

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BUREAU OF LAND, PERMIT SECTION

IN THE MATTER OF:

Underground Injection Control ILLINOIS EPA NO.
(UIC) Draft Permit for Archer 1150155136
Daniels Midland Company (ADM),
Decatur, Illinois

Public hearing held on Tuesday, September 16,
2008 at the hour of 5:00 p.m., at 130 N. Franklin,
Decatur, Illinois, pursuant to notice.

PATKES REPORTING SERVICE
(217) 787-9314

REPORTER: LAUREL A. PATKES, CSR #084-001340

IEPA STAFF:

JOHN KIM, Hearing Officer

KEVIN LESKO
UIC Permit Engineer

STEVEN NIGHTINGALE
Permit Section Manager

MELINDA SHAW
Geologist, Groundwater Assistance Unit

TERRI MYERS
Groundwater Assistance Unit Manager

I N D E X

	PAGE
Opening statement by Hearing Officer	4
Introduction of EPA staff	12
Presentation by Kevin Lesko	13
Questions from the public	20
PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	
Becki Clayborn	22
Randy Locke	33
Jay Dunne	38
Gary Sebens	41

EXHIBITS

	PAGE
No. 1 Notice of public hearing	11
No. 2 Copy of the Fact Sheet	11
No. 3 Copy of the Draft UIC Well Permit for ADM	11

1 would allow construction and operation of a single
2 deep injection well, two optional deep injection
3 zone monitoring wells, and four required shallow
4 groundwater monitoring wells.

5 This hearing will allow the
6 Illinois EPA to collect comments for our
7 consideration prior to issuing a final permit
8 decision on the permit application. The Illinois
9 EPA opened a public comment period on August 1,
10 2008, which will remain open for an additional 30
11 days after this hearing during which time comments
12 can also be submitted.

13 The public comment period will
14 conclude on October 17, 2008, which means you must
15 submit a written comment to me that is postmarked
16 before midnight on October 17th in order for that
17 comment to be considered.

18 This public hearing is being
19 held under the provisions of the Illinois EPA's
20 Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan Hearings,
21 which can be found in Title 35 of the Illinois
22 Administrative Code Part 166.

23 Copies of these procedures can
24 be obtained from me upon request or they can be

1 accessed on the Web site of the Illinois Pollution
2 Control Board at www.ipcb.state.il.us.

3 This public hearing is an
4 informational hearing. It is an opportunity for the
5 Illinois EPA to provide you with information
6 concerning the permit, and it is also an opportunity
7 for you to provide information or to ask questions
8 of the Illinois EPA concerning the permit.

9 I would like to explain
10 briefly how tonight's hearing is going to proceed.

11 First, I will introduce the
12 Illinois EPA staff members that are present tonight.
13 There will then be a short presentation by Kevin
14 Lesko of the Illinois EPA regarding the regulations
15 of the permitting program and the current draft
16 permit proposed for this project.

17 Following this draft permit
18 overview, I will allow the public to ask questions
19 or provide comments. You are not required to
20 verbalize your comments tonight as written comments
21 are given the same consideration and may be
22 submitted to the Illinois EPA at any time within the
23 public comment period, which again ends at midnight
24 on October 17, 2008.

1 Any person who wishes to make
2 an oral comment tonight may do so as time permits,
3 keeping in mind that tonight's hearing will be
4 adjourning at 8 p.m.

5 I will first call all those
6 who have indicated on the registration card
7 available at the entrance of the room that he or she
8 would like to comment and the statement or question
9 is relevant to the permit application or the draft
10 proceeding.

11 If you have not filled out a
12 card yet but would like to do so, please feel free
13 to fill out a card and you will be added to the list
14 of speakers.

15 If you have lengthy comments
16 or questions, it would be helpful to submit them to
17 me in writing before the close of the comment
18 period, and I will ensure that they are included in
19 the hearing record as exhibits.

20 I would like to stress that as
21 there is a specified period of time for tonight's
22 hearing, please keep your comments and questions
23 relevant to the issue at hand. If your comments
24 fall outside the scope of this hearing, I may ask

1 you to proceed on to another issue.

