MR. RIDER: Good evening. My name is Alan
2 Rider; A-l-a-n, R-i-d-e-r. I am a concerned citizen.
3 I live in Mt. Auburn, Illinois. I'd like to make some
4 comments about my perception as a concerned citizen.
5 My first comment relates to why are we rehearing this
6 again. And yes, it was brought up in this public
7 forum that the Senate has approved it this past week.
8 But the Senate has rejected it in the past.

9 What's changed, is my question? What's
10 changed? Why do companies like ADM, Staley's,
11 Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois ICC, who
12 have all opposed this, what's changed? Right now we
13 have or had recently George Ryan and Rod Blagojevich
14 sitting in prison because of backroom political deals.
15 Were there any backroom political deals in the Senate
16 changing some of their votes? We'll let you decide
17 that.

18 We hear a lot about jobs. Of the first
19 five speakers, four of them said jobs. But what did
20 the United States of America do as far as renewable
21 energy in 2010? In 2010 the United States created 880
22 megawatts of power with renewable energy. How does
23 that compare to other countries? Japan, 990 megawatts
24 created in 2010. Italy, 2,320 megawatts of energy

1 created in 2010. Even the Czech Republic beat the
2 United States. Czech Republic, 1,490 megawatts of
3 renewable energy in 2010. We beat China though.
4 China only created 550 megawatts of renewable energy
5 in 2010.

6 We all know about the economics of the
7 United States and the world, and one of the things we
8 hear about is Germany is doing, pretty good shape.
9 They're the strongest country in Europe. Germany in
10 2010 created 7,405 megawatts of renewable energy. And
11 I suspect there was a lot of people working in all of
12 these countries including the United States that got
13 jobs from creating energy through renewable energy.

14 Well, how does the United States compare to
15 other countries in their total portfolio of renewable
16 energy? United States has approximately 134 gigawatts
17 of renewable energy. Canada, our neighbor up north,
18 which is obviously a much smaller country, has 81
19 gigawatts of renewable energy. China? 263 gigawatts
20 of renewable energy.

21 Well, how does Illinois stand compared to
22 the rest of the states of the United States? Illinois
23 ranks 36th in renewable energy in our state. North
24 Dakota is ahead of us. And if that doesn't concern

1 all of us here, I would ask you to please reflect upon
2 that this weekend. But this hearing is about air
3 quality and environmental impacts. I would suggest
4 that this technology on this scale is untested. Yes,
5 I understand this is somewhat of a pilot program.

6 But I would like to make a comment for the
7 record on transporting and sequestering the 50 percent
8 the of CO2. Burning coal is not new, as some of the
9 other speakers have mentioned. It's been going on for
10 a number of years. And yes, we have made excellent
11 strides on controlling and collecting many of the
12 pollutants that are produced when we burn coal. One
13 pollutant that all of the gentlemen here and I'm sure
14 many, if not all, of the participants in this hearing
15 would agree on is CO2. But we've heard that it would
16 just collect or be able to sequester 50 percent. So I
17 would suggest we call not -- we call this technology
18 not clean coal. Let's call it 50 percent clean coal.

19 As far as sequestering and transporting the
20 CO2, what happens if we have an earthquake? We've got
21 this stored in the ground, and what happens if we do
22 have an earthquake? Earthquakes don't happen, right?
23 Ask the people of Oklahoma in the last week how many
24 earthquakes they've had. If anybody heard -- I'm sure

1 you all have heard about the New Madrid Fault. It's
2 not necessarily right on top of us or right underneath
3 of us -- excuse me -- but it is close at hand. If you
4 are skeptical about natural disasters, ask yourself,
5 answer this question: What do you think the people of
6 Japan would have said one year ago about the safety of
7 their nuclear plants?

8 Renewable energy can produce jobs, and it
9 does produce jobs. Renewable energy produces cheaper
10 energy. That's why the ICC is opposed to it, that's
11 why companies like Staley's and ADM are opposed to
12 this. And renewable energy does not harm the
13 environment. Thank you very much.

14 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Rider. The
15 next person will be Jim Deere, and that'll be followed
16 by Phillip Gonet.

17 MR. DEERE: Jim Deere, D-e-e-r-e, on behalf
18 of the City of Pana. And Pana Mayor Sipes couldn't
19 attend this evening. And for the City of Pana as well
20 as myself as the developmental director for the City
21 of Pana, Illinois, thank you for this opportunity for
22 public comment.

