

1 ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2 GRANITE CITY TOWNSHIP HALL
3 GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS
4
5
6 CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE
7 OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PERMITS
8 FROM UNITED STATES STEEL
9 CORPORATION IN GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS
10
11 PUBLIC HEARING
12 JULY 18, 2012
13
14 Hearing panel:
15 Mr. Dean Studer, Hearing Officer
16 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
17
18 Mr. Kevin Smith, Permit Engineer
19 IEPA Bureau of Air
20
21 Mr. Anatoly Belogorsky, Permit Engineer
22 IEPA Bureau of Air
23
24 Court Reporter: Angie R. Kelly, CSR/CCR
25 (Starting time of hearing: 7:03 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
25

I N D E X

Speakers:	Page
Dean Studer.....	3
Kevin Smith.....	9
Kathy Andria.....	17,28
Erika Belmont.....	22
Robert Bewkes.....	25

E X H I B I T S

(None.)

1 (On the record at 7:03 p.m.)

2 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Before I read my opening
3 statement, I would ask that if you have a cell phone or pager
4 that you please silence it at this time, if you haven't already
5 done so.

6 Good evening everyone, my name is Dean Studer, and I'm
7 assuming everybody can hear me? My name is Dean Studer I'm
8 hearing officer for the Illinois Environmental Protection
9 Agency. On behalf of the Interim Director John Kim, I welcome
10 you to tonight's hearing. My purpose tonight is to ensure these
11 proceedings run properly, according to rules and are conducted
12 in a fair, efficient manner. Personally, I will not be
13 responding to specific technical issues related to the permits,
14 but will defer such issues to the technical staff with me.

15 This an informational hearing for Illinois EPA to
16 accept public comments regarding three air pollution control
17 permit applications from United States Steel Corporation,
18 otherwise referred to as US Steel. US Steel operates an existing
19 integrated steel mill located at 1951 State Street here in
20 Granite City.

21 The primary application and the focus of tonight's
22 hearing is a construction permit application, which addresses an
23 emission reduction project planned for existing equipment at the
24 steel mill. The emission reduction project includes a new
25 control system for particulate emission designed to reduce

1 particulate emissions from existing operations at the steel
2 mill. This is an opportunity for you to comment on the
3 construction permit.

4 US Steel has also requested a revision to their
5 operating permit, that is their Clean Air Act Permit Program,
6 and that's otherwise referred to as CAAPP permit, to include the
7 emission reduction project. No other changes are proposed for
8 US Steel's CAAPP permit. Accordingly, the only comments
9 relevant to the CAAPP permit in this proceeding are those
10 involved with the proposed emission reduction project.

11 Finally, US Steel has requested a revision of a
12 previously issued construction permit that addresses existing
13 operations at the steel mill. The proposed revisions to this
14 construction permit would remove certain requirements from this
15 prior permit that would no longer be appropriate or possible
16 with the new control equipment. As with the CAAPP permit, no
17 other changes are proposed for the revised construction permit.
18 Accordingly, the only comments relevant to the revised
19 construction permit in this proceeding are those involved with
20 the proposed emission reduction protect.

21 The project will not constitute a modification under
22 the federal rules for Prevention of Significant Deterioration
23 PSD, under 40 CFR 52.21, or Illinois' rules for Major Stationary
24 Sources Construction and Modification, and those state rules are
25 found in 35 Illinois Administrative Code Part 203. The Illinois

1 EPA has made preliminary determination that requested permits
2 may be issued and has prepared draft permits for public review.
3 The Illinois EPA is holding this hearing for the purpose of
4 accepting comments from the public on the proposed issuance of
5 these permits prior to actually making final decisions on the
6 applications.

7 The public hearing is being held under the provisions
8 of the Illinois EPA's procedure for permit and closure plan
9 hearings, which can be found at 35 Administrative Code, Part
10 166, Subpart A. Copies of this procedures can be accessed on
11 the website for Illinois Pollution Control Board at
12 www.ipcb.state.il.us, or can be obtained from me, upon request.

13 An informational public hearing means exactly that. It
14 is an opportunity for you to provide information to Illinois EPA
15 concerning these permits as previously discussed. This is not a
16 contested case hearing.

17 I would like to explain how tonight's hearing is going
18 to proceed. First, I will have a Illinois EPA staff introduce
19 themselves and identify their responsibilities within the agency
20 in regard to these permitting action. Mr. Kevin Smith is a
21 permit engineer in the Bureau of Air will then make a brief
22 statement. This will be followed by additional instructions on
23 how I will be taking oral comments during the hearing this
24 evening and then I will allow the public to begin providing
25 comments.