2 All speakers will have the
3 option of directing questions to the Illinois EPA
4 panel or they can just make general comments or do
5 both. Representatives of ADM are free to answer
6 questions if they would like but they are not
7 required to do so. Our panel members will make
8 every attempt to answer the questions presented, but
9 I will not allow speakers to argue, cross-examine,
10 or engage in a prolonged dialogue with our panel.

11 If anyone has, prior to you
12 speaking, presented testimony that is contained in
13 your written or oral comments, please feel free to
14 skip over those issues when you speak as that would
15 allow us to avoid unnecessary repetition.

16 Remember, all written comments
17 that are submitted to me tonight or during the
18 remaining comment period, whether or not they are
19 spoken outloud this evening, will become part of the
20 official hearing record and will be considered.

21 Anyone who has filled out a
22 registration card will also receive a notice
23 announcing the Illinois EPA's decision. That notice
24 will also direct you to the Illinois EPA's Web site

1 where you can retrieve all the details related to
2 this application, including the Illinois EPA's
3 Response Summary.

4 The Illinois EPA's Response
5 Summary will attempt to answer all the relevant and
6 significant questions raised at this hearing or
7 submitted to me prior to the close of the comment
8 period.

9 During the comment period, all
10 relevant comments, documents or data will also be
11 placed into the hearing record as exhibits. Please
12 send all written comments, documents or data to my
13 attention at the following address:

14 John Kim (K-i-m), Hearing Officer
15 Illinois Environment Protection Agency
16 1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276
17 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

18 That mailing information is
19 also provided on the public notice for tonight's
20 hearing and in a handout entitled "A Guide to
21 Effective Participation" which is available at the
22 registration table.

23 For anyone who is making a
24 comment or asking questions tonight, I'd like to

1 registered to make a statement.

2 Before we start with the
3 Illinois EPA's presentation, I would like to record
4 a number of preliminary documents into the official
5 record as exhibits.

6 Exhibit No. 1 will be a notice
7 of tonight's public hearing.

8 Exhibit No. 2 will be a copy
9 of the Fact Sheet that is available at the
10 registration table.

11 And Exhibit No. 3 is a copy of
12 the Draft UIC Well Permit for ADM.

13 I would also like to note that
14 Sally Greenburg of the Illinois State Geologic
15 Survey is present tonight representing the Midwest
16 Geological Sequestration Consortium. She has posted
17 some documents and some displays on the side of the
18 room here which she can explain.

19 If you have questions or you
20 would like to seek some additional information from
21 her, please see her during the hearing or at the
22 conclusion of the hearing.

23 And if you could just raise
24 your hand, Sally, so people can see where you are.

1 Thank you.

2 Before I introduce tonight's
3 panel, does anyone have any preliminary questions as
4 to the procedure for tonight's hearing?

5 Yes?

6 MS. CLAYBORN: Is the applicant not
7 going to be doing a presentation?

8 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The applicant
9 will not be making a presentation this evening.

10 I would now like to introduce
11 the Illinois EPA staff that are here tonight after
12 which Kevin Lesko of the staff will be making his
13 presentation.

14 To my left and going down the
15 table we have Kevin Lesko who is a UIC permit
16 engineer.

17 Next to him is Steve
18 Nightingale who is the permit section manager.

19 Next to him is Melinda Shaw
20 who is a geologist with our Groundwater Assistance
21 Unit.

22 And at the end of the table
23 but not least is Terri Myers who is the manager of
24 the Groundwater Assistance Unit.

1 At this time, I'd like to let
2 Kevin make his presentation.

3 MR. LESKO: Thank you, John.

4 Again, my name is Kevin Lesko,
5 and I have been an environmental engineer with the
6 Bureau of Land Permit Section since 1989. I was
7 assigned to be the permit reviewer for ADM's
8 Underground Injection Permit application.

9 Before we talk specifically
10 about ADM's permit, I would like to provide a little
11 background information on the Underground Injection
12 Control program or UIC program.

