1	THE THOLE DOLLUMION COMMON DOADS
2	ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
3	IN THE MATTER OF:) R03-9
4	PROPOSED NEW AND UPDATED) RULES FOR MEASUREMENT AND)
5	NUMERICAL SOUND EMISSIONS) STANDARDS AMENDMENTS TO 35)
	ILL. ADM CODE 901 and 910)
6	
7	
8	RULEMAKING HEARING BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION
9	CONTROL BOARD, and Hearing Officer Marie Tipsord, and taken
10	before Ann Marie Hollo, CSR, RPR, RMR, at 1:30 o'clock
11	P.M., on September 1, 2005, at the Offices of the Illinois
12	Environmental Protection Agency, Illinois Pollution Control
13	Hearing Room, 1021 North Grand Avenue, Springfield,
14	Illinois, pursuant to notice.
15	
16	
17	Keefe Reporting Company
18	11 North 44th Street Belleville, Illinois 62226
19	(618)277-0190 (800)244-0190
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
∠ ⊃	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Marie Tipsord, Esq., Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board
3	100 West Randolph Street Suite 11-500
4	Chicago, Illinois 60601
5	
6	Illinois Pollution Control Board Members:
7	G. Tanner, Girard, Ph.D., 704 North Schrader Avenue,
8	Havana, Illinois 62644
9	Anand Rao 100 West Randolph Street
10	Suite 11-500 Chicago, Illinois 60601
11	Thomas E. Johnson, Esq.
12	1717 Philo Road Urbana, Illinois 61802
13	
14	John C. Henriksen Illinois Association of Aggregate Producers
15	1115 South Second Street Springfield, Illinois 62704
16	
17	Jim Hafliger Illinois Department of Natural Resources
18	One Natural Resources Way Springfield, Illinois 62702
19	Milland Diana
20	Willard Pierce Evenson Explosives, LLC
21	516A Bedford Road Morris, Illinois 60450
22	E X H I B I T S
23 24	NUMBER ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE Exhibits 4 and 5 22 Exhibit 6 33
24	Exhibit 7 34

1	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Good afternoon.
2	My name is Marie Tipsord, and I've been
3	appointed by the Board to serve as hearing
4	officer in this proceeding, entitled, "In the
5	Matter of Proposed New and Updated Rules for
6	Measurement and Numerical Sound Emission
7	Standards Amendments to 35 Ill. Admin Code,
8	part 901 and 910." This is docket number
9	R03-9.
10	To my right is Dr. Tanner Girard, the lead
11	board member assigned to this matter. And to
12	his right is Board Member Thomas Johnson. To
13	my immediate left is Anand Rao of our technical
14	unit. And also present today is John Nittle,
15	attorney, assistant to Board Member Johnson.
16	And Erin Connolly, our rules coordinator.
17	This is the fifth hearing to be held in
18	this proceeding and is being held at the
19	request of the Illinois Association of
20	Aggregate Producers pursuant to Section 5-40 of
21	the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. The
22	purpose of today's hearing is to hear the
23	pre-filed testimony from the Illinois
24	Aggregate Illinois Association of Aggregate
25	Producers and the Illinois Department of

Natural Resources.

2	As time allows, we will also hear from
3	anyone else who wishes to testify. At this
4	time, is there anyone else present who wishes
5	to testify?
6	MR. PIERCE: I am.
7	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And you are
8	with?
9	MR. PIERCE: I'm Willard Pierce with
10	Evenson Explosives.
11	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Right. You're
12	with the Illinois Association of Aggregate
13	Producers, and we have your summary pre-file.
14	Okay. Thank you.
15	Anyone may ask a question. However, I do
16	ask that you raise your hand, wait for me to
17	acknowledge you. And after I have acknowledged
18	you, please state your name and whom you
19	represent before you begin your question.
20	Please speak one at a time. If you are
21	speaking over each other, the court reporter
22	will not be able to get your questions on the
23	record.
24	Please note that any question asked by a
25	board member or staff are intended to help

1	build a complete record for the Board's
2	decision and not to express any preconceived
3	notion or bias.
4	Also just for the record, I would like to
5	note that I had previously heard from Pat
6	Sharky (sp) who is representing the Village of
7	Bridgeview, and Dr. Paul Schomer who had hoped
8	to testify today, but Dr. Schomer had an
9	accident and is unable to attend. Ms. Sharky
10	notified us today that she will not be
11	attending the hearing, but they will be filing
12	additional comments before the close of the
13	comment period.
14	MR. HENRIKSON: Okay.
15	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: At this time,
16	Dr. Girard, would you like to say anything?
17	BOARD MEMBER GIRARD: Good afternoon.
18	On behalf of the Board, I welcome everyone
19	to this hearing to update our noise rules. We
20	are grateful for the time and effort that many
21	people have contributed to this process. We
22	look forward to the testimony and questions
23	today. Thank you.
24	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
25	With that, we'll begin with Mr. Henriksen

1	and the aggregate producers.
2	MR. HENRIKSON: Thank you. May it please
3	the Illinois Pollution Control Board, my name
4	is John Henriksen. I am the executive director
5	of the Illinois Association of Aggregate
6	Producers.
7	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Go ahead and
8	swear him in.
9	[WITNESS SWORN.]
10	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And, you know,
11	we'll go ahead and swear in Mr. Pierce and
12	also I'm sorry.
13	MR. HAFLIGER: Jim Hafliger with DNR.
14	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And Mr. Hafliger
15	at this time, too. So if there are questions
16	that might be asked, you can all answer at once
17	and you'll already be sworn. Okay. Very good.
18	[WITNESSES SWORN.]
19	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you. All
20	right. Go ahead.
21	BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Can I bring my
22	secretary in here? No. To swear her.
23	MR. HENRIKSON: As I was saying, I manage
24	the trade association representing companies
25	that produce aggregates. And for those of you