1 You are not required to provide your comments orally.
2 Written comments are given the same consideration and same
3 weight, and may be submitted to the Illinois EPA at any time
4 during the comment period, which actually started 45 days ago,
5 and goes through August 17, 2012. All comments submitted by
6 mail must be postmarked no later than August 17, 2012. Although
7 we will continue to accept comments through that date, tonight
8 is the only time that we will accept oral comments.

9 The decision date in this matter by the Illinois EPA
10 will depend upon the number and nature of comments received, as
11 well as other factors.

12 Any person who wants to make oral comments may do so,
13 as long as the statements are relevant to the issues at hand and
14 time allows. If you have not completed a registration card at
15 this point, please see Michelle Tebrugge at the registration
16 area, and she will provide you with a registration card. Please
17 be sure to mark the appropriate box on the card if you would
18 like to make comments at tonight's hearing. If you have lengthy
19 comments, you may submit them to me in writing before the end of
20 the comment period, and I will ensure that they are included in
21 the hearing record as exhibits.

22 Again, please keep your comments relative to issue at
23 hand, the emissions and reduction project. If your comments
24 fall outside of the scope of this hearing, I may ask you to
25 proceed to your next issue.

1 US Steel is also free to respond to issues that are
2 raised, if willing to do so, but I am not in the position to
3 require them to do so. I will not allow the speakers to argue
4 or engage in prolonged dialogue with members of our panel. I
5 also will not allow members of the public to address comments to
6 other members of the public. Comments from the public are to be
7 addressed to the hearing panel and the court reporter.

8 For the purpose of allowing everyone to have a chance
9 to comment, I ask that everyone keep their comments to nine
10 minutes.

11 In addition, I'd like to stress we'd like to avoid
12 unnecessary repetition. If anyone before you had already
13 presented what is contained in your comments, please skip over
14 those issues when you speak. Of someone speaking before you has
15 already said what you desired to say, you may pass when I call
16 your name and come forward. Again, we are also accepting written
17 comments, which will become part of the official record in this
18 matter and will be considered.

19 All who legibly complete a registration card or submit
20 written comments in this matter during the comment period will
21 be notified of the final decision in this matter and of the
22 availability of the responsiveness summary. In the
23 responsiveness summary, the Illinois EPA will respond to all
24 significant issues that were raised at this hearing or submitted
25 to me prior to the close of the comment period. The record in

1 this matter will close on August 17, 2012. Again I will accept
2 written comments as long as they are postmarked by August 17,
3 2012.

4 While the record is open all relevant comments and
5 documents and data will be placed into the hearing record as
6 exhibits. Please send all written documents to my attention,
7 they should be mailed to Dean Studer, Hearing Officer, Office of
8 Community Relations, regarding US Steel Air Permits, Illinois
9 EPA, 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276, Springfield,
10 Illinois, 62794-9276. The address is also given on the public
11 notice for this hearing tonight.

12 At this time, again I remind you if you haven't
13 already done so, please silence all cellphones and pagers, if
14 you have not already done so. I will now have the Illinois EPA
15 staff present here tonight to introduce themselves, and then
16 Kevin Smith will make a brief statement regarding permit.

17 MR. SMITH: Hi, I'm Kevin Smith, permit engineer for
18 the Illinois EPA Bureau of Air Permit Section. I'll be giving an
19 overview of the draft permits for the new baghouse capture and
20 control system for the basic oxygen process furnaces at the US
21 Steel, Granite City works this evening.

22 MR. BELOGORSKY: Good evening, I'm Anatoly Belogorsky.
23 I am from Illinois EPA Clean Air Act Permit Section, and if you
24 have any further questions about baghouse program I will be
25 available.

1 MR. SMITH: US Steel has agreed to install a baghouse
2 control system pursuant to agreement between US Steel and
3 Illinois EPA. The purpose of the agreement is to reduce
4 emissions of particulate matter 2.5 from the existing BOP
5 furnace shop. Consistent with the agreement, US Steel submitted
6 an application to construct a new baghouse capture and control
7 system. This permitting process will cover three distinct
8 permitting actions; first a construction permit for the new
9 baghouse capture and control system. Second, modifications to
10 the facilities existing CAAPP permit through the integrated
11 permitting process and third, revisions to an existing PSD
12 permit.

13 The proposed draft construction permit for the
14 baghouse control system would authorize an emissions reduction
15 project for the particulate matter from the charging and tapping
16 stages of the steel making process for two existing BOPF's at
17 the source. The existing electrostatic precipitator ESP would
18 continue to be used to control particulate emissions from these
19 furnaces during the refining stage of the steel making process.

20 The permit containing operating limitations,
21 monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting requirements for the
22 capture and control systems that are appropriate for it's design
23 and representative and reliable indicators of the performance of
24 the capture and control system.