13 Underground injection of waste
14 in the U.S. began in the 1930s with the oil industry
15 injecting oil field brines back into the formation
16 from which the oil was extracted.

17 In the following years, the
18 oil and chemical industry began injecting liquid
19 waste. This led to many states establishing
20 regulations pertaining to injection of waste in the
21 1950s.

22 In response to problems caused
23 due to the injection of waste, Congress passed the
24 Safe Drinking Water Act in 1974, giving the United

1 States Environmental Protection Agency the authority
2 to control underground injection in order to protect
3 underground drinking water sources.

4 Beginning in 1980, the USEPA
5 established regulations for the injection of waste
6 under the UIC program.

7 In 1984, the Illinois EPA was
8 given authority to operate the UIC program within
9 the State of Illinois.

10 Now I would like to give you a
11 brief overview of the permit process.

12 The permitting process begins
13 with the applicant submitting a permit application
14 to the Agency. The application is reviewed by the
15 Agency to identify any additional information or
16 other revisions that are needed to the permit
17 application in order for the application to meet the
18 requirements set forth in the regulations. The
19 applicant then revises the application to address
20 these deficiencies.

21 This review and revision
22 process is usually repeated several times before the
23 Agency is prepared to develop a draft permit
24 decision.

1 Once a draft permit decision
2 is prepared, the public is given an opportunity to
3 comment on the Agency's decision. Sometimes the
4 Agency also schedules a public hearing during the
5 comment period. This hearing is part of the process
6 of collecting comments.

7 Following the close of the
8 comment period, the Agency evaluates the public
9 comments and prepares a final decision regarding the
10 permit.

11 If the final decision is to
12 grant the permit, the Agency will prepare a final
13 permit and will identify any changes that have been
14 made to the draft permit in response to the public's
15 comments.

16 Along with the final decision,
17 the Agency will prepare a "response to comments"
18 that identifies the public comments on the permit
19 and provide the Agency's response to those comments.

20 Notice of the agency's final
21 decision and availability of the response to
22 comments will be given to everyone that has
23 registered today or that has provided comments on
24 the permit.

1 During my review of the permit
2 application, I assure that the application meets the
3 requirements contained in the UIC program
4 regulations. The review and draft decision process
5 is a coordinated effort among several people at the
6 Agency.

7 During this review and the
8 preparation of the draft permit, I worked closely
9 with Terri Myers and Melinda Shaw of the Groundwater
10 Assistance Unit.

11 Steve Nightingale, Permit
12 Section Manager, others within the Agency as well as
13 experts from the USEPA and other sources were
14 consulted during this review process.

15 The Agency reviewed the permit
16 application against the Class I non-hazardous
17 injection well regulations. These are the most
18 stringent regulations that could be applied to this
19 type of injection well. The regulations for the
20 construction and operation of Class I injection
21 wells are set forth in 35 Illinois Administrative
22 Code Part 730.

23 If this permit is granted, ADM
24 would be allowed to inject one million metric tonnes

1 of carbon dioxide into the Mt. Simon sandstone
2 formation beneath their facility. ADM's ethanol
3 fermentation plant generates this carbon dioxide
4 and, should problems arise with the injection well,
5 it could be directly vented to the atmosphere.

6 The permit sets forth the
7 requirements for the construction of the injection
8 well and requires the preparation and submittal of
9 reports detailing the installation and information
10 collected during the installation of the well.

11 The permit details
12 requirements that must be met during the operation
13 of the injection well. Continuous monitoring of the
14 ongoing injection, in addition to continuous
15 monitoring of the well protection system is
16 required. This continuous monitoring is required to
17 assure that a leak in the injection well system is
18 detected quickly and to assure that problems are not
19 developing in the formation where the carbon dioxide
20 is being sequestered.

21 Additional testing is required
22 both annually and biannually for the injection well
23 system and the injection zone formation where the
24 carbon dioxide is placed. These tests help assure

1 that the injection fluid is not migrating upward
2 along the outside of the injection well system
3 piping. The injection zone formation testing
4 assures that pressure is not building up within the
5 injection zone and that the formation can handle the
6 continued injection as expected.