1	don't know, that's crushed sand, stone and
2	gravel. We have 113 members that operated in
3	80 out of 102 Illinois counties last year to
4	put it in perspective. We produce 111 million
5	tons of these materials.
6	Since 1995, my industry has been regulated
7	for blasting by the Illinois Department of
8	Natural Resources, Office of Mines and
9	Minerals, in accordance with Section 6.5 of the
10	Surface Mined-Land Conservation and Reclamation
11	Act. Since 1982, the coal mining industry has
12	been regulated by the same agency in accordance
13	with Sections 3.13 of the Surface Coal Mining
14	Land Conservation and Reclamation Act.
15	Office of Minerals has promulgated a
16	comprehensive set of regulations that subject
17	both of these types of blasting operations,
18	coal mining and aggregate mining, to air blast
19	or ground vibration monitoring, or both, as
20	necessary to prevent property damage and
21	protect public safety. IDNR regulations
22	protect the general public from the impacts of
23	air overpressure resulting from blasting
24	operations of the mines. Both the aggregate
25	mining and coal mining blasting regulations are

enforced by a highly trained, technologically

2	proficient inspection staff using
3	state-of-the-art monitoring equipment.
4	Jim Hafliger's testimony the gentleman
5	sitting to my left Jim Hafliger's testimony
6	later this afternoon will outline in detail
7	this comprehensive regulatory program.
8	Although blasting operations at aggregate
9	and coal mines are currently regulated by IDNR,
10	the Board is seeking to maintain an essentially
11	duplicative and overlapping regulatory program
12	for these operations, pursuant to 35 Ill. Admin
13	Code 901.109. During our last public hearing,
14	we argued that the Board could and should elect
15	not to regulate an industry that is already
16	heavily regulated by the State.
17	In the March 17, 2005 Hearing Officer's
18	Order and Opinion, the Board declined to follow
19	this assertion and stated that any exemption
20	from the Board's noise regulations would
21	require a statutory exemption. This holding
22	was based upon the Board's construction of
23	Section 24 of the Illinois Environmental
24	Protection Act that states as follows:
25	"No person shall emit beyond the

boundaries of his property any noise that

2	unreasonably interferes with the enjoyment of
3	life or with any lawful business or
4	activity" this is the important part "so
5	as to violate any regulation or standard
6	adopted by the Board under this Act."
7	Although we are mindful or I am mindful
8	and my industry is mindful of what Section 24
9	states, it's critical for the Board to bear in
10	mind that the regulations or standards adopted
11	by the Board are promulgated pursuant to
12	Section 25 of the Act.
13	As outlined in Section 25 of this Act,
14	"The Board" and this is important "may
15	adopt regulations prescribing limitations on
16	noise emissions beyond the boundaries of the
17	property of any person and prescribing
18	requirements and standards for equipment and
19	procedures for monitoring noise and the
20	collection, reporting, retention of data
21	resulting from such monitoring." "May adopt."
22	Pursuant to this grant of rule-making
23	authority, the Board has elected to regulate
24	highly impulsive sound from blasting operations
25	at mines They've elected to regulate our

1	blasting. A source of sound that's heavily
2	regulated already by a sister agency.
3	Yet the Board has elected not to regulate
4	other sources of noise, despite the lack of a
5	statutory exemption for each of these sources
6	found in Section 24 of the Act. Moreover, the
7	Board has elected not to exempt these sources
8	despite the fact that these sources of noise
9	are currently unregulated by the State.
10	For example, the Board rules at 901.107
11	provides specific exemptions for sound emitted
12	from emergency warning devices, unregulated
13	safety relief valves, lawn care maintenance
14	equipment and agricultural field machinery used
15	during the day, equipment being used for
16	construction, land use for automobile,
17	motorcycle racing, and any land used for
18	contests, rallies, time trials, test runs or
19	similar operations of any self-propelled device
20	during the day.
21	Although the IAAP acknowledges the Board's
22	authority to decide what activities are subject
23	to limits on noise emissions, this authority
24	cannot be unlimited.

Specifically, we contend it's unreasonable

_	to regulate bound generated by brabering
2	operations at mines, operations already subject
3	to the comprehensive State regulatory program,
4	while electing not to regulate other sources of
5	noise. Especially when there are no exemptions
6	in Section 24, exempting the other source of
7	noise. What the Pollution Control Board did in
8	its wisdom is elect to regulate some sources
9	than not. We contend that you should also
10	elect to not regulate blasting associated with
11	coal mining or aggregate mining, especially
12	since we are heavily regulated by a state
13	agency, as Mr. Hafliger will outline.
14	Therefore, the IAAP, with respect to
15	Section 901 of the Board's rules, the
16	regulations identifying those activities not
17	subject to Board noise regulations be amended
18	to state as follows:
19	And what I'm going to say is in little bit
20	of variance with my pre-filed testimony, since
21	my strike-through didn't work.
22	But anyway. Subsection H, we would
23	suggest that and respectfully submit that
24	901.107 (h) state, in part, 901 shall not apply
25	to impulsive sound produced by explosive

1	blasting activities conducted on any Class C
2	land used as specified by capital L-B-C-S
3	Codes 8300 and 8500, period.
4	Land-Based Classification Standard 8300
5	refers to coal mines. LBCS Code 8500 refers to
6	aggregate mines. As outlined previously,
7	blasting operations at coal and aggregate mines
8	are currently regulated by IDNR's comprehensive
9	programs.
10	Amending 901.107 (h), as outlined
11	previously, allows the Board to regulate
12	non-mining blasting activities, pursuant to
13	901.109, and leaves the regulation of blasting
14	operations at mines to IDNR. Given the
15	flexibility of the Board's rule-making
16	authority under Section 25 of the Illinois
17	Environmental Protection Act, flexibility that
18	the Board has exercised previously to exempt
19	other sources of noise from regulation, we
20	respectfully submit that the Board should amend
21	901.107 in order to defer to IDNR's
22	comprehensive regulatory scheme.
23	But in the event that the Board elects to
24	continue regulating blasting operations
25	associated with the Illinois mining industry

the IAAP respectfully submits that Section

2	901.109 should be amended to bring the Board's
3	regulatory program in harmony with the program
4	enforced by IDNR.
5	We do appreciate the Board's amendment of
6	its proposed rules in response to our previous
7	comments in this rule making. The Board did
8	follow some of the changes we suggested, and we
9	do appreciate that.
10	Although these changes help to bring
11	Section 901.109 closer to the regulatory
12	standards enforced by IDNR, a further review of
13	the proposed rule making has revealed other
14	changes that must be made in the Board's rules.
15	First, Section 901.109, little "c,"
16	provides that allowable sound limits of
17	blasting operations prior to 7:00 a.m. must be
18	reduced by 10 decibels. Given that decibel
19	limits are logarithmic, a 123 decibel limit
20	represents approximately only 30 percent of 133
21	decibels. In order to accurately and fairly
22	regulate the same way we're regulated by IDNR,
23	we suggest that Section 901.109(c) should be
24	amended as follows:
25	All blasting shall be conducted between