25 Testing is required for the new baghouse control

1 system and the existing ESP to demonstrate initial compliance
2 with the permit limits; follow-up testing is also required
3 within one year of initial operation of the new baghouse system.

4 In conjunction with the issuance of the construction
5 permit, Illinois EPA is proposing to authorize certain changes
6 to the conditions in the current CAAPP permit for Granite City
7 Works. This is because the CAAPP permit contains certain
8 requirements for control of the BOP furnaces with the existing
9 ESP that would no longer be feasible or necessary when
10 particulate emissions are controlled by the combination of the
11 new baghouse and existing electrostatic precipitator ESPs that
12 would no longer be feasible or necessary when particulate
13 emissions are controlled by the combination of the new baghouse
14 and existing ESP control systems. Therefore, these CAAPP permit
15 conditions will be replaced with new provisions for the new
16 control configuration. In order to clearly address both current
17 requirements and future requirements for the BOP furnaces, the
18 draft construction permit is being processed by means of the
19 integrated processing procedure.

20 Consequently, the draft construction permit is subject
21 to procedural requirements that are substantially equivalent to
22 those that apply to CAAPP permits and will provide for future
23 requirements for the furnaces with the baghouse control system
24 as they will be set forth in the CAAPP permit. However, until
25 the new baghouse system begins operation, the basic oxygen

1 furnaces would continue to be subject to the conditions in
2 Section 7.5 of the current CAAPP permit.

3 In addition to the modifications of the CAAPP permit,
4 for the new baghouse control system, US Steel has requested to
5 make revisions to an existing PSD, prevention of significant
6 deterioration construction permit. The PSD permit includes
7 conditions for the controlling of emissions from the BOPF with
8 electrostatic precipitator during the charging and tapping metal
9 processing steps. The revised permit would not include
10 operational and other requirements for the BOP furnaces and the
11 existing ESP control system that would be inconsistent with the
12 future operation of the furnaces with both the baghouse and ESP
13 control systems. Revisions to this permit would also include
14 replacement of operational requirements for the BOP furnaces
15 that are now considered obsolete or outdated given new
16 requirements that apply to the furnaces adopted by USEPA.
17 However, these revisions would not involve the emissions limits
18 for the BOP furnaces that were set by this permit.

19 In summary, US Steel applied for permits for an
20 emission reduction project for the BOPF that will cover a total
21 of three permits including a construction permit for the new
22 baghouse capture and control system, modification to the
23 facilities existing CAAPP permit to incorporate the new
24 construction permit conditions through integrated permitting
25 processing and revisions to an existing PSD permit to reflect

1 the new control strategy for the BOPF's.

2 Illinois EPA is proposing to grant the emissions
3 reduction project permits for the facility. We welcome any
4 comments or questions on our proposed action as they pertain to
5 the emissions reduction permit. Thank you.

6 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you Kevin. I'll go
7 ahead and give some further instructions on how we take comments
8 this evening.

9 While the issues raised tonight may indeed be
10 heartfelt concerns to many of us in attendance, applause is not
11 appropriate during the course of this hearing. On a similar
12 note, booing, hissing and jeering are also not appropriate and
13 will not be allowed tonight.

14 Secondly, I am not going to allow statements to be
15 made tonight that do not relate to the issues involved with the
16 proposed emission reduction project planned for the two basic
17 oxygen process furnaces at the steel mill. Statements and
18 comments that are of a personal nature or reflect on the
19 character or motive of a person or group of people are not
20 appropriate in this hearing. If statements or comments begin to
21 drift into this area I may interrupt the person speaking and ask
22 that they proceed to the next relevant issue. As hearing officer
23 I intend to treat everyone here tonight in a courteous,
24 respectful and professional manner. I ask that the members of
25 the panel and public do the same. If the conduct of persons

1 attending this hearing should become unruly, I am authorized to
2 adjourn this hearing should the actions warrant. In such a case,
3 the Illinois EPA would still accept written comments through the
4 close of the comment period.

5 Since we have a limited time in which to conduct this
6 hearing, Illinois EPA staff members will be responding to issues
7 primarily for clarification purposes. We are here tonight to
8 listen to environmental issues. You may disagree with some of
9 the statements and comments made tonight, but this is a public
10 hearing and everyone has a right to express their comments on
11 this matter.

12 Again, written comments are given the same
13 consideration as oral comments received during the hearing and
14 may be submitted to the Illinois EPA at any time within the
15 public comment period which ends at the end of the day on
16 August 17, 2012. Excuse me, yeah, August 17, 2011. Although we
17 will continue to accept comments through that date, tonight is
18 the only time that we will accept oral comments. Any person who
19 wishes to make an oral comment may do so as long as the
20 statements are relevant to the issues at hand and time allows,
21 as previously discussed.