7 ADM must provide monthly
8 reports that detail the amount of material injected,
9 injection pressures, and detailed information on the
10 continuous monitoring required for the well
11 protection system. These reports must include the
12 results of any testing that has been conducted,
13 maintenance that has been performed or changes to
14 the injection well system, as well as identifying
15 any upcoming tests that will be performed. This
16 notification allows the Agency to be present during
17 any testing that will occur.

18 A groundwater monitoring
19 system is also required to ensure that the injection
20 does not impact usable sources of groundwater. The
21 permit requires that ADM perform regular sampling of
22 the groundwater and that the results of this
23 monitoring be submitted to the Agency for
24 evaluation.

1 This concludes my
2 presentation, and I will now turn it back over to
3 our hearing officer.

4 Thank you.

5 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you.

6 Before we begin to speak, if
7 anyone in this room cannot hear any of the speakers,
8 we will try to make better use of the microphones.
9 I think I've lost several octaves of hearing every
10 time the whining goes off, so I honestly don't know
11 how much or how little you can hear out there, so if
12 you're having a hard time hearing us, please just
13 let us know or let me know.

14 All right then. I will move
15 now to the first member of the public that has
16 indicated they would like to make a comment or ask a
17 question. That would be Donald Klinker.

18 MR. KLINKER: The only question I
19 had was I know this is not an earthquake. They
20 don't have any earthquakes around here. However, we
21 have had...

22 HEARING OFFICER KIM: I'm sorry,
23 Mr. Klinker. Would you mind standing at the
24 microphone?

1 MR. KLINKER: Sure.

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you
3 very much.

4 MR. KLINKER: My name is Don
5 Klinker, and the question I had was I know this is
6 not an area where we're troubled with many
7 earthquakes but we do have from time to time little
8 tremors.

9 My question is, has anyone
10 thought about that?

11 As deep as you're drilling or
12 injecting this stuff, it may not have any bearing at
13 all, but that was the question I had.

14 HEARING OFFICER KIM: And before we
15 answer your question, Mr. Klinker, just so your
16 spelling is clear, your last name is K-l-i-n-k-e-r?

17 MR. KLINKER: Yes.

18 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you.

19 MS. SHAW: I'm Melinda Shaw. I was
20 the geologist that reviewed the application.

21 Part of the process of the
22 review is they had to identify any geologic faults
23 beneath the facility and then in a specific radius
24 outside the facility.

1 Geologically speaking, the
2 predisposition to have earthquakes is not present
3 beneath the facility. There are no known faults
4 within -- it went out to a 25 mile-radius outside
5 the facility.

6 As far as the material they're
7 injecting causing an earthquake would be something
8 maybe Kevin could address as far as the capacity of
9 Mt. Simon to be able to accommodate that.

10 MR. LESKO: As far as the injection
11 actually causing any problems related to
12 earthquakes, the understanding of the situation
13 where this type of action has occurred was an area
14 where they were injecting very high volumes, and
15 basically what appears has happened, my
16 understanding, is you pressurize the formation so
17 much that it actually allows it to slip rather
18 easily.

19 At ADM, one of the things that
20 will not be allowed is for them to inject in a
21 manner that would cause a fracture within the
22 formation or an excessive buildup of pressure in the
23 formation, so that shouldn't present any problem in
24 this area just based on the fact that high pressures

1 will not be generated within the formation.

2 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
3 speaker is Becki Clayborn.

4 MS. CLAYBORN: Hi there. I'm Becki
5 Clayborn. I'm with the Sierra Club. My last name
6 is C-l-a-y-b-o-r-n.

7 The Sierra Club has 27,000
8 members here in Illinois and about 1.3 million
9 members and supporters nationwide. We're the oldest
10 and largest environmental organization.

11 This is an issue that we at
12 this point are monitoring and are interested in
13 learning more about, and we have a lot of questions,
14 probably more than I could actually go into tonight.