sunrise and sunset except in emergency

2	situations where unscheduled blasting is
3	required to ensure operator or public safety.
4	This change reflects the fact that sunrise
5	is often well before 7:00 a.m. during the
6	summer, the time that aggregate operations are
7	most active.
8	Second, the regulatory focus in Section
9	901.109 must be shifted from property lines to
10	protected structures. Regulating noise levels
11	at a property line is irrelevant to ensuring
12	public health and safety. Section 901.109
13	should be amended by replacing all references
14	to, quote, "receiving class A or B land,"
15	unquote, with quote, "protected structures,"
16	unquote, and then amended by referring
17	specifically to the way protective structures
18	are regulated by DNR in relation to coal mining
19	and aggregate mining.
20	My pre-filed testimony contained language,
21	but as my expert, Mr. Hafliger, points out,
22	this language is taken just from the aggregate
23	program. And the coal mining industry, their
24	protected structures are articulated
25	differently. So I would ask that the

1	Board if the Board is going to be planning
2	to regulate mine industry and the coal mining
3	industry, that it focuses on protected
4	structures, and then regulate those structures
5	that are protected under the respective
6	aggregate and coal mining regulations.
7	Third, and frankly, even though it
8	may it's a very subtle point, but even most
9	importantly, in this context, new Part 910
10	35 Illinois Code 910, purports to establish
11	measurement procedures for the enforcement of
12	35 Illinois Code 900 and 901, procedures that
13	would include monitoring to enforce the limits
14	specified in 901.109. However, none of the
15	methods described in Part 910 will monitor
16	highly impulsive sound from blasting.
17	In essence, Part 910 must flatly state
18	that monitoring undertaken to ensure compliance
19	with Section 901.109 requires the use of a
20	blasting seismograph with a low frequency
21	response of 2.0 Hertz, and that this machinery
22	be used in conformance with manufacturer's
23	specifications and industry standards. Highly
24	impulsive sound from blasting can only be
25	accurately monitored by using this type of flat

1	response, sound pressure level microphone and
2	recording device. In the absence of the use of
3	such a device, any Board measurement procedures
4	purporting to show compliance or noncompliance
5	with the performance standards established by
6	Section 901.109 are totally meaningless.
7	The gentleman to my right with Evenson
8	Explosives will outline in detail the technical
9	problems that are inherent in the Board's
10	standards in 901 and 109. And more
11	importantly, he'll outline why the part 910
12	regulations are so woefully deficient.
13	At this time, I've concluded my testimony,
14	but I'd be glad to answer questions.
15	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Let's go ahead
16	with Mr. Pierce, and we'll have questions of
17	the panel, if that's okay.
18	MR. HENRIKSON: I would like the gentleman
19	from IDNR to speak next, if I may.
20	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: That's fine.
21	MR. HENRIKSON: Because I talked about the
22	IDNR program. He'll help put it in
23	perspective, and Willard can go last. And his
24	testimony is kind of based upon Jim's
25	testimony.

1	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right.
2	That's fine. We'll do that then.
3	MR. HAFLIGER: Okay. Thank you.
4	My name is Jim Hafliger. I work for the
5	Illinois Department of Natural Resources Office
6	of Mines and Minerals, Mine Safety and Training
7	Division. My work title is Chief Division
8	Technical Explosive Specialist.
9	The information I'd like to share with you
10	today and respectfully submit for your
11	consideration, first of all, is basically a
12	program overview of what our responsibilities
13	are when we look through the rule-making
14	process that you're undertaking currently. We
15	would like to respectfully submit your
16	consideration on the voting areas of duplicity
17	in regards to our already existing program.
18	So to give you an overall summary of what
19	our program responsibilities are and how we're
20	structured here, I'd like to start out by
21	telling you that we have a staff of 12 members
22	that work out of three regional offices. We
23	have an office in Ottawa, Illinois, and we have
24	an office in Springfield, which is our main
25	administrative office, and we have an office in

2	Out of that number, out of that 12, we
3	have 8 inspectors that are dedicated full time
4	as a lead state agency, regulating the use of
5	commercial explosives in the State of Illinois.

Benton, Illinois.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Within the scope of our regulatory responsibilities that we're statutorily delegated to regulating explosive use, handling and storage at the State's 172 active surface mining operations. Within the scope of our program and what we do, our inspectors are in the field on a daily basis. And we have monitoring equipment that includes 35 seismographs that register and record for our analysis by our division experts the traces reflected as a result of air blast or air overpressure and ground vibrations at these operations.

One thing that we stress as part of our comprehensive program, the way we regulate this, first of all, is we do have a mature program in place. The State was initially delegated with authority to regulate explosive use in the mid 1930s. Subsequently in the 1980s, in the mid 1980s, we began our coal

1	regulatory blasting program. And then
2	subsequently in the mid '90s, we began
3	regulating blasting operations at the surface
4	aggregate operations.

Through the course of this and the inception of this program and development of our staff and their expertise, we've attained 35 seismographs that we use. And the nature of government today is -- provides an opportunity for us to reflect on the fiscal responsibilities that we have in maintaining this program. And for your knowledge, I respectfully submit that these 35 seismographs that we have for monitoring are valued at nearly one hundred thousand dollars for our monitoring equipment that our agent inspectors use statewide.

Our people are also trained. Our field inspectors are trained to go out and use this equipment and analyze this equipment. It's specifically designed for monitoring blasting at surface operations. We're trained in the use of this, and we're trained in the analysis of the data that we subsequently recover after these.