22 If you have lengthy comments, please consider
23 giving only a summary of those comments during the hearing and
24 then submitting comments in their entirety to me in writing
25 before the close of the comment period. I will ensure that they

1 are included in the hearing record as an exhibit. Please keep
2 your comments relevant to the issues at hand. Again, if
3 comments fall outside of the scope of this hearing, I may ask
4 you to proceed to your next issue. For the purpose of allowing
5 everyone to have a chance to comment and to make sure we conduct
6 this hearing in a timely fashion, I will impose a time limit of
7 five minutes per speaker. If everyone has had an opportunity to
8 speak and time still allows, I may allow those who did not
9 initially desire to speak to do so. In the event that we cannot
10 accommodate everyone who wishes to make comments this evening,
11 you are asked to submit your comments to us in writing. Again,
12 written comments are given the same weight as comments made
13 orally at this hearing.

14 Again, I stress that I want to avoid unnecessary
15 repetition. Once a point is made, it makes no difference if a
16 point is made once or whether it's made 99 times; it will be
17 considered and will be reflected only once in the responsiveness
18 summary. The final decision of Illinois EPA will not be based
19 on how many people support or oppose this project, but rather
20 upon the record and whether the facility will comply with
21 applicable laws, regulations and requirements for permit
22 issuance.

23 We have a court reporter here tonight who is taking a
24 record of these proceedings for the purpose of us compiling the
25 administrative record. Therefore for her benefit, please keep

1 the general background noise in the room to a minimum. So that
2 she can hear everything that is said. Illinois EPA will post a
3 transcript of this hearing on our web page in the same general
4 place where the hearing notice, project summary and draft
5 permits have been posted. It is my desire to have this posted
6 in about two to two and a half weeks following the close of this
7 hearing, but the actual date will depend on when I get the
8 transcript back from the court reporter.

9 When it is your turn to speak, I will call your name
10 to come forward. For the record, you should state your name and
11 if applicable, any governmental mental body, an organization
12 that you represent. If you are not representing a governmental
13 body, an organization or an association, you may simply indicate
14 that you are a concerned citizen or a member of the public. For
15 the benefit of the court reporter, I ask that you spell your
16 last name. If there are alternate spellings for your first
17 name, you may also spell your first name. Once you spell your
18 name, I will start timing you, and you will have nine minutes to
19 complete your comments.

20 I ask that while you are speaking that you direct
21 your attention to the hearing panel and to the court reporter to
22 ensure that accurate record of your comments can be made.
23 Prolonged dialogue with members of the hearing panel or with
24 others here in attendance will not be permitted. Comments
25 directed to the audience are also not allowed. Again, I remind

1 everyone that the focus of this hearing is the environmental
2 issues associated with the permits required to address the
3 emissions reduction project planned for the two basic oxygen
4 process furnaces.

5 People who have requested to speak will be called upon
6 in the order they have registered. Are there any questions
7 regarding the procedure that will be used regarding this hearing
8 this evening?

9 Let the record indicate that no one raised their hand.
10 With that, the first person is Erika Belmont. If you would come
11 forward to the podium please.

12 MS. BELMONT: (Inaudible)

13 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Well, we are going in this
14 order, but if you want to pass and come back. We've only got a
15 few people that have registered, we can do that.

16 MS. BELMONT: Sure.

17 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: The other person that
18 registered next was Robert Bewkes.

19 MR. BEWKES: I'll pass also.

20 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Okay. The next person that
21 registered is Kathy Andria. Kathy, you may have to turn the
22 switch on on that mike, I think I left it off while I was
23 speaking. You've got it. It's kind of temperamental with the
24 podium set up the way it is. It's kind of hard to get your voice
25 to project. I'll turn you up if need be. With your back to the

1 audience, sometimes it's hard for them to hear.

2 If you're sitting out here and you can't hear what is
3 said, please let me know. Okay.

4 MS. ANDRIA: My name is Kathy Andria, Kathy with a K,
5 A-N-D-R-I-A. I am president of American Bottom Conservancy.
6 Member of Sierra Club, National Clean Air Committee member of
7 Illinois EPA Environmental Justice Advisory Group. I want to
8 thank you and US Steel for reaching a Memorandum of
9 Understanding to install a baghouse to control fine particulate
10 emissions coming from the basic oxygen furnace at the Granite
11 City working facility.

12 The St. Louis area has been unable to meet federal air
13 quality standards for fine particulates for far too long. Both
14 US EPA and IEPA point to US Steel as the primary contributor.
15 IEPA thinks the problem may be basic oxygen furnace, known at
16 BOPF, and that's why we're here.