15 Our comments, we will have
16 written comments that will have more extensive
17 questions, but I'd like to follow up first on the
18 seismic activity question.

19 ADM did identify that there is
20 a fault line somewhere on the southwest side of
21 their property and that they, in their permit, said
22 that they were going to complete seismic surveys,
23 but it's not required by the permit that they report
24 those surveys to the public or to the Illinois EPA.

1 I was wondering if there's any
2 intention of having those reports go to the EPA or
3 to the public?

4 MS. SHAW: That was part of the
5 review is that they are going to have the seismic
6 surveys, and it's going to be part of their
7 completion report. You know, once the well is
8 drilled, they'll have to address anything like that
9 and to show that there aren't going to be any
10 impacts to the underground sources of drinking water
11 via any such, you know, earthquake or seismic
12 activity.

13 Part of that is the geology is
14 such that it's very unlikely for an earthquake or
15 seismic activity to occur, and then the other
16 portion of that would be part of what Kevin's review
17 was of the engineering of the actual well.

18 I don't know. Did you want to
19 say anything about --

20 MS. CLAYBORN: Is it going to be
21 made public is all I want to know, the results?

22 MS. SHAW: Anything that comes to
23 the agency is available through the Freedom of
24 Information Act.

1 MS. CLAYBORN: Since it's not
2 required by their permit, that's my concern, that
3 it's not required in their permit that they report
4 their seismic study.

5 MS. SHAW: That will be part of
6 their completion report which will be then available
7 through FOIA, Freedom of Information Act.

8 MS. CLAYBORN: Great. Thank you.

9 MS. SHAW: You're welcome.

10 MS. CLAYBORN: My next question is
11 about the current USEPA rulemaking that's going on
12 for CO2 injection.

13 September 30th they're having
14 a hearing in Chicago and I know that they're not
15 planning on having the rulemaking done until late
16 2010, early 2011, and I don't know much about this
17 so I'm not going to pretend that I do, but I do
18 understand that they are creating an entire new well
19 class for these types of projects.

20 And I'm just wondering, is
21 this permit process that the Illinois EPA has in
22 place right now adequate for such a large scale CO2
23 injection project if the United States EPA hasn't
24 even created their permit process for this project,

1 this type of project yet?

2 MR. LESKO: If you take a look at
3 the proposed regulations and you review them against
4 the Class I regulations for injection wells, what
5 you'll find is they're very similar, and if they
6 were passed in effect today and we required ADM to
7 come in and meet those standards, there really
8 wouldn't be much to do other than there's a
9 requirement that following injection, they continue
10 to monitor the site for I believe it's 50 years.

11 MS. CLAYBORN: I think you're
12 right.

13 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Their proposal is
14 50 years at this point.

15 MR. LESKO: Right.

16 That is really the only
17 difference. We chose to go with the Class I,
18 reviewed it against Class I regulations, and
19 basically what USEPA has proposed lines up very well
20 with those, and really, the only difference is on
21 the post-closure monitoring that's required.

22 MS. CLAYBORN: And how long is the
23 post-closure monitoring required in this permit?

24 MR. LESKO: Actually, there is no

1 post-closure monitoring required under the current
2 regulations.

3 MS. CLAYBORN: So how long is this
4 permit in effect for?

5 MR. LESKO: It will most likely be
6 up to ten years, and just due to the nature of the
7 project, they're talking about a five-year period,
8 but as you go, you know, a ten-year period is the
9 limit, and that's most likely what we would be
10 considering just because, you know, a lot of times
11 during these projects, things can get delayed.

12 You know, the limit right now
13 is basically on the amount of injection. Whether
14 they do it in three years or six years, the limit
15 currently is the amount of CO2 to be injected.

16 MS. CLAYBORN: The total --

17 MR. LESKO: Total amount.

18 MS. CLAYBORN: -- amount.

19 MR. NIGHTINGALE: There is a
20 special condition in the permit that will basically
21 allow us to reopen the permit and incorporate any
22 additional conditions that may be a result of the
23 new federal regulations.

