

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  
5 CHRISTIAN COUNTY GENERATION  
6 IN TAYLORVILLE, ILLINOIS  
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](http://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. ROMAINÉ: 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 machination (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