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

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

Can everyone hear me?

(Audience members nodding.)

MR. STUDER: Okay.

This is an informational hearing before the Illinois EPA in the matter of an application for a reissued air pollution control permit for U.S. Silica Company facility located at 701 Boyce Memorial Drive in Ottawa. This permit is a federal Title V permit under the Clean Air Act Permitting Program, often
referred to as CAAPP, C A A P P.

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

This public hearing is being held under the provisions of the Illinois EPA's procedures for permit and closure plan hearings which can be found at 35 Illinois Administrative Code, Part 166, Subpart A. Copies of these procedures can be accessed on the Web site for the Illinois Pollution Control Board at www.ipcb.state.il.us or can be obtained from me on request.

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

I would like to explain how tonight's hearing is going to proceed. First, I will have the Illinois EPA staff introduce themselves and identify their responsibilities within the agency in regards to this permitting action. Then, Mr. Justin Cameron, and he is sitting on my left, a permit engineer in the
Bureau of Air, will then make a brief statement. This will be followed by additional instructions on how I will be taking oral comments during the hearing this evening, and then I will allow the public to begin providing comments beginning with Patrick Smelko, plant manager for the U.S. Silica facility here in Ottawa.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All who legibly complete a registration card or submit written comments in this matter during the comment period will be notified of the final decision in this matter and of the availability of the responsiveness summary. In the responsiveness summary, the Illinois EPA will respond to all significant issues that were raised at this hearing or submitted to me prior to the close of the comment.
period. The record in this matter will close, again, that's October 30th, 2014. And, again, I will accept written comments as long as they are postmarked no later than October 30th, 2014.

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

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

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

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 JUSTIN, CAMERON. 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

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

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

I would like to take a few moments and point out some of the control measures the source is
required to follow under this permit.

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

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

There are several benefits to issuing an up-to-date renewal CAAPP permit for U.S. Silica. These benefits include, among other things, updated monitoring and testing requirements that the existing
CAAPP permit does not contain. A few of these items that would now be required include the following: monitoring in accordance with Compliance Assurance Monitoring, also known as CAM, requirements and performing ongoing periodic emission testing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. STUDER: Thank you, Justin.

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

Secondly, I'm not going to allow statements to be made tonight that do not relate to the issues involved with this air permit. Statements and comments that are of a personal nature or reflect on the character or motive of a person or group of people
are not appropriate in this hearing. If statements or
comments begin to drift into this area or begin to
drift away from the issues involved with this permit,
I may interrupt the person speaking and ask that they
proceed to their next relevant issue.

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

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

Again, written comments are given the same
consideration as oral comments received during this
hearing and may be submitted to the Illinois EPA at any time within the comment period. And, again, that comment period runs through October 30th, 2014. And although we will continue to accept comments through that date, tonight is the only time, again, I remind everyone, that we will be accepting oral comments.

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

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

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

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
7 In the event that we could not or cannot
8 accommodate everyone who wishes to make comments this
9 evening, you are asked to submit your comments to us
10 in writing. And, again, those written comments are
11 given the same weight as any statements during this
12 hearing.
13
14 Again, I stress that we want to avoid
15 unnecessary repetition for the comments this evening.
16 Once a point is made, it makes no difference if that
17 point is made once or whether it is made 99 times. It
18 will be considered on its merit and will be reflected
19 only once in the responsiveness summary. The final
20 decision of the Illinois EPA will not be based upon
21 how many people support or oppose the issuance of this
22 permit but, rather, on the record and whether the
23 facility will comply with the applicable laws,
24 regulations, and requirements for permit issuance.
25
26 We have a court reporter here who is taking
27 a record of this hearing for the purpose of us
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compiling our administrative record. Therefore, for
her benefit, please keep the general background noise
in the room to a minimum so that she can hear
everything that is said. Illinois EPA will post the
transcript of this hearing on our Web page in the same
general place where the hearing notice, Statement of
Basis, and draft permit have been posted. The actual
date when the transcript is posted will depend largely
on when I get the final transcript from the court
reporter.

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

For the benefit of the court reporter, I
ask that you spell your last name. If there are
alternate spellings for your first name, you may also
spell your first name. Once you spell your name, I
will start timing you and you will have seven minutes
to complete your comments. I'd ask that while you are
speaking that you direct your attention to the hearing panel and to the court reporter to ensure that an accurate record of your comments is made. Prolonged dialogue with members of the hearing panel or with others here in attendance will not be permitted. Comments directed to the public are also not allowed.

