

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL HEARING

IN RE: )  
 )  
APPLICATION FOR REISSUED )  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PERMIT, )  
U.S. SILICA COMPANY )

Report of proceedings had at the public  
hearing in the above-entitled cause before the  
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, commencing  
at 7:00 p.m. on the 30th day of September, A.D., 2014.

## PANEL MEMBERS:

MR. DEAN STUDER  
Hearing Officer/Right-to-Know Coordinator  
Office of Community Relations

MR. MICHAEL T. REED  
Clean Air Act Permit Program, Unit Manager  
Permit Section, Bureau of Air

MR. JUSTIN CAMERON  
Environmental Protection Engineer  
Permit Section, Bureau of Air

On behalf of the Illinois Environmental  
Protection Agency.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

## I N D E X

## E X H I B I T S

## PAGE

Written Comment (Farley Andrews) ..... 28

Monitoring Protocol (Wedron) ..... 48

(EXHIBITS RETAINED BY HEARING OFFICER)

## P U B L I C C O M M E N T

Patrick Smelko ..... 18

Farley Andrews ..... 21, 46

Ashley Williams ..... 29

Joyce Blumenshine ..... 32, 54

Randy Juras ..... 41

Tom Walsh ..... 47

Rick Coleman ..... 53

\* \* \* \* \*

Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           MR. STUDER: Good evening. Some of you may have  
2 a hard time seeing me around the podium, but I would  
3 prefer to leave the podium there simply because it  
4 will give those that come forward something to set  
5 their notes on as they speak.

6           My name is Dean Studer and I'm the hearing  
7 officer for the Illinois Environmental Protection  
8 Agency. On behalf of Director Lisa Bonnett, I welcome  
9 you to tonight's hearing. My purpose tonight is to  
10 ensure that this proceeding runs properly according to  
11 rules and is conducted in a fair and efficient manner.  
12 Personally, I will not be responding to specific  
13 technical issues related to the permit, but I will  
14 defer those issues to the technical staff that are  
15 with me this evening.

16           Can everyone hear me?

17                           (Audience members nodding.)

18           MR. STUDER: Okay.

19           This is an informational hearing before the  
20 Illinois EPA in the matter of an application for a  
21 reissued air pollution control permit for U.S. Silica  
22 Company facility located at 701 Boyce Memorial Drive  
23 in Ottawa. This permit is a federal Title V permit  
24 under the Clean Air Act Permitting Program, often

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 referred to as CAAPP, C A A P P.

2           The Illinois EPA is holding this hearing  
3 for the purpose of accepting comments from the public  
4 on the proposed issuance of the CAAPP permit for this  
5 facility prior to actually making a final decision on  
6 the application.

7           This public hearing is being held under the  
8 provisions of the Illinois EPA's procedures for permit  
9 and closure plan hearings which can be found at  
10 35 Illinois Administrative Code, Part 166, Subpart A.  
11 Copies of these procedures can be accessed on the  
12 Web site for the Illinois Pollution Control Board at  
13 [www.ipcb.state.il.us](http://www.ipcb.state.il.us) or can be obtained from me on  
14 request.

15           An informational public hearing means  
16 exactly that. It is an opportunity for you to provide  
17 information to the Illinois EPA concerning this  
18 permit. This is not a contested case hearing.

19           I would like to explain how tonight's  
20 hearing is going to proceed. First, I will have the  
21 Illinois EPA staff introduce themselves and identify  
22 their responsibilities within the agency in regards to  
23 this permitting action. Then, Mr. Justin Cameron, and  
24 he is sitting on my left, a permit engineer in the

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 Bureau of Air, will then make a brief statement. This  
2 will be followed by additional instructions on how I  
3 will be taking oral comments during the hearing this  
4 evening, and then I will allow the public to begin  
5 providing comments beginning with Patrick Smelko,  
6 plant manager for the U.S. Silica facility here in  
7 Ottawa.

8           Written comments submitted to the Illinois  
9 EPA during the comment period are given the same  
10 consideration as comments made orally on the record  
11 during this hearing. Written comments may be  
12 submitted to the Illinois EPA at any time during the  
13 comment period which ends on October 30th, 2014. All  
14 comments submitted by mail must be postmarked no later  
15 than October 30th, 2014. Although we will continue to  
16 accept comments through that date, tonight is the only  
17 time that we will accept oral comments on this  
18 permitting action. Once the record -- once this  
19 hearing is adjourned, all comments will need to be  
20 submitted in writing in order to be included in the  
21 hearing record.

22           The Illinois EPA would like to have a final  
23 decision in this matter as quickly as is practical;  
24 however, the actual decision will depend on the number

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 and nature of the comments received, as well as other  
2 factors.

3 Any person who wants to make oral comments  
4 may do so at tonight's hearing as long as they are  
5 registered to speak, the statements made are relevant  
6 to the issues at hand, and time allows. If you have  
7 not completed a registration card at this point,  
8 please see either Brad or Stephon in the registration  
9 area and either would be happy to provide you with a  
10 registration card. Please be sure to check the  
11 appropriate box on the card if you desire to make  
12 comments at this hearing. If you have lengthy  
13 comments, it would be helpful if you would provide a  
14 summary of those comments during this hearing and then  
15 submit the comments to me in their entirety in writing  
16 before the end of the comment period, and I will  
17 ensure that they are included in the hearing record as  
18 an exhibit.

19 If your comments fall outside the scope of  
20 the hearing this evening, I may ask you to proceed to  
21 your next relevant issue.

22 U.S. Silica is also free to respond to  
23 issues that are raised if desirous to do so, but I am  
24 not in a position to require them to do so.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           I will not allow speakers or members of the  
2 public to argue or engage in prolonged dialogue with  
3 members of our panel. I will also not allow members  
4 of the public to address comments to other members of  
5 the public. Comments are to be addressed to the  
6 hearing panel and the court reporter.

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

10           In addition, I'd like to stress that we  
11 want to avoid unnecessary repetition. If anyone  
12 before you has already presented what is contained in  
13 your comments, please skip over those issues when you  
14 speak. If someone speaking before you has already  
15 said what you desire to say, you may pass when I call  
16 your name to come forward.

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

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 period. The record in this matter will close, again,  
2 that's October 30th, 2014. And, again, I will accept  
3 written comments as long as they are postmarked no  
4 later than October 30th, 2014.

5 While the record is open, all relevant  
6 comments and documents or data will be placed into the  
7 hearing record as exhibits. Please send all written  
8 documents to my attention. They should be mailed to  
9 Dean Studer, Hearing Officer, Office of Community  
10 Relations, Regarding: U.S. Silica, Illinois EPA,  
11 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276,  
12 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276. The address is also  
13 given on the public notice for the hearing tonight.

14 At this time, please silence all cell  
15 phones and pagers if you have not already done so. I  
16 will now ask the Illinois EPA staff present tonight to  
17 introduce themselves and then give a sentence or two  
18 regarding their responsibilities in the review of this  
19 permit application. Then Justin Cameron will make a  
20 brief statement regarding the permit.