1	A point that I believe worth making is
2	that we regularly monitor these sites. We take
3	a proactive stance to making sure that the
4	operators are fulfilling their statutory
5	obligation of compliance. And for us to
6	determine non-compliance at this operation, we
7	do that by monitoring with the seismographs on
8	a regular basis, and not specifically in
9	response to a citizen's complaint. Our
10	regulatory philosophy is that we're proactive,
11	not reactive. We don't just specifically show
12	up after there's been an incident or an
13	accident involving property damage or personal
14	injury.
15	And as part of the proactive program that
16	we have, where we stress compliance through
17	education, we have an extremely comprehensive
18	training program, which is referred to by other
19	agencies as one of the most comprehensive
20	blasting regulatory programs in the United
21	States.
22	And part of our program that we have, when
23	I stress compliance through education, is that
24	people that are in the field that are actually
25	doing the blasting are trained by our agency

1	through a comprehensive training device and a
2	certification program that covers a multitude
3	of topics, that there are 22 specified within
4	the scope of our regulations, which have
5	already been submitted to you as part of my
6	summary of my testimony today. So you'll have
7	those for reference. So that's kind of an
8	overview of our program.

Our training, what we do, we have an outstanding safety record. The industry does. They've been cooperative in maintaining the safety record. We recently achieved a landmark safety achievement, which I had the opportunity to announce at a venue last week, the Illinois Mining Institute, where the aggregate and surface mining operations in Illinois recently completed a five-year period, during which time they had used an estimated 500 million pounds of explosives over a 5-year period without a reported injury from the use of explosives, which is admirable, to say the least.

So I'd like to address any questions that you may have specifically about our program.

And I encourage you to look at the regulations that I've submitted to you during the course of

1	your rule-making process. And if you have
2	any if there's I'd also like to offer,
3	you know, our expertise, any reference to our
4	program or any of our staff if you have any
5	additional questions about the equipment that
6	we utilize, what our existing program is, or
7	anything else you might have in reference to
8	that.
9	So with that, if you have any questions,
10	I'd be glad to address those.
11	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
12	And just a little bit of housekeeping. We
13	will admit as Exhibit Number 4, the Illinois
14	Department of Natural Resources Rules 62
15	Illinois Admin Code Part 300.
16	And as Exhibit Number 5, 62 Illinois Admin
17	Code, Sections 1816.61 through 1816.68. And
18	that's, as I said earlier, for ease of the
19	record.
20	(WHEREBY, EXHIBIT NUMBERS 4 and
21	5 WERE ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE.)
22	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you. And
23	I think we'll go ahead and continue, and we'll
24	ask questions from the panel.
25	MR. PIERCE: Thank you. Good afternoon.

1	I'm willard Pierce. I am the general manager
2	of Evenson Explosives. Our home office is
3	located in Morris, Illinois.
4	Our company manufactures and sells
5	explosives. And we provide blasting services
6	in four states. Again, our home base is in
7	Illinois, and that's where the majority of our
8	business is, but and it is mostly in the
9	aggregate industry.
10	Previously I was a technical specialist
11	with the DNR. A couple well, more than a
12	year ago, I was with them and had Jim's job at
13	that time. But I helped establish and
14	implement the blasting regulatory program that
15	is now in place. Prior to that, I conducted
16	air blast ground vibration research with the
17	U.S. Bureau of Mines. And the U.S. Bureau of
18	Mines has done blasting research as it relates
19	to air blasting ground vibrations since the
20	1940s.
21	All of the regulatory programs across the
22	country that I have seen or heard of or have
23	been involved with because when I was with
24	the Bureau of Mines, I traveled all over the
25	country in one form or another uses the

1	Bureau	of	Mines	re	ecommendations	for	limits	to
2	prevent	da	amage	to	structures.			

Given my background and given the job that

I have now where we are blasting, again, mostly
at aggregate industry, I have a technical
interest in this subject. And I also have a
practical interest in what we have to do, day
to day, to control the adverse effects from our
activity.

The interest that I have is that the regulatory requirements are, one, consistent, and they need to be consistent not maybe with another regulation, but they have to be consistent with what technology tells us. And once we get that consistency, then the requirements in the regulations and the limits that are in the regulations can be implemented. If they're not consistent, you have the problem of one day doing one thing and another day doing another.

Our blasters, based upon the regulations here in Illinois, need two years of hands-on experience. They need to take a training -- a classroom training, classroom examination, and then they're licensed blasters for the State.

1	For our company, they have to have another two
2	years at least of hands-on working with
3	experienced lead blasters before we turn them
4	loose as a blaster.
5	Part of that training, part of that
6	requirement as a blaster is someone using
7	explosives in this state or in any state,
8	because of the liabilities involved, go well
9	beyond what any regulations are, and we want to
10	control the adverse effects. We want to know
11	how do you design that blast to control air
12	blast.
13	My testimony or outline of my testimony
14	that I previously submitted I'm not going to
15	read it, but I want to hit the highlights of it
16	as I go through this.
17	When I look at first the first thing
18	that I mentioned is there's two different
19	limits of the C-weighted and the flat measuring
20	systems that you list in 901.109. And they are
21	two different numbers. If you look at the
22	Bureau of Mines' work, because the Bureau of
23	Mines say that 133 dB is equivalent to 105 dB.
24	So there we have a discrepancy between two
25	different numbers.

The other thing that I would suggest is 1 that once you have a number that is 3 appropriate, whatever number that is, whatever you want to base that on -- and I don't know, based on the science -- but whatever you want 5 6 to base that number on, that should be the number. It shouldn't change with the time of 7 day. It shouldn't change with the number of 8 9 occurrences in a day. And that brings me to the technical part 10 11 of air blast versus noise or sound. Even though we can somewhat interchange those terms, 12 13 they're not. Air blast is a very specific type of sound, if I can say it like that. And the 14 majority of the energy from air blast is very 15 low frequency. You don't even hear it. You 16 17 know, people that live next to a blast say, "Well, I hear that blast every day." Well, 18 yes, but what you hear is the other effects of 19 20 blasting. You may hear some of the surface 21 delays. You may hear some of the venting, but 22 the majority of energy from blasting is that 2 to 3 hertz. You cannot hear that. You can 23 24 feel it on your chest if it's high enough, just