24 One point that I would like to

1 make is that USEPA suggested that states cover these
2 type of injection activities under a Class V
3 experimental well.

4 In Illinois, we chose to go
5 the more restrictive route and require that they use
6 a Class I injection well which is turning out to be
7 pretty much the same thing, as Kevin said, as what
8 the USEPA is proposing for the Class VI injection
9 well for carbon sequestering.

10 MS. CLAYBORN: One of the reasons
11 that the Sierra Club is interested in these types of
12 projects is not only because of, you know, how it's
13 going to affect the groundwater or drinking water of
14 local supplies but also if the CO2 is actually going
15 to stay in the ground.

16 And there are many technical
17 questions that I could ask, but a general question
18 that I'd like to know the answer to is, if there is
19 a problem, if the pressure doesn't stay there, if it
20 does go back to a gaseous property and it is able to
21 come out of the ground, who is liable for anything
22 that might go wrong in the future after their permit
23 is over? If there's no post-closure monitoring,
24 who's going to be responsible for something that

1 goes wrong?

2 MR. NIGHTINGALE: Well, I think
3 Melinda could probably answer the question as far as
4 modeling and where we think that this would go or
5 where it's actually not going to go.

6 The underground injection
7 permit program is really developed to protect
8 drinking water. That is what that program has been
9 developed to do, and we feel that based on the
10 application we received and the modeling and
11 everything else that it will be protective of
12 drinking water, both underground and surface water.

13 The question that you bring up
14 about this being emitted unintentionally is really
15 beyond the scope of the underground injection
16 control permit program.

17 However, the Environmental
18 Protection Act does give us provisions to go after
19 somebody who is causing some type of environmental
20 problem, and that's probably where we would end up
21 going.

22 There may be additional
23 regulations through the Clean Air Act eventually,
24 but I think that's generally where we would be

1 trying to deal with these types of issues.

2 But I do want to mention that
3 based on what we've seen, and again, if Melinda
4 would like to expand upon it, but we feel this will
5 be injected and will stay down there and will not
6 cause problems with surface water or groundwater.

7 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Before your
8 next question, and I don't mean to cut you off but I
9 think when we're answering, because of the
10 background noise, to make sure the court reporter
11 can hear us, I think we need to make a point to hold
12 the microphone fairly close so she can hear us as
13 well as possible.

14 I'm sorry. Go ahead.

15 MS. CLAYBORN: That's okay. And I
16 do realize that this permit is not -- I was
17 wondering first of all if the scope of the permit
18 included any unintentional emissions of CO2 because
19 at the Sierra Club, one of our concerns is global
20 warming, and I believe that one of the reasons that
21 this project is even happening is to make sure that
22 carbon capture and sequestration will actually keep
23 CO2 in the ground, and therefore, I think even
24 though it's not within this permit, it still needs

1 to be addressed as part of the project. That's part
2 of the whole reason that they're doing this, and
3 specifically about the liability of what happens if
4 that CO2 goes back in the air. What if there's a
5 safety hazard because of CO2 escaping.

6 So I don't know how that fits
7 in. I don't know who can answer that question, but
8 it is a concern that Sierra Club has, and we will
9 probably keep pushing on that concern.

10 MR. NIGHTINGALE: I know that USEPA
11 has tried to address these issues in their proposed
12 regulation, and some of the questions that you're
13 bringing up, they have the same comments that we do.
14 It is beyond the scope of the UIC permitting
15 program.

16 What we feel is, and I think
17 the USEPA also feels, is that if they meet the
18 requirements for this Class I injection well, they
19 meet the design requirements, they've gone through
20 the modeling, we don't think it's going to go
21 anywhere.

22 So what we're saying is --
23 we're mimicking really what the USEPA is saying --
24 is we think that this program will, in fact, be

1 protective, although it is protective of the
2 groundwater, we think indirectly it will protect
3 this from leaving the site, but again, that is kind
4 of beyond the scope of the permitting program.