21 MR. REED: I'm Michael Reed. M I C H A E L,  
22 R E E D. I am the CAAPP unit manager responsible for  
23 ensuring that the CAAPP permits that the Illinois EPA  
24 issues are in compliance with both Part 70 of Federal



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 Clean Act requirements and also Part 39.5 of the  
2 Illinois EPA Permit Program.

3 MR. CAMERON: Hello. I'm Justin Cameron. That's  
4 J U S T I N, C A M E R O N. I'm a Title V permit  
5 engineer with the Illinois EPA.

6 MR. STUDER: Can everyone hear Justin?

7 (Audience members nodding.)

8 MR. CAMERON: The purpose of this hearing is to  
9 discuss the development of the renewal CAAPP permit  
10 for U.S. Silica, which is located here in Ottawa,  
11 Illinois.

12 There are two items I would like to  
13 highlight regarding the intent of this renewal CAAPP  
14 permit. First, the permit addresses the ongoing  
15 operation of an existing source. Second, the permit  
16 does not authorize any expansions of mining operations  
17 at the source or emission increases from the source.

18 To begin, U.S. Silica Company owns and  
19 operates a sand mining facility which produces silica  
20 sand. At the source, sandstone is blasted from the  
21 mine, the mine sand is mixed with water and  
22 transported as a slurry to a screening pit where  
23 nonconforming material is removed. The slurry is then  
24 pumped to the plant for further processing. At the

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 plant, the sand is filtered, sized, and dewatered  
2 before entering one of four enclosed fluidized bed  
3 dryers. Using a heated airflow, the dryers place the  
4 sand in suspension as it dries. High efficiency  
5 scrubbers, which recently have been updated at the  
6 facility, are utilized for control of particulate  
7 matter emissions from the dryers. The dried sand is  
8 elevated with closed conveyors and elevators to either  
9 the fine sand plant or the sizing building where the  
10 different grain sizes of sand are divided by  
11 screening, classifying, and sizing operations. The  
12 dry sand handling and processing equipment is  
13 primarily controlled by baghouses. The source  
14 operates multiple baghouse systems to control  
15 particulate matter emissions at the source.

16           The draft CAAPP permit for U.S. Silica went  
17 to public notice between February 27th, 2014, and  
18 March 29, 2014. During this initial public notice  
19 period, the Illinois EPA received multiple comments on  
20 the draft permit. Many of the comments received were  
21 in regards to fugitive particulate matter, or PM,  
22 emissions from the source.

23           I would like to take a few moments and  
24 point out some of the control measures the source is

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 required to follow under this permit.

2           The permit requires the source to operate  
3 in accordance with the fugitive PM operating program  
4 designed to minimize fugitive dust from the source.  
5 This program is incorporated by reference into this  
6 permit and is a stand-alone document. U.S. Silica is  
7 required to update this program over time to address  
8 changes in its operation.

9           The fugitive PM operating program for U.S.  
10 Silica was last updated as recently as February 27th,  
11 2014. Under this program, the source will use best  
12 management practices to control its fugitive dust  
13 emissions. These practices include water sprays for  
14 roadways and stockpiles, minimizing drop point  
15 distances for loading and unloading activities, and  
16 following a blasting schedule. The blasting schedule  
17 requires that blasting activities only occur when it  
18 has been determined that emissions related to the  
19 blast will remain primarily on-site. For example,  
20 days with calm or low wind speeds.

21           There are several benefits to issuing an  
22 up-to-date renewal CAAPP permit for U.S. Silica.  
23 These benefits include, among other things, updated  
24 monitoring and testing requirements that the existing

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 CAAPP permit does not contain. A few of these items  
2 that would now be required include the following:  
3 monitoring in accordance with Compliance Assurance  
4 Monitoring, also known as CAM, requirements and  
5 performing ongoing periodic emission testing.

6 In addition, the issuance of a CAAPP permit  
7 assist in the compliance and enforcement of applicable  
8 requirements. Some of these benefits are as follows:

9 All regulatory requirements are identified  
10 in a single permit. This gives the source, the  
11 public, and regulators a clear picture of the source's  
12 compliance obligations.

13 The compliance procedures. This is the  
14 provisions for testing, monitoring, and record keeping  
15 to accompany substantive regulatory requirements that  
16 may be developed as needed to ensure that compliance  
17 can be reasonably demonstrated.

18 There is reporting required that allows the  
19 source to determine and certify the status of their  
20 compliance.

21 The CAAPP permit is subject to review by  
22 U.S. EPA. The conditions in this permit are federally  
23 enforceable, which means that the U.S. EPA and the  
24 public can enforce the terms of this permit along with

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 the State.

2 The permitting action for this renewal  
3 CAAPP permit have been discussed in the Statement of  
4 Basis and in a Response to Comments, which will be  
5 issued with the final permit.

6 We are here to provide you information and,  
7 most importantly, to listen to comments and concerns  
8 regarding the permit. I thank you all for taking time  
9 out of your evening to attend this hearing. I will  
10 now turn things back over to the hearing officer to  
11 provide details regarding procedures for conducting  
12 this hearing tonight.

13 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Justin.

14 While the issues tonight may indeed be  
15 heartfelt concerns to many of us here in attendance,  
16 applause is not appropriate during the course of this  
17 hearing. On a similar note, booing, hissing, and  
18 jeering are also not appropriate and will not be  
19 allowed this evening.

20 Secondly, I'm not going to allow statements  
21 to be made tonight that do not relate to the issues  
22 involved with this air permit. Statements and  
23 comments that are of a personal nature or reflect on  
24 the character or motive of a person or group of people

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 are not appropriate in this hearing. If statements or  
2 comments begin to drift into this area or begin to  
3 drift away from the issues involved with this permit,  
4 I may interrupt the person speaking and ask that they  
5 proceed to their next relevant issue.

6 As hearing officer, I intend to treat  
7 everyone here tonight in a courteous, respectful, and  
8 professional manner. I ask that members of the panel  
9 and the public do the same. If the conduct of persons  
10 attending this hearing should become unruly, I am  
11 authorized to adjourn this hearing should the actions  
12 warrant. In such a case, Illinois EPA would still  
13 accept written comments through the close of the  
14 comment period.

15 We have a limited time in which to conduct  
16 this hearing and there are -- excuse me -- and during  
17 that time we want to be able to listen to  
18 environmental issues associated with the air permit.  
19 You may disagree with or object to some of the  
20 statements and comments made tonight, but this is a  
21 public hearing and everyone has a right to express  
22 their comments on this matter.

23 Again, written comments are given the same  
24 consideration as oral comments received during this

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 hearing and may be submitted to the Illinois EPA at  
2 any time within the comment period. And, again, that  
3 comment period runs through October 30th, 2014. And  
4 although we will continue to accept comments through  
5 that date, tonight is the only time, again, I remind  
6 everyone, that we will be accepting oral comments.

7           If you have lengthy comments, again, please  
8 consider giving only a summary of those comments  
9 during this hearing and then submitting the comments  
10 in their entirety to me in writing before the close of  
11 the comment period. And, again, I will assure you  
12 that those will be put in the hearing record as an  
13 exhibit.

14           Please keep your comments relevant to the  
15 issues regarding this permit. If your comments fall  
16 outside the scope of this hearing, again, I remind you  
17 that I may interrupt and ask that you proceed to your  
18 next relevant issue.