like a band going by with a base drum, but you

1	really don't hear it. The noise that you hear
2	is actually a very low level part of the air
3	blast. And as you look at air blast records or
4	seismograph records, you can pick this out, and
5	it's very easy to see.
6	The industry that the blasting industry
7	recognized the importance of consistency within
8	not only regulations, but basing regulations or
9	research and bringing the measurement
10	instruments into this standard.
11	And about 12 years ago, the International
12	Society of Explosive Engineers, the industry
13	professional society, brought all the
14	manufacturers of blasting seismographs to the
15	same table to look at the standards so that all
16	the machines are standardized because there
17	were no standards. The standard was,
18	regulatory standard, was plus or minus 3 dB.
19	That's plus or minus 50 percent. That's a
20	huge, wide range. That was a deficiency.
21	So the industry brought all the
22	manufacturers together at the same table, and
23	they came up with standards for monitoring air
24	blast from blasting. That's the only thing
25	they looked at with a blasting seismograph,

because it measures ground vibration, and it

2	has a microphone to measure air.
3	Within that standard, it was eventually
4	it was published about 1999, and that is the
5	standard that everybody refers to now. And
6	part of that standard was the monitoring
7	procedures.
8	And when I read through Part 910, where it
9	talks about that's I'm reading the
10	procedures for monitoring sound, not for
11	monitoring air blast. And that's the
12	deficiency that I see.
13	Because there's even parts in several
14	places in there, where you have a switch on a
15	monitoring instrument to turn it off for a
16	transient noise, for short-term transient
17	noises. By definition, air blast is a
18	short-term transient noise. It lasts about
19	three seconds. It's not the same frequency.
20	So it's not a steady state. It's a transient.
21	So by definition, the monitoring
22	procedures suggest even turn the machine off
23	during air blast. And I would I find that
24	confusing. Let me put it that way.
25	And what I would suggest is that if you're

Τ.	going if the Board Chooses through rule
2	making to monitor air blast from blasting, that
3	you use a blasting seismograph that is
4	specifically designed to monitor that type
5	of I'm going to say the word "noise," even
6	though that it's not noise. It's a change in
7	pressure is what it is.
8	But from a technical standpoint, and
9	looking at what the industry has been using for
10	the last 20 some years as a standard, based
11	upon what the Bureau of Mines has done for
12	decades in their research, Part 910 does not
13	address how to monitor properly air blast from
14	blasting.
15	With that said, if we have a method that's
16	not consistent or that doesn't measure it, why
17	should we even I know I'm not supposed to
18	ask questions, but why should we even be
19	monitoring if we're going to turn the machine
20	off, bearing that in part of the blast?
21	I guess the main thing I want to say is
22	that the blasting industry has a standard for
23	air blast, and it has a standard for
24	monitoring. And it's been in place in coal
25	mining for many years. And in the aggregate

1	industry, it's newer, but it's been in place
2	for many years. And it's based upon a science,
3	and the science says that 133 dB at a house, it
4	will protect that house. And if we're going to
5	have a standard, it needs to comply or be
6	consistent with what other regulatory schemes
7	have, unless we got a new body of research to
8	prove otherwise, and I don't know that we have
9	that.
10	I guess my five recommendations that I
11	have and I will repeat these is that both
12	the C-weighted and flat response microphones
13	reflect the same number, not two different
14	numbers.
15	I would suggest that the limit for air
16	blast, which a lot of times you can't even
17	hear, applies at a structure of some kind,
18	rather than to a person. And then with that,
19	you'll have to define what structures you want
20	that to apply at.
21	Let me say one thing about having it at a
22	specific location like a structure. The
23	importance of that is, if I read your proposed
24	regulation right, it's at the property line.
25	That may not be the best place to monitor air

1	blast because of the geometry from the source
2	to the receiver. Actually, sometimes closer to
3	the mine is not a good place to monitor air
4	blast. Sometimes it's further away. The
5	consistent thing is the structure is always
6	going to be there. So that's the place to
7	monitor.
8	The third thing I have is to limit
9	blasting from sunrise to sunset except for
10	emergency situations. 7:00 to 10:00, those
11	numbers, you know, based upon the time of year,
12	they may or may not be a good number. Who's
13	going to shoot at 10:00 o'clock when it's been
14	dark since 5:00 o'clock? And yet at the same
15	time, during the busy time of year, we may have
16	to blast before 7:00 o'clock.
17	And then following up from that, do not
18	lower the limit for the time of day, because,
19	again, if we're establishing a limit, it should
20	be one number regardless of the time of day or
21	number of events that day.
22	And most importantly, we have to require
23	monitoring procedures and equipment that are
24	appropriate to blasting.

Basically, my interest as a company that

1	does blasting, if I'm already spending an awful
2	lot of money monitoring from one agency, if I
3	have to do another one, I will, but that
4	may from what I read what's proposed right
5	now, I'm going to have to get a different type
6	of equipment, train in a different type of area
7	for monitoring and monitor at a different
8	location. Those are all costs.
9	With that, I'll answer any questions you
10	have.
11	I would like to say as a user of
12	explosives and as a blasting company, we want
13	to limit our blasting so we don't affect the
14	neighbors, but we want to have limits that are
15	consistent with a regulatory scheme and the
16	technology that we know exists to control air
17	blast from blasting.
18	Thank you very much.
19	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Thank you.
20	Mr. Henriksen, before we go to questions,
21	is there any would you like to have your
22	summaries admitted as exhibits on the off
23	chance that there's something in the summary
24	that perhaps you didn't hit on in the testimony
25	here? We can do that as well if you would like

1	to.
2	MR. HENRIKSON: I just would rather stand
3	on what my testimony was because I made some
4	changes in the summary and expanded it. And
5	also I was corrected by my experts on some of
6	this, on the regulatory change that I was
7	interested in making. So
8	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right.
9	We'll just stand with your oral testimony.
10	What about with Mr. Pierce (sic)?
11	MR. HAFLIGER: I'd like our general
12	summary left as is, which is what you have,
13	what we've submitted to you. I feel that
14	there's probably information, and there's
15	program specific information that could be
16	utilized for your reference at some point.
17	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: All right. We
18	will admit the IDNR summary; is that correct?
19	We'll admit that as Exhibit Number 6.
20	(WHEREBY, EXHIBIT NUMBER 6 WAS
21	ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE.)
22	HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And, Mr. Pierce
23	what about you?
24	MR. PIERCE: I'd like both, the summary
25	and my oral testimony.