23 I've had the fortune to be a part of this
24 project since the very first meeting held at the old

1 Taylorville golf course clubhouse when then Mayor Jim
2 Montgomery brought this project to the table some nine
3 years ago. Mayor Sipes, the Pana City Council,
4 various development partners within the community
5 including the Pana Chamber of Commerce and a very
6 large portion of the citizens of Pana, Illinois have
7 and continue to support this project.

8 The economic benefits of the project are
9 very clear and the project is paramount to the future
10 of all Christian County and central Illinois. Based
11 on my longtime involvement with this project, I'm
12 confident that Tenaska has an intense emotion of
13 operating their plant according to federal, state, and
14 industry guidelines to be a shining star, a worldwide
15 example of clean coal technology, a plant that has
16 many emission profiles of a natural gas plant.

17 The City of Pana recognizes the position of
18 IEPA to ensure the safety of our residents in the
19 stewardship of our air and lands. The City of Pana's
20 requesting that IEPA review the permit and grant the
21 final update for the Taylorville Energy Center.

22 In my closing remarks, while it is the
23 wishes of everybody in this room to have a cleaner
24 world to live in for us and future generations, it

1 will take time for new and improved processes such as
2 solar and wind generation to be established. It is
3 very clear that the path to green is black, black coal
4 that lies beneath our Illinois prairies. Thank you.

5 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Deere.

6 Following Mr. Gonet, it will be, Brian Perbix will be
7 on deck.

8 MR. GONET: Good evening. My name is Phil
9 Gonet, G-o-n-e-t, and I'm the president of the
10 Illinois Coal Association. Thank you for the
11 opportunity to make comments here tonight. The
12 Illinois Coal Association supports the issuance of the
13 construction permit and the Prevention of Significant
14 Deterioration approval for the Taylorville Energy
15 Center.

16 My first comment is to commend the EPA for
17 its analysis of the permit application including the
18 67-page review of the best available control
19 technology. EPA staff has spent considerable time on
20 this project, as the first permit was issued in 2008.
21 We are back in Taylorville tonight because Christian
22 County Generation has made changes in their project
23 that requires another review.

24 The Illinois Coal Association supports the

1 IEPA's preliminary determination that the Taylorville
2 Energy Center meets all applicable state and federal
3 pollution requirements. The Taylorville Energy Center
4 will use Illinois coal and will provide a significant
5 economic impact to the central Illinois region.

6 This once thriving coal mining region has
7 been hit hard by mine closures and other job losses in
8 the past 20 years. We believe over 16,000 direct and
9 indirect construction jobs will be created to build
10 this plant. Another 500 permanent jobs to run the
11 power plant and mine the coal will result from this
12 project. These are good-paying jobs that are sorely
13 needed.

14 I made this next statement four years ago
15 at the last public hearing on this project, and I'll
16 make it again because it's still true: Illinois has
17 an abundance of coal. With an estimated recoverable
18 reserves of over 100 billion, billion tons of coal,
19 Illinois coal alone can meet the nation's energy needs
20 for the next 100 years. There is more energy in the
21 coal beneath our borders here in Illinois than the
22 energy in the oil in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait combined,
23 and we need to find a way to use it.

24 Our coal operators mined a total of 33

1 million tons of coal last year. Sadly, 85 percent of
2 that went out of state. I say sadly because it's not
3 used here. Fortunately, it's, it has happened because
4 it's kept our operators in business. Therefore, the
5 Taylorville Energy Center is a very important project
6 for the Illinois coal industry.

7 It is the first step in merging our
8 enormous supply of coal with a clean coal technology
9 to use it to create a market for Illinois coal, coal
10 use in Illinois. This is an opportunity to replace
11 the aging Illinois power plants burning Wyoming coal
12 with clean coal technology using Illinois coal. Coal
13 gasification means an expansion of good-paying and
14 coal mining jobs in Illinois.

15 There's been much debate during the past
16 year over the cost of this project. There should be
17 no question that the energy from the Taylorville
18 Energy Center will be more expensive than the energy
19 prices today for two reasons. The Taylorville project
20 must capture and store the majority of its carbon
21 dioxide emissions, something that has never been done
22 on a large-scale power plant in the country, and it is
23 obviously an expensive endeavor. Secondly, today's
24 energy prices are at historically low levels due to

1 the economic depression.