17 According to the US EPA website, the size of
18 particulate directly linked to the potential for causing health
19 problems. Small particles less than 2.5 microns in diameter
20 pose the greatest problem because they can get deep into your
21 lungs. Some may even get into your bloodstream. Exposure to
22 such particles can affect both your lungs and your heart.
23 Particle pollution, especially fine particles, contain
24 microscopic solid or liquid droppings that are so small that
25 they can get deep into the lungs and cause serious health

1 problems. Numerous scientific studies have linked particle
2 pollution exposure to a variety of problems, including premature
3 death in people with heart and lung disease, nonfatal heart
4 attacks, irregular heartbeat, aggravated asthma, decreased lung
5 functions, and increased respiratory symptoms such as irritation
6 of the airways, coughing and difficulty breathing.

7 People with heart or lung diseases and children and
8 older adults are the most likely to be affected by particle
9 pollution exposure. However, even if you were healthy, you may
10 experience temporary symptoms from exposure to elevated levels
11 of particle pollution. There are scientific studies that show
12 the fine particles are more strongly associated with acute
13 respiratory health effects in school children than coarse
14 particles. Studies show that they contribute to or exacerbate
15 heart and lung disease and indeed may cause asthma in young
16 children. There's even a new study that shows that fine
17 particle contribute to dementia or Alzheimer's. And as the EPA
18 website states, PM 2.5 can cause premature death.

19 The Granite City area has way more than it's share of
20 young children with asthma, ask any school nurse. We have more
21 than our share of people with heart and lung disease. The
22 percentages of those living in poverty and the minority
23 residences within five miles of the facility are significantly
24 higher than national state and county averages creating
25 environmental justice concerns. There are also significantly

1 higher percentages of children and elderly.

2 In addition, approximately 365,000 people using
3 Horseshoe Lake State Park annually for recreation, including
4 biking, hiking, fishing hunting and picnics. Horseshoe Lake
5 sits right next to the facility.

6 It is important to know the difference between course
7 particles known as PM 10, and the more dangerous or fine
8 particles, or PM 2.5, which can inhale deep into the lungs and
9 even pass into the bloodstream. I make these two points again,
10 because this permit fails to differentiate between the two. All
11 particles are lumped together as PM, and there is no limit in
12 the permit on PM 2.5. There is a mention of fine particulates
13 that are required to submit a onetime report of PM 2.5
14 presumedly for purposes of the state implementation plan or SIP,
15 but there is no ongoing accountability for fine particulates,
16 and I'd like to know why.

17 With current BOF controls and ESP or electrostatic
18 precipitator the PM emissions are reported to be 439.5 tons per
19 year. After installing the new baghouse, they would leave
20 405.4. That is 405 tons of tiny detonate particles a year. A
21 particle that is 30 times smaller than the human hair. It
22 boggles my mind to imagine 400 tons of deadly particles that are
23 so small that several thousand can fit on the end of the period
24 at the end of the sentence.

25 The baghouse installed on the new Gateway Coke plant

1 is required to remove 99.9 percent of the PM 2.5 emission. The
2 baghouse proposed to be used for the BOF has only a 97 percent
3 removal. Is this the best baghouse available for BOF? Is this
4 the best filter available? Are the full capabilities of the
5 baghouse going to be used? What is the manufactures stated
6 capability, and how does it compare to the most protected one?

7 There are there processes in the BOF, charging,
8 tapping and refining. The new baghouse would control emissions
9 from tapping and charging, but emissions from refining would be
10 controlled by ESP. Is there a reason the baghouse can't also
11 control the refining emissions? While we were truly grateful a
12 baghouse will be installed, the big question is can we do
13 better.

14 It has taken many years to get to this point. As long
15 as the company is installing a new baghouse, why not install the
16 most protective one available so that the greatest emission
17 reduction can be made. It will be more protective of our
18 children and our elderly, and perhaps the area can truly get to
19 obtain and meet the federal air quality standards. Thank you
20 for considering my comments. I would like to pursue answers to
21 my question after other people have had an opportunity to
22 comment, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

23 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Thank you Miss Andria.

24 Amy Funk?

25 MS. FUNK: Pass.

1 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Mark Feldor? Nope, okay.

2 We've gone through those that have registered that
3 they want to speak. There were two people that I had passed
4 early on, they said they wanted to reserve their comment, passed
5 initially. I'll go back to those two folks. Following those
6 two, I will ask if there's anyone else here that has not spoken
7 that would like to do, so then we'll see how much time we have,
8 continue with that.

9 Erika Belmont, did you want to speak at this point?

10 MS. BELMONT: Hi. My is Erika Belmont. Erika with a K.
11 B-E-L-M-O-N-T. I'm working with the Washington University
12 interdisciplinary law clinic, which is working with American
13 Bottom Conservancy. I have a few questions about the permit
14 application.