5 MS. CLAYBORN: I have some other
6 technical questions here specifically about how this
7 permitting process or the requirements of this
8 permit may differ from what the USEPA is going to
9 require of such a project with their new rulemaking,
10 and one of the specific questions we have is about
11 the materials that are being used for piping the CO2
12 and is it sufficiently corrosion resistant.

13 MR. LESKO: Well, as I mentioned
14 before, I think that review will show that the
15 requirements are very similar to the Class I
16 regulations, but part of the evaluation is an
17 evaluation of how the material will react to the
18 CO2, and that's a very big part of the design of the
19 well, both to assure that that corrosion will not be
20 a problem now during its operation and after the
21 injection has ceased, so it's part of the evaluation
22 in the permit.

23 MS. CLAYBORN: Do you know what the
24 materials are initially for the piping?

1 MR. LESKO: It's a steel, but off
2 the top of my head I don't know what classification.

3 MS. CLAYBORN: I'd like to keep
4 that question in the record if I could.

5 When you are reviewing, can
6 you go back and find that answer?

7 MR. LESKO: Yes, we'll address
8 those types, you know, when we don't know off the
9 top of our head some of these things or some of the
10 other issues, we will address those as part of our
11 response to comments.

12 MS. CLAYBORN: Okay.

13 Another question we have
14 specifically, technically a specific question we
15 have is about the automatic shutoff mechanism and
16 whether or not those plans are going to become
17 available for public review.

18 MR. LESKO: Those are part of the
19 things that will be developed yet and submitted and
20 will be part of the record, so they will be
21 available for the public review.

22 MS. CLAYBORN: So it's after the
23 permit has been issued is when it gets developed?

24 MR. LESKO: Part of the system

1 design, just because of the nature, you don't know
2 certain things until you get down there and look at
3 the specifics of the aquifer, and so some of those
4 designs have to be developed following the
5 installation of the well, and that will be part of
6 the information that's submitted with the well
7 completion report which we discussed earlier would
8 also be available.

9 MS. CLAYBORN: I think that's it.
10 I think you've answered all of my questions. Thank
11 you very much.

12 MR. LESKO: Thank you.

13 HEARING OFFICER KIM: The next
14 speaker that I have, and again, I will repeat that
15 the speakers or the people that have had questions
16 for tonight's hearing have been identified on the
17 registration cards that have been provided to me. I
18 have only one more card, so if anyone in the room
19 does wish to make a comment or does have a question
20 after this next speaker, then, you know, I'll give
21 you your chance to do so as well.

22 The next speaker is Randall
23 Locke.

24 MR. LOCKE: Randy Locke

1 (L-o-c-k-e). I'm here but not representing any
2 agency or organization.

3 I've been asked to read a
4 letter from John Thompson, the Director of the Coal
5 Transition Project of the Clean Air Task Force,
6 although I am not associated with that group.

7 Dear Mr. Kim: The Clean Air Task
8 Force (CATF) is a national nonprofit environmental
9 organization headquartered in Boston, Massachusetts.
10 CATF operates throughout the United States and
11 increasingly in China and India. We are dedicated
12 to restoring clean air through scientific research,
13 public education, and legal advocacy. CATF is
14 comprised of approximately 20 professionals with
15 backgrounds in science, engineering law, economics,
16 and public outreach.

17 Our work on climate focuses on
18 several areas, including: preparing comments on
19 coal-fueled power plant air permits, evaluating the
20 economics and environmental characteristics of
21 advanced coal technologies, developing federal and
22 state policy on carbon storage, and educating the
23 public about climate issues.

24 The Clean Air Task Force urges

1 Illinois EPA to issue the draft permit. This
2 project has been designed by some of the nation's
3 foremost experts in geologic sequestration. It will
4 make significant contributions to resolving the
5 technical issues associated with storing large
6 volumes of carbon dioxide in deep saline aquifers.