2 And there have been studies and events that
3 lead us to believe and conclude that energy prices
4 will soon be on the rise. To mention a few, I think
5 all of us are aware that several proposed regulations
6 issued by USEPA over the past year that will require
7 coal-burning power plants to substantially reduce its
8 emissions. These regulations could force coal plant
9 operators to decide between retiring plants and
10 installing expensive emission control of them.

11 The rules have been referred to as a train
12 wreck for the negative impact they would have on the
13 nation's economy. There have been at least eight
14 studies in the past year that are predicting or
15 speculating that the power plant retirements could be
16 anywhere between 31 and 75 gigawatts coming offline in
17 the country due to the EPA train wreck. These studies
18 are done by industry and financial institutions not
19 affiliated with the regulated industry that produce
20 reports providing market information to investors.

21 In one report, the Brattle Group stated
22 that "retirements would be especially large in the
23 Midwest ISO, PJM, and ERCOT areas, representing up to
24 72 percent of all coal plants." As you know, the

1 Midwest ISO and the PJM are regional electric
2 transmission authorities that serve Illinois.

3 The train wreck rules will accelerate the
4 plant retirements. This is also the conclusion of the
5 Illinois Power Agency. In a May 24, 2011 letter to
6 legislators, Mark Pruitt stated that "the IPA
7 estimates that as much as 6,000 or 40 percent of the
8 state's nearly 15,000 megawatts of baseload coal
9 generating capacity could exit the market as a result
10 of the new emission rules. The loss of such a
11 substantial amount of generating capacity will lead to
12 higher marginal as well as average prices for Illinois
13 consumers."

14 I think we all know what happens when
15 supply goes down: If demand stays even, prices will
16 increase. The opponents of this power plant have
17 scoffed at this prediction that the proposed
18 regulations will cause power plants to retire. I
19 would like to point to two pieces of evidence, recent
20 evidence that indicate that energy prices will soon
21 rise.

22 First, most citizens do not know that your
23 Illinois EPA's current air emissions standards are
24 more strict than the federal standards. One speaker

1 alluded to that tonight. The Illinois emission
2 standards have already led to announcements this year
3 to take 763 megawatts offline. Coal-burning power
4 plants. The fact is that in Illinois, 60 percent of
5 our coal-burning power plants are over 40 years old.
6 Most are too small and too old to install expensive
7 emission control equipment to remain in operation. So
8 even before any new train wreck rules take effect,
9 many power plants in Illinois will probably be shut
10 down.

11 The second piece of evidence is the
12 capacity auction held last spring in the PJM wholesale
13 market. PJM is a regional transmission authority
14 organization that controls transmission in northern
15 Illinois and all the way to the East Coast. Power
16 plants are paid a capacity fee to ensure that the
17 market has sufficient energy to meet customer demand.
18 The result of the auction was an increased cost for
19 capacity of 354 percent. This cost increase was due
20 to an 11,000 megawatt reduction in generating capacity
21 bidding into the auction. This is real.

22 Commonwealth Edison is part of the PJM
23 market. Com Ed is owned by Exelon which owns 11
24 nuclear power plants in Illinois. In 2009, those

1 plants produced 49 percent of this state's
2 electricity. Exelon opposes the Taylorville Energy
3 Center. Why? Exelon doesn't want competition.
4 Exelon want higher prices. In fact, they now expect
5 it.

6 John Rowe is Exelon's CEO. In an article
7 published in the Wall Street Journal on December 30,
8 2010, Rowe makes his position clear. The pending
9 regulations on coal plants mean that "Exelon's clean
10 generation will grow in value in a relatively short
11 time. We are, of course, positioning or portfolio to
12 capture that value." Later Rowe proclaims that "the
13 upside to Exelon is unmistakable." According to the
14 Wall Street Journal, he also estimated that every \$5
15 increase per megawatt hour translates into 700 to 800
16 million in new annual revenue for Exelon. Where will
17 that new revenue come from? Illinois consumers.

18 Going back to Mark Pruitt, according to
19 him, "the Illinois Power Agency estimates that the
20 cost increase to consumers may range between 40 and
21 65 percent by 2017. The negative impacts of this cost
22 escalation can be mitigated through the introduction
23 of new capacity into the local market." The Illinois
24 Coal Association wholeheartedly agrees.