15 US EPA has certified numerous fabric filters that
16 achieve a 99.99 percent removal efficiency for PM 2.5.
17 According to US Steel, the proposed new baghouse for the basic
18 oxygen furnace will have a 97 percent PM removal efficiency.
19 Could US Steel be achieving a higher removal efficiency? If so,
20 is there a reason that it's not doing so.

21 MR. SMITH: First, the baghouse permit application is
22 an application that was submitted by US Steel pursuant to an
23 agreement for emissions reduction project for additional control
24 of the facility. There were no state or federal requirements
25 mandating that they put this in. The 97 percent control

1 efficiency is a continuously attainable control efficiency that
2 they have agreed to meet, whether the baghouse will do better or
3 not, will be determined at the time of testing.

4 MS. BELMONT: Thank you. I also have questions
5 concerning pendency of application. There is just some gaps in
6 it's description of the proposed baghouse that make it difficult
7 to evaluate the draft permit, and I'll go through.

8 In the air pollution control equipment data
9 information, the manufacturer of control equipment is marked to
10 be determined. There is no fabric filter model emissions. Also
11 in the supplemental form air pollution control equipment filter,
12 the filter materials description is limited to polyester. The
13 filtering area is also to be determined. There are unknown
14 inlet emission stream parameters, and there is an unknown mean
15 particle diameter. I was just the wondering if there were any
16 reasons why these detail are not provided or marked the way they
17 were? Has IEPA obtained anymore information for the fabric
18 filters such as the model, supplier, filter area or details
19 concerning the operation of the baghouse filter?

20 MR. SMITH: I don't believe we have received any
21 additional information of the manufacturer of the baghouse yet.
22 The Memorandum of Understanding required an emissions limit of
23 0.005 units per dry standard cubic foot. As long as they meet
24 that requirement, the requirements said, met the requirements
25 they we put before them, whether they do it with brand A or

1 brand B of baghouses, doesn't matter as much, as actually
2 meeting the emissions limit put forth.

3 MS. BELMONT: I also just have some questions about
4 emissions limits. Although the Memorandum of Understanding has
5 between IEPA and US Steel set emission limits for total PM, is
6 that the only reason why the draft permit does not include a PM
7 2.5 emission limit?

8 MR. SMITH: We'll have to get back to you on that one,
9 if that's okay.

10 MS. BELMONT: Okay. Given that the purpose of the
11 baghouse is to reduce PM 2.5 emissions that this area is
12 non-attainment for PM 2.5 and could well be non-attainment under
13 proposed revised PM 2.5 ambient air quality standards, is there
14 anything that prevents IEPA from putting a 2.5 PM limit in the
15 permit.

16 MR. SMITH: The permit as drafted reflects the
17 agreement between Illinois EPA and US Steel Corporation. The
18 Memorandum of Understanding didn't include such, so for now,
19 there isn't one in the permit.

20 MS. BELMONT: Just one more question. Do any steel
21 mills have PM 2.5 unit for BOP shop emission limits?

22 MR. SMITH: Any other in the state, world?

23 MS. BELMONT: Country, maybe?

24 MR. SMITH: I don't know, we would have to get back to
25 you on that.

1 MS. BELMONT: Okay.

2 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Well, thank you for your time.

3 MR. SMITH: You're welcome. Thank you.

4 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Just as clarification, we'll
5 only be responding to those in the State of Illinois on that.
6 We're not going to do a worldwide search on something like that,
7 when it's outside of our jurisdiction.

8 MS. BELMONT: Okay.

9 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Robert Bewkes, do you want to
10 speak?

11 MR. BEWKES: Yes. Good evening. My name is Robert
12 Bewkes B as in B E-W-K-E-S. I'm a summer intern at the
13 Washington University Interdisciplinary Clinic working with
14 American Bottom Conservancy.

15 My question is concerning the permit. We realize the
16 Memorandum of Understanding between IEPA and US Steel set
17 emission limits for total PM, is that the only reason why the
18 draft -- I'm sorry, that was her question. Let me start over.

19 The permit does not set the emission limits for PM
20 2.5, even though the key purpose of installing the baghouse is
21 to reduce PM to 2.5 emissions. The permit does test for
22 emissions for PM 2.5, we're not questioning that you have
23 emission testings. Our question is, what use do you plan to
24 make of the testing results?

25 MR. SMITH: We in general use test results for other

1 similar facilities when they were going to make modifications at
2 similar facilities in the state. We can use the testing in that
3 manner, or just generally make sure they're in compliance with
4 the permits. Does that answer your question?

5 MR. BEWKES: Sure, thank you. In condition 3-2(a) of
6 the permit requires US Steel to make measurements in order to
7 control PM efficiency of the BOF baghouse. The permit allows
8 for measurements to be made directly or indirectly. Would
9 direct measurement likely be more accurate than indirect? If
10 so, why not require direct measurement?