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

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

(No response heard.)

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

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

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

MR. SMELKO: Good evening. My name is Patrick Smelko, S M E L K O, and I've been the plant manager
at U.S. Silica since August of 2013.

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

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

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

We recently added more than 52 new jobs. In addition, we indirectly support many jobs, including but not limited to contractors, suppliers, truckdrivers, and rail workers. Over the years, we've also worked directly with many people and organizations that are the foundation of the
community, and we appreciate the opportunity to make a
difference by supporting their work.

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

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

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

Finally, I'd like to address the permit
compliance, something that U.S. Silica and the Ottawa
plant in particular have a strong track record for.
As a sand mining company, we are required to adhere to
many different kinds of permits, and compliance is
truly a team effort.

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

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

MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Smelko.

Tom Walsh.

MR. WALSH: I pass at this time.

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

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

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

MR. ANDREWS: Farley Andrews, A N D R E W S.
Regarding the proposed issuance of a clean air permit for the U.S. Silica sand facility in Ottawa, Illinois, we are concerned about the advanced mining technologies that allow for hypermining of a product which byproduct and its airborne particulate matter resulting from the mining, milling, and transportation in and through densely populated areas of the county has recently been established as a toxic substance in a study from the U.S. EPA and Occupation Safety and Health Administration.

It is for the reasons stated above we respectfully request that IEPA issue particulate matter monitors be installed as soon as possible within a one mile -- within one mile of each sand mine and milling facility in LaSalle County and along transport routes, near all shipping channels, and areas with high population density to determine the actual levels of particulate matter in which residents of Ottawa and the county are being exposed prior to the issuance of any clean air permits. It makes sense that information regarding the quality of the air be collected and known by the public prior to issuance of clean air permits.
Presently, the only monitor that exists in LaSalle County screens for sulfur dioxide, not for the particulate matter or air quality related to mining, which is our concern here. These must be IEPA-issued PM monitors that are sufficient for the Illinois Department of Public Health to conduct thorough investigations on silicosis and respiratory and cardiac disease throughout LaSalle County.

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

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

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

This is no longer the relatively small, locally-owned family sand mining operation as it existed in Ottawa for over 100 years prior to the sale of Ottawa Silica to U.S. Silica. The majority of residents polled on Ottawa's west side feel neither local media nor public officials have shown the slightest understanding, awareness, or concern for residents over the quite visible air quality problems on Ottawa's west side. Neither local media nor public officials have shown an interest in seeking expert help to inform either themselves or residents of the possible dangers involved in living so close to a silica mining and milling operation, which residents
understand may be affecting their own and their children's health.

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

The quite visible particulate matter from Ottawa's west side milling operation which layers front porches, windows, window frames, and automobile finishes understandably draws angry comments, especially from west side residents such as, and I quote, Look, since the opening of that new mill and beginning of their extended milling operations, this
is what I have to deal with and sweep away nearly
every day. Layers of fine sand that I know my
children are breathing with no good effect on their
health which has now affected life for them. I would
move away in a minute if I could. I cannot begin to
afford a move at this time. This is fairly typical of
comments I encountered on my signature-seeking trek
through Ottawa's west side.

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

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

It might be worth noting that covered --
this is related to airborne silica dust. It might be
worth noting that covered crops in collar counties of
DuPage, Kane, Lake, and Will and Kendall surrounding Cook County and Chicago are subsidized to reduce the amount of airborne particulate matter reaching the city from prevailing westerly winds. Knowing what we know -- what's now well known as airborne silica dust is a health hazard and toxic substance, this is not a stretch to either comprehend or understand. We in Ottawa and LaSalle County and throughout the state need to learn and read the signs.

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

Prior to any consideration of a clean air permit to mine, mill, or transport silica sand, we in LaSalle County need an ongoing and official air monitoring program for particulate matter subsidized
by mining companies, overseen by the IEPA and local
citizen member boards with findings made available to
the public through the oversight of citizen member
boards. We need laws that protect citizens and their
health and property and not corporations. We need a
renewed will and commitment on the part of the IEPA
members to act on initiatives regarding matters of
health and environment and quality of life for
citizens of Illinois relating to mining of silica
sand.

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

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

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

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

MR. REED: He's got written copies.

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

MR. ANDREWS: You mean now?