19           For the purpose of allowing everyone to  
20 have a chance to comment and to ensure that we conduct  
21 this hearing in a timely fashion, I will ask for a  
22 time limit of seven minutes per speaker. If everyone  
23 has had an opportunity to speak and time still allows,  
24 I may allow those who initially did not desire to

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 speak to do so. If time still allows, I may come back  
2 to those that have already spoken if they have  
3 additional comments. I do reserve the right to impose  
4 a shorter time period for second round should time  
5 allow this evening.

6 In the event that we could not or cannot  
7 accommodate everyone who wishes to make comments this  
8 evening, you are asked to submit your comments to us  
9 in writing. And, again, those written comments are  
10 given the same weight as any statements during this  
11 hearing.

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

23 We have a court reporter here who is taking  
24 a record of this hearing for the purpose of us



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 compiling our administrative record. Therefore, for  
2 her benefit, please keep the general background noise  
3 in the room to a minimum so that she can hear  
4 everything that is said. Illinois EPA will post the  
5 transcript of this hearing on our Web page in the same  
6 general place where the hearing notice, Statement of  
7 Basis, and draft permit have been posted. The actual  
8 date when the transcript is posted will depend largely  
9 on when I get the final transcript from the court  
10 reporter.

11           When it is your turn to speak this evening,  
12 I will call your name. Please come forward and state  
13 your name and, if applicable, any governmental body,  
14 organization, or association that you represent. If  
15 you are not representing a governmental body, an  
16 organization, or an association, you may simply  
17 indicate that you are a concerned citizen or a member  
18 of the public.

19           For the benefit of the court reporter, I  
20 ask that you spell your last name. If there are  
21 alternate spellings for your first name, you may also  
22 spell your first name. Once you spell your name, I  
23 will start timing you and you will have seven minutes  
24 to complete your comments. I'd ask that while you are

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 speaking that you direct your attention to the hearing  
2 panel and to the court reporter to ensure that an  
3 accurate record of your comments is made. Prolonged  
4 dialogue with members of the hearing panel or with  
5 others here in attendance will not be permitted.  
6 Comments directed to the public are also not allowed.

7 Again, I remind everyone that the focus of  
8 this hearing is the environmental issues associated  
9 with the CAAPP permit.

10 Are there any questions regarding the  
11 procedures that I will be using for conducting this  
12 hearing this evening?

13 (No response heard.)

14 MR. STUDER: Let the record indicate that no one  
15 raised their hand.

16 When I call your name, please come forward  
17 to the podium and spell your last name. If there are  
18 alternate spellings of your first name, you may also  
19 spell that.

20 The first person that has registered to  
21 speak this evening is Patrick Smelko, and Mr. Smelko  
22 will be followed by Tom Walsh.

23 MR. SMELKO: Good evening. My name is Patrick  
24 Smelko, S M E L K O, and I've been the plant manager

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 at U.S. Silica since August of 2013.

2 On behalf of U.S. Silica, I want to thank  
3 you for the opportunity to say a few words about the  
4 company and why renewing this permit is so important  
5 to our plant and our employees.

6 As part of our operations, we've requested  
7 the IEPA renew our air permit. The permit contains no  
8 conditions that are being newly established or  
9 revised.

10 I would also like to take a brief minute to  
11 talk about our facility. As many of you know, our  
12 plant in Ottawa has been part of the community for  
13 more than 100 years. U.S. Silica employs over 170  
14 employees, and we're proud of the strong partnership  
15 we have with the U.S. Steelworkers Union. We see  
16 ourselves, however, more than an employer. We  
17 continue to invest in our facility and in our  
18 community.

19 We recently added more than 52 new jobs.  
20 In addition, we indirectly support many jobs,  
21 including but not limited to contractors, suppliers,  
22 truckdrivers, and rail workers. Over the years, we've  
23 also worked directly with many people and  
24 organizations that are the foundation of the

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 community, and we appreciate the opportunity to make a  
2 difference by supporting their work.

3 Our commitment to being a sustainability  
4 company extends not only to local investment but to  
5 our work to ensure safe and responsible operations.  
6 Just recently, the facility passed one year without a  
7 lost-time accident. Over 40 percent of the waste  
8 generated at the facility, including plastic, metal,  
9 glass, and wood, is recycled, and that number is  
10 growing with an eventual goal of 90 percent.

11 Like everyone in the room, we care very  
12 much about air quality. That's why we're here today.  
13 The air quality for our workers and neighbors is of  
14 utmost importance.

15 We work to ensure the quality of the air at  
16 our workplace and our community in a number of ways.  
17 All trucks that leave our facility are covered. All  
18 of the processing equipment at the Ottawa facility is  
19 enclosed. Air and emission monitoring and reporting  
20 are done regularly to ensure compliance. We've also  
21 added two water trucks with 2,000 gallon tanks each to  
22 our fleet in order to wet roads and reduce fugitive  
23 emissions.

24 Finally, I'd like to address the permit

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 compliance, something that U.S. Silica and the Ottawa  
2 plant in particular have a strong track record for.  
3 As a sand mining company, we are required to adhere to  
4 many different kinds of permits, and compliance is  
5 truly a team effort.

6 And I also want to take the opportunity to  
7 recognize the U.S. Silica employees whose diligence  
8 and attention to help keep everyone safe. Just this  
9 June, we received a clean inspection from the IEPA,  
10 and we have every intention of maintaining that track  
11 record.

12 In closing, I want to thank you again for  
13 the opportunity to be here. Renewing this permit is  
14 an important part of our operations, and we hope the  
15 IEPA will grant it. Thank you.

16 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Smelko.

17 Tom Walsh.

18 MR. WALSH: I pass at this time.

19 MR. STUDER: Looks like Farley Andrews. He'll be  
20 followed by Ashley Williams.

21 MR. ANDREWS: My name is Farley Andrews. I live  
22 at --

23 MR. STUDER: Can you hear him in the back?

24 MR. ANDREWS: Farley Andrews, A N D R E W S.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 F A R L E Y is the first name.

2           Regarding the proposed issuance of a clean  
3 air permit for the U.S. Silica sand facility in  
4 Ottawa, Illinois, we are concerned about the advanced  
5 mining technologies that allow for hypermining of a  
6 product which byproduct and its airborne particulate  
7 matter resulting from the mining, milling, and  
8 transportation in and through densely populated areas  
9 of the county has recently been established as a toxic  
10 substance in a study from the U.S. EPA and Occupation  
11 Safety and Health Administration.

12           It is for the reasons stated above we  
13 respectfully request that IEPA issue particulate  
14 matter monitors be installed as soon as possible  
15 within a one mile -- within one mile of each sand mine  
16 and milling facility in LaSalle County and along  
17 transport routes, near all shipping channels, and  
18 areas with high population density to determine the  
19 actual levels of particulate matter in which residents  
20 of Ottawa and the county are being exposed prior to  
21 the issuance of any clean air permits. It makes sense  
22 that information regarding the quality of the air be  
23 collected and known by the public prior to issuance of  
24 clean air permits.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           Presently, the only monitor that exists in  
2 LaSalle County screens for sulfur dioxide, not for the  
3 particulate matter or air quality related to mining,  
4 which is our concern here. These must be IEPA-issued  
5 PM monitors that are sufficient for the Illinois  
6 Department of Public Health to conduct thorough  
7 investigations on silicosis and respiratory and  
8 cardiac disease throughout LaSalle County.