11 MR. SMITH: Actually, I'm not an expert on testing
12 procedures, so we'll have to defer that question for our model
13 unit, when we get back.

14 MR. BEWKES: Thank you. Next question concerns section
15 3-1 (b) (ii) of the construction permit. Is EPA method 201
16 capable of testing for filterable PM 2.5, or does it just test
17 for PM10?

18 MR. SMITH: Again, that would be a question for model
19 unit.

20 MR. BEWKES: Okay, I'll just finish the question. Is
21 method 201A capable of testing for filterable PM 2.5 and PM 10?
22 The permit requires US Steel to test for filterable PM 10 and PM
23 2.5.?

24 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: We'll let you go ahead and ask
25 the question dealing with procedure, but we're not going to be

1 able to answer those at the hearing, but we will respond to
2 those in writing. So go ahead and read them into the record so
3 that we've got them.

4 MR. BEWKES: Okay.

5 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: When you've got a question for
6 the hearing panel.

7 MR. BEWKES: Why give the option of 201 when it does
8 not test for PM 2.5? Why not limit the testing to method 201A
9 which tests for both PM10 and PM 2.5?

10 My next question for the hearing panel. In condition
11 3-1 (e) (iii) of the construction permit, there's a requirement
12 that the permittee submit the final report to Illinois EPA after
13 emissions test containing proposed operating parameter limits
14 that's based on emission testing when applicable. Under what
15 circumstances are proposed operating parameters limits
16 considered applicable? When proposed operating parameter limits
17 are submitted, what is the procedure and timeframe in which IEPA
18 reviews and establishes them?

19 MR. SMITH: I can answer this question in part,
20 probably need something more detailed in writing, but the
21 operating parameter that would be established based on the test,
22 would be how the baghouse control system remained operate during
23 the testing. That will ensure that there is consistent and
24 repeatable use of the baghouse control system, and the operation
25 of the basic process that coincides to that operation, while the

1 testing was going on, so that we can be relatively assured that
2 the emissions from the control system will be consistent because
3 we'll be operating in the same manner

4 MR. BEWKES: And you'll get that procedure on
5 timeframe?

6 MR. SMITH: Yes.

7 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: We'll get back, it will be in
8 response to summary for the hearing. Once a comment is made on
9 the record, it's the policy of Illinois EPA to put those in the
10 response of summary. We don't communicate back with people for
11 additional partial responses while the record is still open.

12 MR. BEWKES: Thank you.

13 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: We have one more person that
14 has indicated she would like to have additional time, but before
15 we go back and go back to those that have already spoken, I want
16 to ask if there's anyone here that has not spoken this evening,
17 that would like to make a comment on the record.

18 Let the record indicate that no one raised their hand.
19 Kathy wanted some additional time, so if Ms. Andria would come
20 forward.

21 MS. ANDRIA: We'll I'm confused, you said Kevin in
22 answer to I think Robert's question about why you would, what
23 you were going to use the results for, to see if they were in
24 compliance with permit limits, but there aren't any permit
25 limits, am I understanding this right?

1 MR. SMITH: There are permit limits.

2 MS. ANDRIA: For 2.5?

3 MR. SMITH: For .005 units.

4 MS. ANDRIA: Could you explain to me why since there's
5 such an incredible difference between PM 2.5 and PM 10, why
6 you're not breaking them down, why there are no limits.

7 MR. SMITH: I think I answered that already.

8 MS. ANDRIA: I didn't understand.

9 MR. SMITH: I can give you a more complete answer in
10 writing, if you'd like, otherwise my answer is already on the
11 record, it pertains to the Memorandum of Understanding and the
12 agreement between US Steel and Illinois EPA.

13 MS. ANDRIA: So you are precluded of imposing limits by
14 your construction permit?

15 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: I think what Kevin is saying,
16 we'll consider it. You are free to also submit additional
17 comments on this matter during the comment period, but we will
18 consider it. The issue is that there is more than just the two
19 people that are up here tonight that have participated in this
20 permit, and we will need input from those additional staff
21 people to adequately address that question. Not as easy as it
22 may seem.

23 MS. ANDRIA: Let me ask you this: In terms of a normal
24 permit, suppose there are memorandums of understanding, would
25 you be free to put limits on PM 2.5 on monitoring the air?

1 MR. SMITH: I'm not sure if that relates to tonight's
2 discussion, I'll have to get back to you on that one.

3 MS. ANDRIA: Do you have other PM 2.5? I mean, do you
4 ever put PM 2.5 limits on anything?

5 MR. SMITH: Yes, we do.

6 MS. ANDRIA: What circumstances would they have to meet
7 to put PM 2.5 limits?

8 MR. SMITH: I think you're asking the same question
9 again, which I've already answered. I'll have to get back to
10 you.