1 In closing, it should be clear that there
2 is a need for new baseload power in Illinois. And I
3 want to stress baseload power. We've heard a lot
4 about wind power tonight. I'm all for wind power. In
5 2009, they provided 1.5 percent of the generating
6 capacity -- or I'm sorry -- generation of megawatts in
7 the state, and they should do more.

8 It's also clear that the Taylorville Energy
9 Center meets all applicable state and federal air
10 pollution control requirements, so we urge the EPA to
11 issue the final permit. Then the Taylorville Energy
12 Center can be the first of many coal gasification
13 plants that will be constructed in this state. We
14 need to merge our abundant supply of coal with the
15 technology that will use it to create good-paying jobs
16 to benefit our economy. Thank you.

17 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Gonet. Brian
18 Perbix.

19 MR. PERBIX: Good evening. My name is
20 Brian Perbix -- that's P-e-r-b-i-x -- and I'm with the
21 Prairie Rivers Network and the Illinois Sierra Club.
22 Prairie Rivers Network is a statewide river
23 conservation organization that seeks to protect the
24 health and beauty of the rivers and streams in

1 Illinois for the people, fish, and wildlife that
2 depend on them to survive. In particular, I work with
3 the local citizens to protect the rivers and streams
4 of Illinois from coal pollution.

5 As we've heard from many folks here
6 tonight, from the coal mines to the power lines, coal
7 in Illinois is often very dirty, and the folks who
8 live next to these facilities often wind up bearing
9 the toxic burden that comes with these facilities.
10 Now, I'm specifically here tonight because wanted to
11 discuss some of the issues related to the hazardous
12 air pollutants that are slated to be coming out of
13 this facility.

14 A gentleman earlier referred to the
15 Environmental Protection Agency, and I would like to
16 raise the issue that it's just absolutely appalling
17 that the draft permit under consideration here tonight
18 would allow 19.2 million tons a year of hazardous air
19 pollutants to be emitted into the air. As written --
20 correct me if I'm wrong, folks -- it also allows for
21 over one -- over 200 tons of mercury per year to be
22 emitted; is that the case?

23 MR. SMET: Two hundred pounds.

24 MR. PERBIX: Two hundred pounds, excuse me.

1 MR. SMET: Or 20 -- I'm sorry. Twenty --.
2 In the permit it says 200 pounds, but it's actually
3 going to be 20. It's going to be 20 because Tenaska's
4 committing to BACT levels at this point.

5 MR. PERBIX: And when will that be
6 reflected in a permit that's available for public
7 comments?

8 MR. SMET: We'll respond in our
9 responsiveness summary.

10 MR. ROMAINE: That fact has been announced
11 tonight.

12 MR. PERBIX: And I would go so far as to
13 say that even 20 pounds a year is too much mercury to
14 be emitting into our environment. The Illinois
15 Environmental Protection Agency itself acknowledges
16 that our 120 miles of rivers and streams and the
17 316,000 acres of lakes have already been severely
18 polluted by mercury.

19 Unlike many pollutants, mercury does not
20 simply go away. Once it's emitted into the air,
21 actually becomes a part of our ecosystem, it
22 accumulates in aquatic systems and goes up in the fish
23 that folks rely on to eat. You know, we live in an
24 era where 1 in 12 women of childbearing age due to

1 mercury in fish are estimated to contain elevated
2 levels of mercury which could potentially threaten the
3 fetuses of their unborn children.

4 You know, this is not clean coal. Here in
5 Illinois, thousands of folks rely on our rivers and
6 streams for sport fishing, hunting, and bird-watching.
7 If you want to talk about jobs, that alone contributed
8 \$2.3 billion to the state's economy for the last year
9 in which data is available.

10 We know that by avoiding emissions of
11 mercury from coal burning we can avoid these kinds of
12 toxic impacts on our environment, on our fresh water,
13 on our streams, and the wildlife that we rely on and
14 that relies on that clean environment to survive, and
15 for that reason, we would ask you tonight to deny the
16 permit for the Tenaska Taylorville Energy Center.
17 This is not clean coal, and there shouldn't be a
18 mistake about it. Thank you.

19 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Perbix. That
20 completes the first round of going through the cards
21 for those that had indicated they wanted to comment.
22 As is customary and as I said at the beginning of this
23 hearing, that after we did that, I would ask if there
24 was anyone here that has not spoken that wanted to

1 make a brief statement on the record.