1

24

25

HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Then we'll admit

```
Mr. Pierce's summary as Exhibit Number 7.
 3
                          (WHEREBY, EXHIBIT NUMBER 7 WAS
                          ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE.)
                HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Yes. DNR has
 5
 6
           the attachment. That is, we've already
           admitted that as Exhibit 4 and 5. Great.
 7
           Thank you.
 8
 9
                And I think we're ready for questions.
      BY BOARD MEMBER RAO:
10
11
           Q
                Mr. Henriksen, I had a few questions based
      on your summary of your testimony that you
12
13
      pre-filed. Apparently, you changed some of the
14
      things. And just to clarify, in your pre-filed
15
      summary, you suggested some changes to Section
16
      901.107 (h), Subsection (h). In your earlier, you
17
      know, pre-filed summary, you had asked us to make
      sure that mining activities should be gone by
18
      901.109. Now you are recommending that we just
19
20
      leave the regulation of mining industry to the DNR,
21
      not 901.109. Is that --
22
                (By Mr. Henrikson) As I testified when I
23
      turned my summary in, as I've gone over it, I
```

realized that I hadn't struck through some of the

language that I wanted to strike through to indicate

```
1 that it should be excised. So during my oral
```

- testimony, which I'll rest on, I had that 901, this
- 3 Subsection (h), this exemption to state Part 901 --
- 4 Q The whole part?
- 5 A -- shall not apply to impulsive sound,
- 6 impulsive sound produced by explosive blasting
- 7 activity conducted on a Class C land use as
- 8 specified by -- used as specified by LBCS Code 8300,
- 9 8500.
- Now, that's not to say that the IEPA
- 11 shouldn't regulate sounds generated from, you know,
- 12 crushing equipment, backup alarms on equipment.
- 13 There are -- there is sound that -- there are steady
- 14 state noises that are a function of a mining
- operation that, you know, need to be regulated. We
- 16 understand that. And I may misuse a word or two.
- 17 I'm not a technical person. There are constant
- 18 noises, you know, like equipment operator, sound of
- 19 processing equipment operating.
- 20 And the IEPA has the authority to
- 21 regulate under Section 24, but we're suggesting is
- 22 that under Section 25, your rule-making powers, you
- 23 should defer to IDNR to regulate whatever noise is
- 24 produced by -- the impulsive sound produced by
- 25 explosive blasting, all right?

```
1 And if we heard -- what Mr. Willard
```

- was saying and what Jim was saying, we're talking
- 3 about a sound that lasts three seconds. Now, just
- 4 to put that in context; people have the idea that
- 5 you're constantly blasting at quarries, and we're
- 6 talking about stone quarries versus sand gravel
- 7 pits. Sand gravel pits, there's no blasting because
- 8 of the nature of the material. You scoop it up.
- 9 Stone quarries, you have to actually blast for
- 10 materials.
- It's rare that a company blasts more
- 12 than one time a day. And that blast would
- 13 last -- the part you could hear -- and, again, I
- 14 have an expert here, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Hafliger,
- both, if I misused words, they'll be quick to
- 16 correct me. But what you can hear is for three
- 17 seconds, all right? That's what we're talking
- 18 about. As opposed to backup alarms that might be
- 19 going on 8, 10, 12 hours a day if the conditions are
- 20 good, all right? So that's a busy operation that's
- 21 doing production shots every day. That's what --
- 22 BY BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON:
- 23 Q If the rule was amended to changed to
- 24 reflect that request that -- or that suggestion that
- 25 we exempt that particular activity from the noise

```
1 rules, then all the other suggestions are irrelevant
```

- 2 at that time? We need to ask you questions about
- 3 them, right?
- 4 A That's correct. That's correct.
- 5 Q That's what you think the most appropriate
- 6 thing for us to do is, is to list those particular
- 7 activities as exempt from the rule?
- 8 A Yes, just the impulsive -- the impulsive
- 9 sound produced by explosive blasting activities.
- 10 That three seconds a day, to have DNR regulate, as
- 11 they've been doing very successfully over a number
- 12 of years. The rest of the noise that comes from our
- 13 business and quarries, you know, DNR is going
- 14 to -- EPA is going to regulate it as noise under
- 15 Section 24. And we tried monitoring devices, which
- 16 produce nuisance problems out there. That's a whole
- 17 different concept and spectrum of activities than
- 18 what these -- than what we're talking about.
- 19 Q Is it common that the day begins -- if the
- 20 sun rises at 5:30, is it common then at 5:35, that's
- 21 when that -- because you're -- some testimony was
- 22 with respect to changing -- if we get past that,
- your first suggestion to change the hours, the
- 24 regulatory hours, and include making them daylight
- 25 to sunrise to sunset, rather than the specific hours

1

25

we've listed here, is it often then that the day

```
begins with the blast and the rest of the day's
 3
      activity?
                MR. HENRIKSON: I'll defer to Mr. --
 5
                MR. PIERCE: Very commonly what happens
 6
           is, when we do a service, a contractual service
 7
           for a quarry, we'll show up right about
           daybreak or sunrise. We'll load the shot, and
 8
           maybe 4 or 5 hours later, the first shot will
 9
           go off or the shot will go off. There are
10
11
           times, however, based upon production needs or
           especially this time of year when
12
13
           everybody's -- you know, the demands are there
14
           and busy, we'll get there earlier, load the
           shot. And we'll shoot by 7:00 o'clock, yes,
15
           but that is rare. That is not -- we're not
16
17
           sitting there waiting for the sun to come up,
18
           no.
                Another situation where that may come into
19
20
           play -- and this is even more rare -- is if
21
           whatever reason we had to defer a shot from the
           day before; equipment breakdown, a lightning
22
23
           storm came through. Whatever the reason is,
24
           the shot, we didn't shoot. So it's sitting
```

there now. Somebody is going to be guarding it

```
overnight. The sooner we can shoot that, the
```