11 MS. ANDRIA: Because that's very, to me, I mean, I am
12 thrilled that there's going to be a baghouse, but I am very,
13 very troubled that there's no PM 2.5 limits, that is my biggest
14 concerns, I will go to some of my other.

15 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Can I clarify your question,
16 make sure we responded correctly to it in writing. Is your
17 question under what conditions and what circumstances we would
18 put a 2.5 PM limit in a permit, is that it?

19 MS. ANDRIA: Yes, because right now, the answer to why
20 they didn't is because there, it's not in the memorandum
21 agreement, but a Memorandum of Understanding, but it seems to me
22 reading the permit of construction permit that there's a heck of
23 a lot that's not in the Memorandum of Understanding, so you
24 choose not to put it in. I'm trying to figure out why, because
25 you put a lot of other things in.

1 Okay. You said that you when you answered Robert's
2 one question about comparing it to other facilities, and I'm not
3 sure, did you answer Erika's question on are there other
4 manufacturers, are there other units that can get better than 97
5 percent removal?

6 MR. SMITH: I believe I did answer that, and the 97
7 percent removal was part of the agreement. The baghouse may get
8 better than that, but that was the requirement under the
9 Memorandum of Understanding.

10 MS ANDRIA: And again, you can't because of the
11 agreement, you can't require anything more stringent in a
12 non-attainment area?

13 MR. SMITH: Again, I think that goes back to the same
14 type of questions, with the 2.5, we'll just have to get back to
15 you on that one.

16 MS. ANDRIA: And are you -- you mentioned that you
17 compared other facilities in the state, I think you mentioned
18 something that other than just in the state, are there other
19 facilities like this in the state that you're written
20 construction permits for a baghouse?

21 MR. SMITH: You mean other steel production plants?

22 MS. ANDRIA: Correct.

23 MR. SMITH: I have written permits for electric arc
24 furnace.

25 MS. ANDRIA: That would not be the same BOF process?

1 MR. SMITH: BOF is different than an electric arc
2 furnace.

3 MS. ANDRIA: We don't know who the manufacturer is, or
4 we aren't supposed to address the people, but perhaps US Steel
5 might want to answer these questions. If they don't, that's
6 fine, but they know they're here if they're interested in
7 answering any of the questions, we would be appreciative.

8 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: If a member from US Steel
9 wants to address the questions, they may raise their hand during
10 this. Otherwise, if not, we'll continue. I'm not in a position
11 to be able to require them to answer it at this point.

12 MS. ANDRIA: I understand.

13 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: But you can go ahead and state
14 the question on the record, if you will.

15 MS. ANDRIA: Well, the nature of the filter, if there
16 are other filters that can get better percentages, how
17 protective, you know, that's what I'm trying to get the best
18 percentage removal. We got Gateway Coal to do the 99.9, we got
19 so many kids with asthma, and that's what we're really after. I
20 mean we're thrilled that we're finally getting the baghouse,
21 believe me, but I just think you know, they're spending the
22 money for this, and we are going to put new standards on PM 2.5.
23 We're in like a little window, not going to be attaining it,
24 just seems like this is the appropriate time to just do it and
25 get it done. Might not happen again for a long time.

1 Then I have another question and maybe US Steel might
2 want to answer. I said this, but I didn't wait for an answer.
3 About the three processes in the BAF charging, capping and
4 refining. The baghouse would control emissions for capping and
5 charging, but the emissions for the refinery would be controlled
6 by the ESP, and I asked Kevin and then if US Steel would care to
7 answer, but Kevin doesn't know, is there a reason the baghouse
8 can't also control the refining issues?

9 MR. SMITH: The requirement in my understanding is that
10 the baghouse control will be charging and capping portions of
11 the refining process.

12 MS. ANDRIA: This all goes back to the Memorandum of
13 Understanding, is it your answer?

14 MR. SMITH: That question is yes.

15 MS. ANDRIA: And so, anyway, I would like to then ask
16 if US Steel would like to answer any of my questions, thank you
17 very much.

18 HEARING OFFICER STUDER: Is there anyone that has not
19 spoken this evening, that wants to publically make a statement
20 on the record this evening? Okay. Let the record indicate that
21 there was none.

22 I remind everyone here the hearing record is open
23 until August 17, 2012, and we will be accepting written comments
24 through that date, as long as they are postmarked no later than
25 August 17. I thank all of you for coming to this hearing this

1 evening, and for coming out on this very warm, hot evening.

2 Thank you I appreciate it, have a good evening. This hearing

3 adjourned.

4 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 7:57 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

) Ss.

COUNTY OF MADISON)

I, Angie R. Kelly, a Certified Shorthand Reporter (IL), 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