9           We request that at the urging of the IEPA,  
10 local governmental bodies give greater attention to  
11 the urgent matter of addressing the long-term  
12 environmental public health and land problems created  
13 by the rush to mine silica sand in LaSalle County,  
14 along with request for monitoring and air quality.

15           In our attempts to alert the city of Ottawa  
16 of its public concerns -- of public concerns over  
17 health issues associated with local mining and milling  
18 of silica sand, a number of us collected signatures  
19 door to door in Ottawa, personally covering the  
20 area -- I personally covered the area of Ottawa's west  
21 side adjacent to U.S. Silica's present milling  
22 operation from Route 6 to the Illinois River, from  
23 Leland Street to Boyce Memorial Drive for the local  
24 petition, urging our city council to adopt stricter

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 controls over the mining and milling processes so  
2 close to Ottawa's residential areas.

3 A vast majority of those I approached on  
4 Ottawa's west side were more than anxious to add their  
5 signatures to anything, expressing their frustration  
6 with having been, in their words, wholly excluded from  
7 the process in the absence of any real questioning or  
8 discussion by public officials leading to what they  
9 see as the precipitous explosion in hypermining,  
10 milling, and transport of silica sand from West Ottawa  
11 through our town and throughout our county.

12 This is no longer the relatively small,  
13 locally-owned family sand mining operation as it  
14 existed in Ottawa for over 100 years prior to the sale  
15 of Ottawa Silica to U.S. Silica. The majority of  
16 residents polled on Ottawa's west side feel neither  
17 local media nor public officials have shown the  
18 slightest understanding, awareness, or concern for  
19 residents over the quite visible air quality problems  
20 on Ottawa's west side. Neither local media nor public  
21 officials have shown an interest in seeking expert  
22 help to inform either themselves or residents of the  
23 possible dangers involved in living so close to a  
24 silica mining and milling operation, which residents



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 understand may be affecting their own and their  
2 children's health.

3 I would like to respectfully suggest that  
4 state, city, village officials, LaSalle County board  
5 members, and the IEPA that unless they can assure us,  
6 the citizens of LaSalle County and the state of  
7 Illinois, that the science on this subject of silica  
8 sand and the destructive effect associated with  
9 airborne matter is utterly false, that you consider  
10 stepping back, calling a halt to the pernicious land  
11 grab for sand mines, put aside disagreements which  
12 block possible collaborations with governmental  
13 bodies, and study and consult with states and  
14 governments and experts independent of mining  
15 companies in your efforts to develop a set of  
16 restrictions which will protect farmland and citizen  
17 health.

18 The quite visible particulate matter from  
19 Ottawa's west side milling operation which layers  
20 front porches, windows, window frames, and automobile  
21 finishes understandably draws angry comments,  
22 especially from west side residents such as, and I  
23 quote, Look, since the opening of that new mill and  
24 beginning of their extended milling operations, this

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 is what I have to deal with and sweep away nearly  
2 every day. Layers of fine sand that I know my  
3 children are breathing with no good effect on their  
4 health which has now affected life for them. I would  
5 move away in a minute if I could. I cannot begin to  
6 afford a move at this time. This is fairly typical of  
7 comments I encountered on my signature-seeking trek  
8 through Ottawa's west side.

9           This is a mill which I believe we were  
10 assured wouldn't contain ambient silica dust now  
11 experienced by Ottawa residents, many of whom are  
12 unaware of the U.S. EPA's latest warnings regarding  
13 airborne silica dust.

14           The comments I encountered and recent EPA  
15 findings make it difficult to understand official  
16 resistance to an air monitoring program as well as the  
17 disclaimers and denials of public officials at all  
18 levels of government in an area of LaSalle County long  
19 known for its elevated levels of heart and lung  
20 problems, so-called allergies and asthma, and probable  
21 deaths resulting from silicosis.

22           It might be worth noting that covered --  
23 this is related to airborne silica dust. It might be  
24 worth noting that covered crops in collar counties of

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 DuPage, Kane, Lake, and Will and Kendall surrounding  
2 Cook County and Chicago are subsidized to reduce the  
3 amount of airborne particulate matter reaching the  
4 city from prevailing westerly winds. Knowing what we  
5 know -- what's now well known as airborne silica dust  
6 is a health hazard and toxic substance, this is not a  
7 stretch to either comprehend or understand. We in  
8 Ottawa and LaSalle County and throughout the state  
9 need to learn and read the signs.

10 If members of the IEPA, Illinois  
11 Environmental Protection Agency, have not yet either  
12 contacted or reviewed the studies of Dr. Crispin  
13 Pierce, Dr. David J. Zaber, or Dr. Sandra Steingraber  
14 relating to their work on the subject of silica sand  
15 mining and resulting effects on public health, I would  
16 hope that you would take this opportunity to seek out  
17 this information, find ways to inform the public, and  
18 engage in public discussion which procedural  
19 restrictions on both city and county levels that so  
20 far have failed to allow.

21 Prior to any consideration of a clean air  
22 permit to mine, mill, or transport silica sand, we in  
23 LaSalle County need an ongoing and official air  
24 monitoring program for particulate matter subsidized

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 by mining companies, overseen by the IEPA and local  
2 citizen member boards with findings made available to  
3 the public through the oversight of citizen member  
4 boards. We need laws that protect citizens and their  
5 health and property and not corporations. We need a  
6 renewed will and commitment on the part of the IEPA  
7 members to act on initiatives regarding matters of  
8 health and environment and quality of life for  
9 citizens of Illinois relating to mining of silica  
10 sand.

11 I tried to omit things that would extend  
12 this longer than I did, and I have copies if I can  
13 submit those now to you.

14 MR. STUDER: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you.

15 MR. ANDREWS: I eliminated things and didn't read  
16 parts of this in order to shorten its length, and so I  
17 wonder if I can give you all copies at this time?

18 MR. STUDER: Yeah. You can either submit written  
19 copies to us or you can, you know --

20 MR. REED: He's got written copies.

21 MR. STUDER: Yep. I'll enter it into the record  
22 as an exhibit.

23 MR. ANDREWS: You mean now?

24 MR. STUDER: That's fine, yeah. Sure.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 MR. ANDREWS: Do you need three? I have more.

2 MR. STUDER: I only need one for the record.

3 What I'll do is I'll enter it as an exhibit, and I'll  
4 let you hang on to this. If we have time --

5 MR. ANDREWS: That's all right.

6 MR. STUDER: Okay.

7 MR. ANDREWS: This isn't in there, but I can also  
8 recommend the book Deadly Dust: Silicosis and the  
9 On-Going Struggle to Protect Workers' Health. It's  
10 the history of the struggle to -- well, could I read  
11 something to you, or is it --

12 MR. STUDER: Yes. As long as it's with the  
13 citation. We have gone the time limit. What I'll do  
14 is -- we'll probably have time to come back to you. I  
15 can't absolutely guarantee that, but we probably will.  
16 And I'll hang on to your hearing card. And we'll  
17 allow that in the second round, if that's okay.