MR. STUDER: That's fine, yeah. Sure.
MR. ANDREWS: Do you need three? I have more.
MR. STUDER: I only need one for the record.
What I'll do is I'll enter it as an exhibit, and I'll let you hang on to this. If we have time --
MR. ANDREWS: That's all right.
MR. STUDER: Okay.
MR. ANDREWS: This isn't in there, but I can also recommend the book Deadly Dust: Silicosis and the On-Going Struggle to Protect Workers' Health. It's the history of the struggle to -- well, could I read something to you, or is it --
MR. STUDER: Yes. As long as it's with the citation. We have gone the time limit. What I'll do is -- we'll probably have time to come back to you. I can't absolutely guarantee that, but we probably will. And I'll hang on to your hearing card. And we'll allow that in the second round, if that's okay.
MR. ANDREWS: Thank you very much.
MR. REED: Thank you.
MR. STUDER: Thank you, Mr. Andrews.
Ashley Williams. And Ashley will be followed by Joyce Blumenshine.
MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the IEPA. I will do my best not to reiterate what

Mr. Andrews just said. My name is Ashley Williams, W I L L I A M S. My concerns regarding this CAAPP permit are as follows: Due to seasonal differences in climates within LaSalle County, annual limits in 12-month rolling averages prove insufficient to limit pollution during dryer months, and in those months blasting is more recurring. Furthermore, the permit fails to properly address ambient silica dust controls. Airborne crystalline silica may stay aloft for three to four days and travel 10 to 15 miles downwind. Consequently, those who live nearby are exposed to fine crystalline silica dust 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

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

Moreover, the IEPA National Air Quality Standard established without any regard to silica...
content makes no allowance for the type or size of particles being measured under the PM10 threshold.

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

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

Essentially, I'm not asking for regulation of generic particles but for those that pose the greatest risk to human health, primarily in children and the elderly, fine crystalline silica particles. I ask that you, the IEPA, exercise your authority to regulate all forms of particle emissions from U.S. Silica. I ask that multiple air monitors be installed on and off U.S. Silica sites, including detailed mapping of downwind plumes of fine crystalline dust.
The time is now to safeguard the health, well-being, and safety of the public. Silica is no longer just a worker concern but a concern for all. Thank you.

MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Williams.

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

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

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

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

I think it's very fitting tonight that we are here in a school because air quality, of course, has been talked so well by other speakers affects children and very greatly. So I have a few comments and questions tonight.
This Ottawa area is in the Heart of Illinois Group, Sierra Club area for our group. It was added to our group, and we are concerned. I just realized -- and I know this is a single-source status, but I would like to ask IEPA, since this is one of many now sand mines, and they are cropping up with numbers here in the county, is there anything that IEPA does to consider the cumulation of these productions of PM levels by numerous new mines in addition to this permit?

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

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

MR. CAMERON: The --

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

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

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

MR. REED: Correct. Yes.

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

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

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

MR. REED: No. Because that would have already
been done if it was necessary in the construction permit.

MS. BLUMENSHINE: In the construction permit.

Thank you. That is helpful because I know in the application it says under 2.6 there's a fee for the particulate matter for tons per year, and so is that -- is that 233.83 tons per year of PMs estimated or modeled? How is that amount figured out for this specific permit?

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

MR. CAMERON: The way it would work is that fee schedule there, the source would have to have actual emissions of less than that amount. The way our fees work is the source determines their fees to an extent. They determine what they will emit for that year. They perform a projection of that. And so long as their actual emissions are less than the fee, that's all the fee is really there for. It's sort of a --
not necessarily worst case, but it's the highest level
ey they could emit for that year. That's all that they
have paid for, and their actual emissions are
generally much less than that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As far as 39.7, that type of compliance margin does show that they have the ability to comply with the applicable rules from the testing. As for the range in values, generally our testing is set up in several runs to get a gauge of any outliers or anything like that that would be irrelevant or possibly sway the data one way or another. So three are averaged into one value and, therefore, the
compliance margin which is with the -- the one you're
talking about is with the process weight rate, which
gives the pound per hour, a PM. The limit is based on
the overall throughput to the general piece of
equipment. And whatever their value was based off of
our process weight rate tables, they show that they
could comply with that.

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

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

MS. BLUMENSHINE: But on the larger scale, it's
really pretty good. Okay, that helps. Thank you.
I'm not a scientist. I didn't know how those numbers ran. Okay. I have one last point, or should I stop?

One last point?

MR. STUDER: (Indicating.)

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

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

MS. BLUMENSHINE: Pardon?