- 2 better.
- 3 BY BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON:
- 4 O Right.
- 5 A (By Mr. Pierce) Just because it's been a
- 6 long night, maybe sitting. Let's get it off. But
- 7 that is a very rare -- now, it's not, "It's 5:30.
- 8 Let's pull the trigger." It's typically mid morning
- 9 is the first blasting activity.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER RAO: Just following up on
- 11 Mr. Thomas' (sic) question.
- 12 BY BOARD MEMBER RAO:
- 13 Q If we go the other route of not exempting,
- 14 and, say, try to make these rules consistent with
- the IDNR rules, would it be better if we
- 16 cross-referenced to IDNR regulations in our rules to
- 17 save any constant monitoring procedure? Say these
- 18 are the requirements? The requirements are
- 19 specified in, you know, the rules that's been
- 20 submitted by IDNR? You know, a specific reference
- 21 in our rules? That way there is no confusion what
- 22 procedures you follow, how you monitor or what
- 23 equipment you use.
- 24 A (By Mr. Henriksen) If you're addressing
- 25 that to me, I'm saying if you all elect to regulate

- 1 impulsive sound produced by explosive blasting at
- these mines, you should incorporate them by
- 3 reference. You should directly refer to them every
- 4 bit of what they require, so that something is not
- 5 left out or things aren't added to it that are
- 6 improper.
- 7 But the key thing is, that this
- 8 activity be monitored for compliance or lack of
- 9 compliance the same way IDNR does it, because
- 10 this -- and, again, this was not a haphazard
- 11 process.
- 12 I mean, our industry -- just to back
- 13 up. I work for DNR. I work for mines and minerals.
- 14 I helped put together the blasting program as an
- 15 attorney for mines. And I had to work through all
- of this to make sure that we put together a program
- 17 that comported with what industry nationwide says
- 18 are best practices. So if you're going to corporate
- 19 those rules, corporate them all. And most
- 20 importantly, or as important as any of this stuff,
- 21 be sure you incorporate how this stuff is measured.
- 22 Be sure that it's required that anybody who claims
- 23 that we have -- we violated the Board's rules from
- 24 blasting has -- prove that up by using a seismograph
- 25 used precisely the way that Jim Hafliger or Willard

- 1 Pierce would, would use it precisely. It's
- 2 critical.
- 3 BY HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD:
- 4 Q I am familiar with IDNR's program. What
- 5 are the consequences for a producer if they fail to
- 6 meet the --
- 7 A (By Mr. Hafliger) The punitive damage is
- 8 that we consider culpability and a whole host of
- 9 other things -- responsibility and the scope and the
- 10 nature of violation and the magnitude of violation.
- 11 It can go up to suspension or revocation of their
- 12 actual blasting operations with what they do out
- 13 there.
- 14 Q And how do you enforce that? Is that
- through circuit court or the attorney general's
- office? Is that a matter of your own rules?
- 17 A That's through our rule making and hearing
- 18 process, okay?
- 19 And if I can, while I'm adding this
- in, regarding to Mr. Johnson's question earlier
- 21 about blasting during daylight; I think it should be
- 22 added and I probably should have mentioned that
- 23 earlier, but it's part of our inspection process
- that we make to aggregate and surface coal
- operations, they have obligatory records that they

```
1 have to keep for us that incorporate every minor
```

- 2 detail about every element of the blast. There's 17
- 3 different areas or criterion that they have to
- 4 include on the blasting records, including the time
- of day of the blast. In some cases, in coal and
- 6 aggregate industry, there's some minor variation,
- but up to and including wind direction, temperature,
- 8 time of day, person involved with the blast, the
- 9 name and the certificate or license number of the
- 10 person doing the blast. The pounds of explosive per
- 11 eight millisecond delay. When we talk about these
- 12 small duration blasts, it's actually how many pounds
- 13 are going off at this time.
- 14 Within the scope of all this, that's
- 15 how we determine whether or not, A, as an
- operator -- when I talk about us monitoring with our
- 17 35 seismographs, the majority of the operators also
- 18 have their own. And if they meet certain criteria
- 19 within the scope of our regulations in addition to
- 20 being monitored by us, they're also monitored by
- 21 them.
- 22 So when I said earlier that we have
- 23 35 seismographs, the 172 operations, that doesn't
- 24 mean that they're not being monitored. The majority
- of the operations out there, out of the 172, are

```
1 monitoring their selves. Their blasting records
```

- 2 have to be -- their seismograph records for our
- analysis, as explosive experts, have to be available
- 4 to us at the time of our inspections, which are very
- 5 regular.
- 6 So within the scope of what we're
- 7 seeing, if you have any questions about how do you
- 8 know if they're blasting at daylight or not, part of
- 9 their regular statutorily required records include
- 10 all that information for our reference, what we take
- into consideration for any punitive or enforcement
- 12 action that we're taking as the operation or the
- 13 specific blaster in charge or both.
- 14 HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Mr. Pierce?
- MR. PIERCE: Could I also address your
- 16 question about the violation and what's
- 17 involved?
- There is a formula, and it's based on
- 19 different criteria of what dollar value comes
- 20 to the company, and up to and including on that
- is a certain abatement action, what they have
- 22 to do to correct that action. But it could go
- all the way up to a cessation of the operation,
- and specifically the blasting operation.
- 25 In addition to that, Illinois DNR has a

```
notice of infraction to the individual. So the
 1
           mining company may get the violation and a
 3
           dollar value assessed to it. The actual
           blaster, who may be one of my employees, could
           lose his blasting license or could get
 5
 6
           suspended or could have to take more training,
           or whatever the abatement action is for that
 7
           individual.
 8
 9
                So the State holds both the company and
           the individual responsible. And it's a very
10
           serious matter. And I've been involved on both
11
           sides of this discussion now. And I think all
12
13
           parties take it very seriously because
14
           it's -- you know, we hold a person responsible,
           which is very meaningful, very meaningful.
15
      BY BOARD MEMBER RAO:
16
17
                Does your program also have any mechanism
      for nearby residents to come and complain to you?
18
                (By Mr. Hafliger) We have implemented a
19
20
      program over the past 10 years what we consider also
21
      to be very comprehensive where we've established an
22
      800 number for the ease of the people. We encourage
      them to call us.
23
24
                     What we find is the blasting is
```

inherently specialized in nature. Much of the

```
1 general public's perception from blasting comes from
```

- 2 Hollywood. And I also have the opportunity to teach
- 3 the classes for these blasters and explosive users
- 4 and law enforcement and anybody that used any kind
- 5 of commercial explosives.
- 6 And quite realistically, an effective
- 7 blasting at a quarry coal mine is very undramatic in
- 8 nature. What we might see on Hollywood, Hollywood's
- 9 portrayal of explosive use are giant fireballs, just
- 10 to make it a little more interesting and dynamic as
- 11 part of that.
- 12 But the practicality of explosive use
- in the aggregate and coal industry, that anything
- 14 that you see, feel or hear as a result of the blast
- is inefficient because it's lost energy. And the
- 16 economics dictate that you're utilizing every bit of
- 17 energy possible of your explosive. The fireballs,
- 18 the flashes of light and everything that you see on
- 19 television, which are created by adding special
- 20 effects, pyrotechnics, to make it more interesting
- 21 for the folks watching at home are not an accurate
- 22 portrayal by any means of the surface aggregate and
- 23 coal blasting.
- 24 Does that address your --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER RAO: Yeah.