18 MR. ANDREWS: Thank you very much.

19 MR. REED: Thank you.

20 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Andrews.

21 Ashley Williams. And Ashley will be  
22 followed by Joyce Blumenshine.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen  
24 of the IEPA. I will do my best not to reiterate what

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 Mr. Andrews just said. My name is Ashley Williams,  
2 W I L L I A M S.

3 My concerns regarding this CAAPP permit are  
4 as follows: Due to seasonal differences in climates  
5 within LaSalle County, annual limits in 12-month  
6 rolling averages prove insufficient to limit pollution  
7 during dryer months, and in those months blasting is  
8 more recurring. Furthermore, the permit fails to  
9 properly address ambient silica dust controls.  
10 Airborne crystalline silica may stay aloft for three  
11 to four days and travel 10 to 15 miles downwind.  
12 Consequently, those who live nearby are exposed to  
13 fine crystalline silica dust 24 hours a day, 365 days  
14 a year.

15 According to your report entitled,  
16 Crystalline Silica: A Review of Dose Response  
17 Relationship and Environmental Risks, recent research  
18 has disputed the prevailing consensus that ambient  
19 silica is not detrimental to surrounding communities  
20 and established that exposure of those downwind of  
21 peak sites can be very high and has produced multiple  
22 documented cases of silicosis.

23 Moreover, the IEPA National Air Quality  
24 Standard established without any regard to silica

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 content makes no allowance for the type or size of  
2 particles being measured under the PM10 threshold.

3 For example, high levels of amorphous  
4 silica in this range as often found in farm dust are  
5 not particularly problematic. Similar levels of  
6 freshly fractured fine crystalline silica produced by  
7 mining are very hazardous. This standard takes no  
8 account of the makeup and size of the particles below  
9 10 microns.

10 It is imperative that the IEPA mandate  
11 monitoring for not simply U.S. Silica's total  
12 suspended particulates and PM10, but, most  
13 importantly, for their particulates of respirable  
14 fraction smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter.

15 Essentially, I'm not asking for regulation  
16 of generic particles but for those that pose the  
17 greatest risk to human health, primarily in children  
18 and the elderly, fine crystalline silica particles. I  
19 ask that you, the IEPA, exercise your authority to  
20 regulate all forms of particle emissions from  
21 U.S. Silica. I ask that multiple air monitors be  
22 installed on and off U.S. Silica sites, including  
23 detailed mapping of downwind plumes of fine  
24 crystalline dust.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           The time is now to safeguard the health,  
2 well-being, and safety of the public. Silica is no  
3 longer just a worker concern but a concern for all.  
4 Thank you.

5           MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Williams.

6           Joyce Blumenshine, and she'll be followed  
7 by Randy Juras.

8           MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. Good evening. My  
9 name is Joyce, J O Y C E. Last name Blumenshine,  
10 B L U M E N S H I N E.

11           I appreciate that Illinois EPA is holding  
12 this hearing tonight. Thank you to all the staff for  
13 the opportunity for the public to speak to you and for  
14 people to hear these concerns for this local area.

15           I am a member and active person with Heart  
16 of Illinois Group, Sierra Club. Sierra Club is a  
17 national environmental group, and our motto is to  
18 protect the environment for our families and our  
19 future.

20           I think it's very fitting tonight that we  
21 are here in a school because air quality, of course,  
22 has been talked so well by other speakers affects  
23 children and very greatly. So I have a few comments  
24 and questions tonight.



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           This Ottawa area is in the Heart of  
2 Illinois Group, Sierra Club area for our group. It  
3 was added to our group, and we are concerned. I just  
4 realized -- and I know this is a single-source status,  
5 but I would like to ask IEPA, since this is one of  
6 many now sand mines, and they are cropping up with  
7 numbers here in the county, is there anything that  
8 IEPA does to consider the cumulation of these  
9 productions of PM levels by numerous new mines in  
10 addition to this permit?

11         MR. CAMERON: For the area as a whole -- sorry.  
12 For the area as a whole, I do believe that our  
13 modeling group does do analysis on some level for new  
14 mines whenever they are constructed to try to get a  
15 gauge on the overall effects of the area and anything  
16 that would result from that new construction. They  
17 sort of pull up data and emission estimates from the  
18 area as a whole and perform some modeling analysis.

19         MS. BLUMENSHINE: I appreciate knowing that. Is  
20 there a way for the public to look at, you know, the  
21 overall effects when IEPA looks at this new CAAPP  
22 permit and others? How do we find out the overall  
23 effects that IEPA is looking at for the Ottawa area?

24         MR. CAMERON: The --

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Maybe I can put that in my  
2 written comments, and it's just a concern for the  
3 area. I know you hear what I'm saying, but overall  
4 cumulative effects.

5 MR. REED: Joyce, was your question regarding  
6 this CAAPP permit being new or a new source getting a  
7 brand new CAAPP?

8 MS. BLUMENSHINE: No. I'm just trying to make a  
9 point that this is a single source, but now it's a  
10 single source with a lot of new single sources in this  
11 area added to it.

12 MR. REED: Correct. Yes.

13 MS. BLUMENSHINE: So while you're looking at the  
14 specific concerns for this plant, does IEPA look at  
15 the cumulative impacts of all these new plants and  
16 this plant?

17 MR. REED: For this permit, no, we do not do that  
18 level of analysis. That is done in the construction  
19 permitting stages for brand new sites that want a  
20 permit for the first time.

21 MS. BLUMENSHINE: And so as far as the air  
22 issues, am I hearing this right, that IEPA doesn't  
23 look at anything on a cumulative version?

24 MR. REED: No. Because that would have already

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 been done if it was necessary in the construction  
2 permit.

3 MS. BLUMENSHINE: In the construction permit.  
4 Thank you. That is helpful because I know in the  
5 application it says under 2.6 there's a fee for the  
6 particulate matter for tons per year, and so is  
7 that -- is that 233.83 tons per year of PMS estimated  
8 or modeled? How is that amount figured out for this  
9 specific permit?

10 It's on page 9 of 32 in the detail  
11 document, and it's at specific point No. 2.7. It  
12 says, Fee schedule. The following table lists the  
13 approved annual fees. And then it says tons. I'm  
14 just trying to get a handle on how many tons IEPA is  
15 assessing on this plant for particulate matter per  
16 year.

17 MR. CAMERON: The way it would work is that fee  
18 schedule there, the source would have to have actual  
19 emissions of less than that amount. The way our fees  
20 work is the source determines their fees to an extent.  
21 They determine what they will emit for that year.  
22 They perform a projection of that. And so long as  
23 their actual emissions are less than the fee, that's  
24 all the fee is really there for. It's sort of a --

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 not necessarily worst case, but it's the highest level  
2 they could emit for that year. That's all that they  
3 have paid for, and their actual emissions are  
4 generally much less than that.

5 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. That's very  
6 helpful. So the plant does the estimating, and then  
7 they pay for that. I'm glad they're paying a fee, but  
8 as a concern that's been expressed before about the  
9 effects, you know, of this particulate matter  
10 directly, I do have to question the comment in this  
11 Statement of Basis that it says on page 11 of 32.  
12 There's an environmental justice discussion at .3.1.