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

MS. BLUMENSHINE: This is my last one.

MR. STUDER: Okay. Go ahead then.

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

MR. STUDER: Thank you, Ms. Blumenshine.

Randy Juras.

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

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

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

One of the things that we have been talking about is we're hoping that on October 14th, JCAR will in fact reject the IDNR rules, open up the discussion, and then everything regarding fracking will then be fair game. At that point we are wondering what would
happen to having the IDNR be responsible for air
pollution coming from a frac sand mining operation
because it's related to fracking. Have you guys given
that any thought?

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

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

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

But go ahead, Mike.

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

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

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

MR. JURAS: Right. You're only going to look
at -- you're going to issue a permit for a specific site and you're going to monitor a specific site. You don't do cumulative air sampling of the area.

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

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

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

MR. REED: Well, I was just speaking to Justin
here a few minutes ago, and I do believe our agency is looking into establishing some sort of network, but that is not being done by the permitting group that is represented here today. That's being done by our ambient air monitoring and air quality planning sections, and ambient monitoring is not something that we can require in a permit for a specific source, unless it comes out of the Title I program that requires it. So I do believe the agency is looking into that, but I can't tell you for sure what will happen.

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

MR. STUDER: One of the things under Illinois law is our agency does not make regulations of an environmental substantive nature. That is not a power
that the General Assembly has given to the Illinois EPA. That power does rest with the Illinois Pollution Control Board. So, I mean, you can make all the recommendations to us, but we don't enact air regulations.

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

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

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

MR. REED: I'll just add one thing. I do believe here in Region 5, which is U.S. EPA's six state coverage, I think the State of Wisconsin and the State of Minnesota have done some silica dust air monitoring around some of their sand mines, so you might be able to get some data there through the U.S. EPA to see what the impacts were and the results of those
MR. JURAS: That's true. The question and that particular answer came up in Utica when they were talking about the frac sand mining there, and the lawyers for that mining company mentioned, That's Wisconsin. This is Illinois.

MR. STUDER: Thank you.

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

(No response heard.)

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

MR. ANDREWS: I don't have a page. I'm just reading from the cover. The name of the book is called Deadly Dust by David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz. And what they've included on the dust cover is, During the Depression, silicosis was an industrial lung disease and emerged as a national social crisis. Experts estimated that hundreds of
thousands of workers were at risk from disability of
the disease and death by inhaling silica in mines,
foundries, quarries. By the 1950s, however, silicosis
was nearly forgotten by the media and health
professionals, asking what makes a health threat a
public issue? David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz
examine how a culture defines disease and how disease
itself is understood at different moments in history.
They also explore the interlocking relationships of
public health, labor, business, and government to
discuss who should assume responsibility for
occupational disease.

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

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

MR. WALSH: Tom Walsh. My name is Tom Walsh,
W A L S H. And the only thing that I'd like to submit
is after listening to the fact that it's my
understanding that your agency has no direct authority
in relationship to requiring any type of monitoring or
anything like that, but I would like to submit to you
the protocol that was recently established by Region 5 U.S. EPA in relationship to the Wedron facility that is on a comparative nature. (Tenders.)

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

MR. WALSH: I would appreciate that. Are they the only group other than the air quality, Illinois Pollution Control Board that has authority to require monitoring? Was I understanding you correctly or ... MR. REED: I think what I had said was we can't require ambient air monitoring in this operating permit that we're discussing tonight. That would have to be done through a Title I permit, which is a construction permit basically. And that is what this Wedron permit is. It's a construction permit. And so they do have authority under Title I provisions to require those types of monitoring.

The only thing we can require, as far as monitoring in our Title V permit, which is the CAAPP permits here in Illinois, is stack testing requirements, inspection requirements, making sure that the plant is maintained at a specific level that can demonstrate compliance and/or identify that there is a noncompliance or a deviation from permit
MR. WALSH: So there are no monitoring stipulations in it at all that you have authority in order to --

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

MR. CAMERON: No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WALSH: Yes. Uh-huh.

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

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

MR. REED: Generally, what happens is we'll require them to do monitoring, and then they have to
pay for it, support it, you know, do the data collection and all that stuff.

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

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

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

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

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. REED: You could participate in that process.

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

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.
MR. COLEMAN: Rick Coleman, Coleman.

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

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

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

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

MR. COLEMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STUDER: Is there anyone else that has a

comment that they would like to make on the record?

Joyce.

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

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

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

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

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

This hearing is adjourned.

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