2 If you'd come forward, sir, to the
3 microphone and state your name and spell your last
4 name for the record, please.

5 MR. CURTIN: John Curtin, J-o-h-n,
6 C-u-r-t-i-n. Until a little less than 24 hours ago, I
7 was chairman of the Christian County Board. And I
8 speak tonight on behalf of that Christian County Board
9 and the residents that the board represents. I ask
10 you to approve the updated Taylorville Energy Center
11 air quality permit. Over the years, the board has
12 unanimously shown their support through your approval
13 of resolution that was adopted to meet the needs and
14 encourage that action be taken to see this endeavor
15 through to fruition.

16 I was here during the coal boon when
17 supplies would come in, trainloads of coal went out,
18 the miners were secure with American jobs, and they
19 ate and lived in this town. I saw that boom end and
20 eventually die off when the demand for Illinois coal
21 waned due to more stringent standards in the Clean Air
22 Act. Now we have a chance to bring new life into this
23 industry by using the coal in a cleaner more
24 environmentally responsible way.

1 Over the years, we have raised our
2 questions to Taylorville Energy Center Development's
3 director, and we are comfortable with their answers
4 and their ongoing working relationship. In addition,
5 I am a landowner, and the impact to my land operation
6 is extremely important to me. We are very satisfied
7 with the standards that Illinois Environmental
8 Protection Agency and the United States EPA have
9 imposed on the Taylorville Energy Center. We
10 understand this area being based down the road from
11 us. We are asking the IEPA to support this project
12 and by doing so support the economic and environmental
13 development of our region. Thank you very much.

14 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Curtin. There
15 was someone over here. If you'd come forward to the
16 podium and state your name and spell your last name
17 for the record, please.

18 MR. PETERSON: My name's Pat Peterson,
19 P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n. I'm an assistant business manager
20 for the International Brotherhood of Electrical
21 Workers Local 193, Springfield, Illinois. I stand
22 here before you and represent my organization. Myself
23 and my organization fully support the issuance of this
24 permit. As Mr. Curtin earlier, we have a lot of coal

1 plants that are going to be shut down because they
2 don't meet the EPA requirements because it would be
3 too expensive to retrofit those.

4 This plant will bring, you know, catch up
5 the slack of that lost electrical production. And the
6 jobs that it will create are, there's 2500
7 construction jobs, hundreds of coal mining jobs,
8 hundreds of permanent plant jobs. The wind power was
9 mentioned tonight is great. I love wind power too.
10 That gives us jobs too. Wind power is not going to
11 meet the demands that we need when these coal plants
12 are shut down.

13 Solar power's great. Solar power provides
14 us some jobs too. But it's not going to meet the
15 demands either. This coal plant will have the cutting
16 technology. We'll be leading the world in this
17 cutting-edge technology, and I think we need to go
18 through with this plant. And again, we're in full
19 support of the issuance of this permit. Thank you.

20 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Peterson. Is
21 there anyone else that has not spoken that would like
22 to do so this evening before we go back to those that
23 have spoken and ran out of time?

24 (No response.)

1 MR. STUDER: Okay. Not seeing any more
2 hands, we had one person that ran out of time, and
3 Patricia Rykhus.

4 MS. RYKHUS: Thank you for allowing me the
5 opportunity to come back up here. As a concerned
6 local citizen, I was wondering how Christian County
7 compared with the other counties within the state of
8 Illinois. When I looked at the IEPA document, the
9 2009 Illinois Air Quality Report, I was shocked when I
10 saw that Christian County was 16th highest in PM10,
11 which is a measure of particulate matter in our air.
12 As far as carbon monoxide, we are the 10th highest
13 within our state. Currently sulfur dioxide, we're
14 seventh highest in the state, and nitrogen oxides, we
15 are third highest in the state of Illinois out of the
16 102 counties. In this respect, I'd say right now we
17 are not doing so great here in Christian County as far
18 as the emissions in our air, and this is even before
19 the Taylorville Energy Center emissions are added in.

20 Earlier when I talked about the air
21 separation unit and what comprised the plant and how
22 emissions were measured and counted, when I looked at
23 the air separation unit, I didn't see anywhere where
24 the measurement of the oxygen required for the

1 gasification block was. I didn't see that number. I
2 didn't know if IEPA had any idea what the oxygen
3 requirements for the gasifiers was.

4 MR. SMET: Well, certainly not offhand.

5 MR. ROMAINE: I think we have general
6 information about that based on Illinois coal
7 gasification, but it isn't something that's relevant
8 to the permitting process because oxygen is not a
9 pollutant.