13 We are very appreciative in this state that  
14 Governor Quinn has elevated environmental justice  
15 concerns for our state and has made that, of course, a  
16 direct concern for all agencies. So thank you to IEPA  
17 for, you know, including environmental justice, but I  
18 don't understand with the many new sand mines here and  
19 the existing older mines and the, you know, location  
20 of this plant so close to town with potentially often  
21 prevailing westerly winds, which would, you know,  
22 bring particulates right into residential areas, I  
23 don't understand how IEPA cannot consider this permit  
24 under an environmental justice concern. Could you

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 please elaborate on that?

2 MR. CAMERON: Environmental justice, in general,  
3 is not made up of the types of sources in an area. It  
4 is based on demographics of an area and those citizens  
5 that may not have a voice to be heard whenever a  
6 source is in an area which environmental justice is a  
7 concern. For example, those with significant poverty  
8 levels or lack of ability to communicate and the  
9 language that the permit is written. It doesn't  
10 necessarily link up to the types of sources in a  
11 general geographical area.

12 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. And then just for  
13 the advice for citizens who have, you know, concerns  
14 locally, could IEPA advise us as citizens what kind of  
15 data do we collect? Would it be, like, the number of  
16 elderly, the number of kids with asthma? What kind of  
17 assessment could we provide in our written comments to  
18 help you look more closely at environmental justice  
19 issues for Ottawa?

20 MR. CAMERON: It's made up primarily of  
21 percentage of poverty level in an area, as well as  
22 minority groups and those that do not have -- in which  
23 there are some language barriers. And those are  
24 really the three determining factors, largely.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you. And I'm almost  
2 done. I'm not sure of what my time is, but I'll  
3 certainly quit if I need to. I did have a quick  
4 couple other questions, please.

5 Under the emission testing results, it  
6 seems like -- and I'm not a scientist, but at page 11  
7 of 32, again at .3.2 on the results of the different  
8 runs from the fluid bed dryer, it seems like there's a  
9 range from 2.4 to 4.8. And the compliance margin, is  
10 that relatively -- that 29.7 percent, is that a  
11 relatively, you know, mediocre compliance margin? How  
12 does IEPA characterize that margin?

13 MR. CAMERON: In general, compliance margins  
14 aren't characterized by the percentages of which they  
15 demonstrate compliance. It's that they're complying  
16 with the standard. The standard is the standard.

17 As far as 39.7, that type of compliance  
18 margin does show that they have the ability to comply  
19 with the applicable rules from the testing. As for  
20 the range in values, generally our testing is set up  
21 in several runs to get a gauge of any outliers or  
22 anything like that that would be irrelevant or  
23 possibly sway the data one way or another. So three  
24 are averaged into one value and, therefore, the

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 compliance margin which is with the -- the one you're  
2 talking about is with the process weight rate, which  
3 gives the pound per hour, a PM. The limit is based on  
4 the overall throughput to the general piece of  
5 equipment. And whatever their value was based off of  
6 our process weight rate tables, they show that they  
7 could comply with that.

8 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Okay. That helps a lot. Thank  
9 you. I certainly respect the importance of having  
10 several, you know, samples and I appreciate that IEPA  
11 goes to that extent. If this was a grade for a class,  
12 39.7 percent, to a citizen like me that doesn't sound  
13 very good. I'm just wondering is that a decent amount  
14 compared to other plants?

15 MR. REED: Yeah. Here's how -- just to clarify  
16 that a little further. A 10 percent compliance margin  
17 would be -- they are very, very -- the results of  
18 their testing is very, very close to the permit limit.  
19 If they had a 90 percent compliance margin, that means  
20 that they were very, very far away from the compliance  
21 limit. So, yes, in a way you are correct, Joyce,  
22 39 percent is not as good at 70 percent.

23 MS. BLUMENSHINE: But on the larger scale, it's  
24 really pretty good. Okay, that helps. Thank you.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 I'm not a scientist. I didn't know how those numbers  
2 ran. Okay. I have one last point, or should I stop?  
3 One last point?

4 MR. STUDER: (Indicating.)

5 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you so much. I did want  
6 to go ahead and also reiterate the concern --

7 MR. STUDER: How many more questions do you have,  
8 Joyce?

9 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Pardon?

10 MR. STUDER: How many more questions do you have?

11 MS. BLUMENSHINE: This is my last one.

12 MR. STUDER: Okay. Go ahead then.

13 MS. BLUMENSHINE: I just wanted to go ahead and  
14 support the concern that IEPA, however possible,  
15 encourage this plant, require this plant, ask this  
16 plant to put in air monitors. You know, as recently  
17 as just September 9th, I believe, if I understood  
18 correctly, the LaSalle County Board has requested that  
19 Northern White Sands, a newer mine, put in some  
20 monitors. And I think there's an awareness of the  
21 public and a will in this area to get the information  
22 they need to know what is happening to their air. So  
23 I'd just ask IEPA to be sensitive to that and support  
24 in any way possible getting air monitors at this site.



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1                   Thank you very much.

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

3                   Randy Juras.

4           MR. JURAS:   My name is Randy Juras, J U R A S.   I  
5   live at 14351 Oak Trail, Homer Glen, Illinois.   I'm  
6   here as a member of the Homer Glen Environmental  
7   Committee.   The last time I talked to you was --

8           MR. STUDER:   Try and direct your comment into the  
9   mike.

10          MR. JURAS:   My comments have to do with multiple  
11   sources of pollution as a follow-up to the frac sand  
12   mining operations that have been popping up in this  
13   area.   Everything seems to be centered on what will  
14   happen at the one location, and there's not a  
15   cumulative effect.   The 2.5 soot and particulate  
16   matter that will accumulate, added to that the diesel  
17   traffic that is going to happen with the acceleration  
18   of truck traffic, and we're even talking now rail, is  
19   going to be huge.

20                 One of the things that we have been talking  
21   about is we're hoping that on October 14th, JCAR will  
22   in fact reject the IDNR rules, open up the discussion,  
23   and then everything regarding fracking will then be  
24   fair game.   At that point we are wondering what would

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 happen to having the IDNR be responsible for air  
2 pollution coming from a frac sand mining operation  
3 because it's related to fracking. Have you guys given  
4 that any thought?

5 MR. STUDER: It's a good question, but it has  
6 very little to do with this specific permit.

7 MR. JURAS: Well, it's kind of interesting  
8 because that's going to happen on the 14th. And when  
9 do you anticipate this Statement of Basis to become  
10 reality?

11 MR. STUDER: I still don't understand what the  
12 relevance is.

13 But go ahead, Mike.

14 MR. REED: Are you asking questions about whether  
15 we would regulate fracking in this permit or what we  
16 would be doing as far as permits for the actual  
17 fracking operation?

18 MR. JURAS: No. Right now the only people that  
19 are dealing with frac sand mining air pollution is  
20 the IEPA, if my understanding of the situation is  
21 correct.

22 MR. REED: Yes. We regulate -- I believe  
23 there's --

24 MR. JURAS: Right. You're only going to look

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 at -- you're going to issue a permit for a specific  
2 site and you're going to monitor a specific site. You  
3 don't do cumulative air sampling of the area.

