

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

**IN THE MATTER OF:** )  
**PETITION OF GREIF PACKAGING, LLC** )  
**FOR AN ADJUSTED STANDARD FROM** ) **AS 11-01**  
**35 ILL ADM. CODE PART 218** ) **Air**  
**SUBPART TT** )

**NOTICE**

TO: John Therriault, Acting Clerk  
Illinois Pollution Control Board  
James R. Thompson Center  
100 W. Randolph St., Suite 11-500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3218

Bradley Halloran, Hearing Officer  
Illinois Pollution Control Board  
James R. Thompson Center  
100 W. Randolph St., Suite 11-500  
Chicago, IL 60601-3218

Susan Charles  
Tom Dimond  
Ice Miller LLP  
200 W. Madison Street, Ste. 3500  
Chicago, IL 60606-3417

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that I have today filed with the Office of the Pollution Control Board the ILLINOIS EPA ANSWERS TO ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD QUESTIONS AT HEARING of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency a copy of which is herewith served upon you.

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION AGENCY

By: /s/ Charles E. Matoesian  
Charles E. Matoesian  
Assistant Counsel  
Division of Legal Counsel

DATED: January 12, 2012

1021 North Grand Avenue East  
P.O. Box 19276  
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276  
217.782.5544  
217.782.9143 (TDD)

**THIS FILING IS SUBMITTED  
ON RECYCLED PAPER**

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**

**IN THE MATTER OF:** )  
**PETITION OF GREIF PACKAGING, LLC** )  
**FOR AN ADJUSTED STANDARD FROM** ) **AS 11-01**  
**35 ILL. ADM. CODE PART 218** ) **Air**  
**SUBPART TT** )

**ILLINOIS EPA ANSWERS TO ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD**  
**QUESTIONS AT HEARING**

**NOW COMES** Respondent, ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

("Illinois EPA" or "Agency"), by its attorney, Charles E. Matoesian, and files this response to the questions of the Illinois Pollution Control Board's ("Board") at the December 20, 2011, hearing.

**Question 1:** Page 31 – 32 of the transcript:

Previously in Adjusted standard AS 09-4 for a company called Royal Fiberglass, the agency stated that an increase of two parts per billion is quote, "potentially significant", end quote.

In this case we are looking at 1.47 parts per billion. My first question is, does the Agency believe that an increment of 1.47 parts per billion is potentially significant?

**Response:** *United States Environmental Protection Agency has not defined a level of significance for ozone. However, the Agency reviewed the impact of an increment of 1.47 parts per billion on the current air quality in the area. For 2007 – 2009, the one-hour design value at Lisle, the closest monitoring site to the facility, is 70.7 parts per billion. The Agency believes that an increase of 1.47 parts per billion to the design value will not cause the violation of 120 parts per billion one-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone. Also, the Agency believes that adding 1.47 parts per billion to the design value of 62.7 parts per billion for 8-hour ozone standard (2007-2009) at Lisle monitoring site will not cause or contribute to a violation of the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards of 75 parts per billion.*

**Question 2:** Page 32 of the transcript:

And the second question is, does the Agency believe the granting of this proposed adjusted standard will cause or contribute to the violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone or delay efforts to attain the NAAQS in a timely manner?

***Response:*** *The Agency believes that granting of this proposed adjusted standard will not cause or contribute to violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone or delay the Agency's efforts to attain or maintain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone in a timely manner.*