10 MS. RYKHUS: I know oxygen is not a
11 pollutant. But knowing the composition of air as
12 being 80 percent nitrogen and 20 percent oxygen, I was
13 trying to ascertain the amount of N2 nitrogen gas that
14 would be separated out during that process too and
15 where it was going.

16 MR. ROMAINE: Quite simply, the nitrogen
17 would eventually return back to the atmosphere.

18 MS. RYKHUS: Because my concern would be as
19 I look down through the permit, Section 1.13-1 and
20 4.12-1, I see that the flare was going to use nitrogen
21 to purge gas, and the gasification block was going to
22 use it to purge gas, and I was just wondering about
23 volumes of how much was going to be created versus how
24 much was going to be used because further on in the

1 permit, it said that the nitrogen separated in the
2 ASUs would be used in the plant. And the volumes
3 concern me. This doesn't really require an answer.

4 But when I look at that and compare it to
5 what I've read in the ICC paperwork and they're
6 looking at the nitrogen waste stream and the ICC
7 Exhibit 10-3.1.7 is the next and (inaudible) sulfur
8 versus sulfuric acid processing, and I'm looking down
9 at that. And in it, they talk about sulfur and they
10 asked if plant exhaust. They had consultants who said
11 that marketing the sulfur and then the sulfuric acid
12 and the cost benefits of it, I was looking at where
13 the other byproducts would be and whether they'd be
14 gas versus a liquid or solid form and where the
15 responsibility for measurements of the emissions from
16 these other plants that they may or may not be under
17 the Tenaska umbrella would be.

18 When I looked at the emissions during the
19 different processes, I had questions about the
20 startup, shutdown, malfunction, and breakdown
21 processes and especially for during their startup
22 because I saw that the sulfur emissions during regular
23 processing was like .63 pounds per hour but during
24 startup it was like 64.4 pounds per air per hour. I

1 didn't see anywhere where there was a time limit on
2 like the startup process. I saw all the other
3 criteria requirements, but I never saw a time frame.
4 Did I miss it somewhere?

5 MR. ROMAINE: No. In terms of dealing with
6 the startup that's addressed per event, so that there
7 is not a rate per hour, it's a total amount per event.

8 MS. RYKHUS: So there's no time limit? It
9 could be in startup mode for hours, days?

10 MR. ROMAINE: I don't think that's
11 realistic, but certainly there could be a variability
12 in the startup depending if unforeseen events develop
13 during the startup. In either case, no matter what
14 the startup is, if it's a hot start, there is a
15 certain limit for the amount of emissions per that hot
16 start event; likewise, there's a limit on the amount
17 of emissions for a coal startup.

18 MS. RYKHUS: Okay. Not very many more
19 comments. When I look at the waste streams and I see
20 the unaccounted-for nitrogen in the air, it has to be
21 going some other route. When I look at the amount of
22 sulfur generated and don't see it going into the air,
23 we're changing kind of a paradigm of thought where
24 before combustion, things were captured or they went

1 into air and dispersed over large areas
2 geographically.

3 In coal gasification, these toxic chemicals
4 can be concentrated and stored and/or processed
5 locally. Talking about the nitrogen for maybe uses in
6 an ammonium hydroxide plant, sulfur that could be used
7 in a sulfuric acid processing plant, and I really
8 wanted to make it emphatically clear this is not the
9 clean coal industry, this is actually the coal
10 chemical industry.

11 And I challenge everyone here today to go
12 home and Google coal chemical industry or coal to
13 chemicals and research this. What the general public
14 in Taylorville do not understand is that this plant
15 has a high propensity to act as a government-funded
16 front end for chemical processing plant. And do we
17 want that within our city corporate limits? This is
18 not a clean coal plant. It actually looks more like a
19 dirty gas plant to me. Thank you.

20 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Rykhus. I
21 remind everyone that we will be accepting written
22 comments through December 31, 2011, and I thank you
23 all for your patience and for your attendance here
24 this evening. This hearing is adjourned.

(Off the record at 8:55 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

) ss.

COUNTY OF SANGAMON)

I, Rhonda K. O'Neal, a Certified Shorthand Reporter (IL), Registered Professional Reporter, and a Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the meeting aforementioned was held on the time and in the place previously described.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal.

Notary Public within and for
the State of Illinois