4 MR. REED: Well, I think one of the gentlemen  
5 mentioned that we only have one monitor right now, and  
6 that's not even measuring particulates. So if we were  
7 to put in a monitoring network, I'm sure it would be  
8 more than one for this type of activity and it  
9 would -- ambient monitors are just for that,  
10 cumulative impact. That's what they measure.

11 MR. JURAS: We live in Northern Will County,  
12 which is out of compliance with sulfur oxide. We  
13 haven't asked the IEPA. We have had Will County  
14 Township ask the IEPA for additional monitoring  
15 because we are definitely pinpointing the coal-fired  
16 plants that are in our area. They have said no.

17 What would you think? What would you  
18 assume would be the request from this area, knowing  
19 that the amount of frac sand mining is going to be  
20 increasing, not decreasing, that you guys would be  
21 able to look at cumulative effects, not only of the  
22 frac sand dust but also of the truck traffic and the  
23 diesel traffic that's come to this area?

24 MR. REED: Well, I was just speaking to Justin

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 here a few minutes ago, and I do believe our agency is  
2 looking into establishing some sort of network, but  
3 that is not being done by the permitting group that is  
4 represented here today. That's being done by our  
5 ambient air monitoring and air quality planning  
6 sections, and ambient monitoring is not something that  
7 we can require in a permit for a specific source,  
8 unless it comes out of the Title I program that  
9 requires it. So I do believe the agency is looking  
10 into that, but I can't tell you for sure what will  
11 happen.

12 MR. JURAS: Okay. The problem that we've had is  
13 every time we've approached the legislation side of  
14 this, they keep telling us, Don't worry. It's already  
15 covered by the IEPA or it's already covered by the  
16 IDNR. And if you really want to see things happen, we  
17 have to get legislation changed. Well, for us to do  
18 that we have to build a case, and that is part of the  
19 reason I'm here tonight. We need to find out more  
20 information as to how we feel there's something that's  
21 a shortfall, and we want to work to get it fixed.

22 MR. STUDER: One of the things under Illinois law  
23 is our agency does not make regulations of an  
24 environmental substantive nature. That is not a power

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1   that the General Assembly has given to the Illinois  
2   EPA. That power does rest with the Illinois Pollution  
3   Control Board. So, I mean, you can make all the  
4   recommendations to us, but we don't enact air  
5   regulations.

6           MR. JURAS: I understand that, but what we  
7   continue to do is bounce back and forth.

8           MR. STUDER: I understand what you're saying, and  
9   what you're saying is there needs to be more of a  
10   comprehensive look at the regs from their inception  
11   when they're being formed.

12          MR. JURAS: Well, that's all I'm looking at. And  
13   we are very hopeful that on the 14th we will get the  
14   law changed is what we're looking at. And if that's  
15   going to light a fire under getting some more  
16   monitoring in this area, along with the other things,  
17   that is what we're hoping for.

18          MR. REED: I'll just add one thing. I do believe  
19   here in Region 5, which is U.S. EPA's six state  
20   coverage, I think the State of Wisconsin and the State  
21   of Minnesota have done some silica dust air monitoring  
22   around some of their sand mines, so you might be able  
23   to get some data there through the U.S. EPA to see  
24   what the impacts were and the results of those

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 studies.

2 MR. JURAS: That's true. The question and that  
3 particular answer came up in Utica when they were  
4 talking about the frac sand mining there, and the  
5 lawyers for that mining company mentioned, That's  
6 Wisconsin. This is Illinois.

7 MR. STUDER: Thank you.

8 Is there anyone that has not spoken that  
9 would like to make a comment on the record this  
10 evening?

11 (No response heard.)

12 MR. STUDER: Okay. There was a gentleman that  
13 had asked earlier if he could read into the record. I  
14 believe that was Farley Andrews. Please come forward  
15 and state the name of the book, the author, and the  
16 pages that you're reading from, and that way we'll  
17 have a record.

18 MR. ANDREWS: I don't have a page. I'm just  
19 reading from the cover. The name of the book is  
20 called Deadly Dust by David Rosner and Gerald  
21 Markowitz. And what they've included on the dust  
22 cover is, During the Depression, silicosis was an  
23 industrial lung disease and emerged as a national  
24 social crisis. Experts estimated that hundreds of

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 thousands of workers were at risk from disability of  
2 the disease and death by inhaling silica in mines,  
3 foundries, quarries. By the 1950s, however, silicosis  
4 was nearly forgotten by the media and health  
5 professionals, asking what makes a health threat a  
6 public issue? David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz  
7 examine how a culture defines disease and how disease  
8 itself is understood at different moments in history.  
9 They also explore the interlocking relationships of  
10 public health, labor, business, and government to  
11 discuss who should assume responsibility for  
12 occupational disease.

13 And I recommend this. I'd be glad, after  
14 the hearing, if you'd like to look at it. I only have  
15 my copy, so -- all right. Thank you very much.

16 MR. STUDER: Thank you. Is there anyone here  
17 that has not spoken or has spoken that would like to  
18 make a comment on the record?

19 MR. WALSH: Tom Walsh. My name is Tom Walsh,  
20 W A L S H. And the only thing that I'd like to submit  
21 is after listening to the fact that it's my  
22 understanding that your agency has no direct authority  
23 in relationship to requiring any type of monitoring or  
24 anything like that, but I would like to submit to you

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 the protocol that was recently established by Region 5  
2 U.S. EPA in relationship to the Wedron facility that  
3 is on a comparative nature. (Tenders.)

4 MR. STUDER: And I will enter this as an exhibit  
5 into the hearing record.

6 MR. WALSH: I would appreciate that. Are they  
7 the only group other than the air quality, Illinois  
8 Pollution Control Board that has authority to require  
9 monitoring? Was I understanding you correctly or ...

10 MR. REED: I think what I had said was we can't  
11 require ambient air monitoring in this operating  
12 permit that we're discussing tonight. That would have  
13 to be done through a Title I permit, which is a  
14 construction permit basically. And that is what this  
15 Wedron permit is. It's a construction permit. And so  
16 they do have authority under Title I provisions to  
17 require those types of monitoring.

18 The only thing we can require, as far as  
19 monitoring in our Title V permit, which is the CAAPP  
20 permits here in Illinois, is stack testing  
21 requirements, inspection requirements, making sure  
22 that the plant is maintained at a specific level that  
23 can demonstrate compliance and/or identify that there  
24 is a noncompliance or a deviation from permit



## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 limitations.

2 MR. WALSH: So there are no monitoring  
3 stipulations in it at all that you have authority in  
4 order to --

5 MR. REED: In this permit we do not, I believe,  
6 have any construction permits, right, that require  
7 ambient air monitoring around the source?

8 MR. CAMERON: No.

9 MR. REED: Right. So that would all have to be  
10 done through our ambient air quality -- ambient air  
11 monitoring/air quality planning section if that were  
12 to be set up, separate and apart from the permitting  
13 activities.

14 MR. WALSH: Okay. And how is that handled? Is  
15 that handled -- is that a subsidiary of your agency or  
16 is that a separate agency?