7 The Midwest Geological
8 Sequestration Consortium's work is one of only seven
9 groups in the U.S. to receive significant levels of
10 federal support. While this project is aimed at the
11 Illinois Basin, the knowledge and understanding
12 developed from this work will advance geologic
13 sequestration across the world.

14 Climate change is one of the
15 most critical challenges in the 21st century, and it
16 won't be solved without new technologies that can
17 reduce carbon dioxide. To prevent the worst of
18 impacts of climate change, new technologies must be
19 deployed in the coming decades that can reduce
20 carbon dioxide release by amounts measured in
21 gigatons. Geologic sequestration is one of the few
22 options that can be deployed on this large scale.

23 Thank you in advance for your
24 consideration.

1 until 8 p.m.

2 If you do wish to make a
3 comment or ask a question, then please approach me
4 or let one of our staff know. There's Mara McGinnis
5 in the back in the fuchsia colored shirt. Let us
6 know, and then we will make sure that we get back on
7 the record and you can make your comments or
8 questions.

9 So for now, we'll just recess
10 the hearing until further notice.

11 Thank you.

12 (Recess taken.)

13 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Excuse me. I
14 think we'd like to go back on the record.

15 For the benefit of anyone who
16 came in late, the hearing started this evening at
17 5 o'clock. We went through the people that
18 indicated that they had a comment or a question. We
19 had no further citizens or members of the public
20 that had any questions or comments at that time so
21 we took a short recess.

22 It is now approximately 6:05,
23 and I do have a registration card that indicates we
24 have someone who would like to make a comment, so

1 you.

2 Is there anyone else present
3 right now that has any question or any comment that
4 they would like to make on the record?

5 Seeing no one indicate an
6 interest, I will now again take another short
7 recess. I will go back on the record either at
8 around 6:30 or I will go on before if I receive a
9 registration card from someone that indicates that
10 they'd like to speak.

11 So for now, we'll go on
12 another recess on the hearing.

13 Thank you.

14 (Recess taken.)

15 HEARING OFFICER KIM: It is now
16 6:30 p.m. We're going to go back on the record to
17 again ask if there are any members of the public
18 present who have any comments or any questions that
19 they would like to make to the panel on the record.

20 Seeing none, again, this
21 hearing is scheduled to last until 8 p.m. so I will
22 be here till 8 p.m. The court reporter will be here
23 till 8 p.m., and there may be some other EPA staff
24 here as well. However, our hearing panel, our

1 name and spell your last name and then go ahead with
2 what you'd like to say.

3 MR. SEBENS: Okay. My name is Gary
4 Sebens. My last name is spelled S-e-b-e-n-s.

5 I own some adjacent property
6 to where this well is going to be, and I came here
7 this evening with questions about possible pollution
8 to drinking water on wells that I have on this
9 property which is developed with commercial real
10 estate.

11 I have talked with several
12 people since I arrived here this evening. They
13 seemed to have answered all of my questions, have
14 given me some information to read further after I
15 leave, and have alleviated any concerns that I have
16 about this project off the top of my head at this
17 time.

18 Thank you.

19 HEARING OFFICER KIM: Thank you.

20 Seeing no other members of the
21 public that would like to make a comment at this
22 point, I will again recess the hearing, and I will
23 not convene the hearing again until either someone
24 wishes to speak or until we reach the appointed hour

1 of 8 p.m., so we are now again taking a recess.

2 Thank you.

3 (Recess taken.)

4 HEARING OFFICER KIM: We are now
5 back on the record. It is approximately 8 p.m., and
6 seeing as there are no members of the public present
7 who wish to make any further comments or questions,
8 I am now going to close the hearing.

9 I would like to again remind
10 anyone who is interested in submitting comments that
11 the comment period for this record closes on
12 October 17, 2008, so any written comments must be
13 postmarked before midnight on October 17th to be
14 accepted as part of the record. Copies of the
15 exhibits of the hearing will be available upon
16 request.

17 On behalf of Director Doug
18 Scott, thank you very much for your participation
19 this evening.

20 The hearing is now closed.

21 (Conclusion of the foregoing
22 public hearing.)

23

24