17 MR. REED: It's still the Illinois EPA. The  
18 Bureau of Air. But the Bureau of Air is broken up  
19 into different sections based on their representative  
20 responsibilities and obligations. So ambient air  
21 monitoring, they are responsible for installing,  
22 maintaining, operating, and ensuring quality data for  
23 all the monitors across the whole entire state of  
24 Illinois that demonstrate attainment or not

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 attainment.

2           And the air quality planning section, those  
3 are the ones that actually do, like, modeling runs and  
4 so forth to determine impacts. They take the ambient  
5 air monitoring data that's gathered across the state  
6 and, you know, model it, look at the data, and provide  
7 feedback for construction permitting when new sites  
8 want to be built to make sure there won't be a  
9 national ambient air quality standard that's exceeded  
10 as a result of that construction. Things of that  
11 nature.

12           MR. WALSH: It was my understanding that Region 5  
13 actually stipulated that it was the company's  
14 obligation to handle that, rather than the agency. So  
15 is that something that --

16           MR. REED: I'm not sure in what context you are  
17 speaking of for Region 5. Does the document you gave  
18 us say anything about that?

19           MR. WALSH: Yes. Uh-huh.

20           MR. REED: We'll have to look at that.

21           MR. WALSH: That's the actual company that's  
22 going to do the monitoring, and --

23           MR. REED: Generally, what happens is we'll  
24 require them to do monitoring, and then they have to

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 pay for it, support it, you know, do the data  
2 collection and all that stuff.

3 MR. WALSH: Yeah, that's what I was alluding to.

4 MR. REED: Yes. That is all the responsibility  
5 of the company in that case, yes. Any ambient air  
6 monitoring that the state would do, one of our  
7 monitors that we would install, maintain, operate, and  
8 so forth, that actually -- I believe once a year --  
9 Brad, correct me if I'm wrong. Once a year we go out  
10 with a monitoring plan that can be commented on. Is  
11 it once a year?

12 MR. FROST: Once a year we put out our network  
13 plan for the following year, and what that includes is  
14 our area source monitors and our plan for the coverage  
15 of the state. I don't believe that source-oriented  
16 monitors are typically included in our network plan.

17 MR. REED: Right. But for just your general  
18 ambient monitoring for the whole area.

19 MR. FROST: Yes.

20 MR. REED: You could participate in that process.

21 MR. FROST: I mean, certainly we put the network  
22 plan out for comment. Unfortunately, the 2015  
23 monitoring comment period just closed, but I can  
24 double check if you want me to.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 MR. STUDER: For the record, that's Brad Frost.

2 MR. FROST: But, again, these are area-wide  
3 monitors that are designated for U.S. EPA. This is  
4 our U.S. EPA-approved monitoring plan for coverage of  
5 the state for the various criteria plumes. It's not  
6 monitors that are -- I don't believe. I don't  
7 believe, although I can check for you. I don't  
8 believe it's source-oriented monitors.

9 MR. WALSH: Okay. Back to the other question.  
10 So the only thing that would actually change the idea  
11 here of monitoring would be that there would have to  
12 be more legislation enacted for your agency to become  
13 involved on your permits?

14 MR. REED: I'm not sure. I'm not sure how to  
15 answer that. I would have to find out from the folks  
16 back in the office.

17 MR. WALSH: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. STUDER: And we can address that in more  
19 detail in our written responses in the responsiveness  
20 summary.

21 MR. WALSH: Okay. I appreciate it.

22 MR. STUDER: Is there anyone here --

23 MR. COLEMAN: (Indicating.)

24 MR. STUDER: Okay. If you'd come forward.

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 MR. COLEMAN: Rick Coleman, C O L E M A N.

2 In the permit, or is there anything with  
3 the EPA if there's a law that governs how much sand is  
4 lost out the back of a semi? Is this facility  
5 responsible at all for the transportation of the sand  
6 under the permit?

7 MR. CAMERON: Under the permit, there is no  
8 requirements for the transportation of sand. Those  
9 would be covered -- we do have regulations, I believe,  
10 that cover transportation of materials, but they're  
11 not addressed in a source-specific CAAPP permit, which  
12 addresses the emissions only that occur on the premise  
13 of this facility.

14 MR. COLEMAN: Okay. So once it's outside the  
15 facility, the truck is no longer the responsibility of  
16 the facility, the transportation, if I understand what  
17 you said?

18 MR. CAMERON: It's no longer covered by the CAAPP  
19 permit. It may be covered by some other  
20 administrative codes or federal regulations, but from  
21 this permitting standpoint, no, there's nothing that  
22 covers it in this permit.

23 MR. COLEMAN: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. STUDER: Is there anyone else that has a

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 comment that they would like to make on the record?

2 Joyce.

3 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you very much. Joyce  
4 Blumenshine. I just had one quick question. I  
5 apologize. I didn't remember that earlier. Thank you  
6 for this opportunity again.

7 I did note that -- of course, this isn't  
8 considered currently to be a facility of any concern  
9 for the greenhouse gas emissions. And I realize  
10 that's, you know, specific to the site. But in this  
11 day and age of climate concerns, I just wanted to ask  
12 IEPA since the other gentleman had said that sand  
13 mining is directly related to frac production, frac  
14 gas production, and I did see something recently in  
15 the news about that U.S. Silica has, like, a trademark  
16 name, Ottawa White Sand, and that it's bumped up  
17 production to 500,000 tons annually.

18 I just wanted to know is there any  
19 possibility that at some point IEPA would look at the  
20 larger picture of environmental impacts, like, because  
21 of the frac sand permits, it increases fracking which  
22 increases methane and other global warming gases?

23 MR. STUDER: Are you asking -- is your question  
24 would we be taking into account things other than the

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1 emissions from this facility?

2 MS. BLUMENSHINE: I realize that's not directly  
3 under the CAAPP. I was going to ask is there any  
4 point in time when these CAAPP permits would take in  
5 the larger picture? I mean, I don't know the CAAPP  
6 process.

7 MR. REED: You mean would we ever consider  
8 life-cycle type of impacts?

9 MS. BLUMENSHINE: That's a perfect word. Thank  
10 you.

11 MR. REED: That's a hard question to answer,  
12 Joyce, because you're -- I mean, right now, I don't  
13 believe Title V or the Clean Air Act ever anticipated  
14 that type of analysis. And to speculate whether that  
15 would become part of that type of requirement under  
16 some greenhouse gas requirement, you know, rules or  
17 not, I couldn't tell you. But currently we don't do  
18 any kind of life-cycle analysis for permits.

19 MS. BLUMENSHINE: Thank you so much for your  
20 reply. Thank you.

21 MR. STUDER: Thank you, Joyce.

22 Is there anyone else that has a comment  
23 they'd like to make on the record this evening?

24 (No response heard.)

## Report of Proceedings - September 30, 2014

1           MR. STUDER: Okay. I want to thank everyone for  
2 your attendance. It is 8:14. The record in this will  
3 remain open for written comments for 30 days, which  
4 will put us on the 30th of October. I thank you for  
5 your attendance this evening.

6                       This hearing is adjourned.

7                               (Which were all the proceedings  
8                               had in the above-entitled cause.)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24



Victoria Legal + Corporate Services  
800.827.7708 [www.victoriarptg.com](http://www.victoriarptg.com)