- 1 BY BOARD MEMBER GIRARD:
- 2 Q Jim, how many complaints do you get in a
- 3 typical year?
- 4 A (By Mr. Hafliger) Probably this year, we
- 5 probably have to date, we've had less than a
- 6 hundred. At the beginning of our program, until the
- 7 word got out and they knew who to talk to, that they
- 8 knew not necessarily a liaison, but they had a go-to
- 9 person. We probably started out with initial
- 10 implementation of our program in the aggregate
- industry in the beginning '90s where it was several
- 12 hundred a year.
- 13 We've got kind of an informal number
- 14 that we use, which is an approximation, but we found
- 15 since recordkeeping within our program, that we find
- that about 90 percent of the citizens' complaints
- 17 are addressed simply by them talking to a
- 18 representative of our staff who subsequently
- 19 explains the nature of blasting and what goes along
- 20 with it.
- 21 We find about another 5 percent, it
- 22 takes one of our staff members going out to their
- 23 residence, where they have the concerns, and meeting
- 24 with them, looking at some specifics, the structure
- 25 in relationship -- the geographical location of the

```
1 structure in regards to mining operation.
```

- 2 And then we find about there's
- 3 another 3 percent that probably takes us installing
- 4 a seismograph there to put their mind at ease that
- 5 they can see that what we've described to them and
- 6 what our regulatory parameters are. We give them
- 7 the numbers. We explain the science to them the
- 8 best we can, and explain to them the numbers that
- 9 we're seeing. Whether there is or is not an issue
- of noncompliance or the potential for structure
- 11 damage, or even in some cases, personal injury at
- 12 the nearest protected structure.
- 13 That leaves 2 percent unaccounted
- 14 for. And our best estimate is that there's 2
- 15 percent regardless of what we're going to do. We're
- 16 not going to appease their concerns.
- 17 But, yes, we do address that. That's
- 18 what we see as far as complaints. And those numbers
- 19 are down dramatically. We have interaction to get
- out there, and implement and utilize our outreach
- 21 programs that we have.
- 22 Q Are those complaints more concerned with
- 23 noise or ground vibration or other effects?
- 24 A Just in general, a lot of times it's a
- 25 nuisance of the whole -- maybe the whole mining

- 1 operation in general.
- 2 Maybe they have concerns, as
- 3 Mr. Henriksen stated earlier, where they talk about
- 4 the blasting. They talk about the backup alarms or
- 5 the dust or whatever. And, specifically, it's
- 6 probably the ground vibration.
- 7 If they're calling, describing to us
- 8 in laymen's terms that what they tell us is they're
- 9 shaking the ground out here, and they are giving us
- 10 things to have concern about, and that's where
- 11 we -- if we haven't already been out there in their
- 12 neighborhood somewhere, that's where we get in the
- 13 system and meet with people in a group, citizens
- 14 groups and a whole host of different venues, that we
- do to try to address this not just for the sake
- of -- you know, I don't want to be perceived as
- 17 specifically industry friendly, but it's, you know,
- 18 our obligation is to protect the general public from
- 19 property damage, and more specifically, personal
- 20 injury out there at the location. That's -- really
- 21 we've been delegated as regulators.
- 22 BY BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON:
- 23 Q Just so I've got it right, and I think
- 24 it's in your pre-filed testimony, but the wording
- 25 that you would suggest is that highly impulsive

- 1 sound from blasting operations at mines? That's
- what -- is that right?
- 3 A (By Mr. Henrikson) Yeah. I used the
- 4 Class C land use as specified by LBCS, Codes 8300
- 5 and 8500. I think you guys are upgrading your
- 6 classification system. So I tracked the numbers
- 7 that I think refer to surface coal mining and
- 8 quarrying.
- 9 Q And you said specifically that we don't
- 10 want you to exempt mining operations from noise
- 11 pollution cases based upon trucks coming in and out
- of the quarry or grinding of the gravel. Maybe you
- want us to, but you're saying that that's not
- 14 what -- that's not what you're suggesting in your
- 15 pre-filed testimony.
- 16 A What I'm saying is that -- that's correct.
- 17 That's correct. I think -- I mean, IEPA, Pollution
- 18 Control Board has certain obligations set out by the
- 19 Illinois General Assembly in Section 24. We
- 20 understand that. And our operations try moderately
- 21 to be good neighbors to keep the noise down.
- What we're looking for, what we're
- 23 suggesting is that, that the 901.109, relating to
- 24 blasting activities, exempt us out. Now, there are
- 25 blasting other than coal mines. Aggregate mines and

- 1 maybe construction. Or a farmer blowing up a tree
- 2 stump. Whatever. Regulate away. I mean, nobody
- 3 regulates -- you know, there's certain areas that
- 4 they've all been blasting that aren't, I believe,
- 5 regulated by the state. So regulate away.
- 6 But we're suggesting that your rules
- 7 be amended to -- an exemption to make it clear that
- 8 the Part 901 standards don't apply to impulsive
- 9 sound produced by explosive blasting activities
- 10 conducted at a Class C land used as specified by
- 11 LBCS Codes 8300 and 8500, period.
- 12 BY BOARD MEMBER GIRARD:
- 13 Q John, have you considered approaching the
- 14 General Assembly and getting a specific statutory
- 15 exemption written into the Environmental Protection
- 16 Act?
- 17 A (By Mr. Henrikson) No. And by that I
- 18 mean, I believe that you have enough flexibility in
- 19 your regulatory scheme if there's good reason, good
- 20 cause shown to do that. I mean, these rules -- I've
- 21 read them again. But there's different standards
- 22 set for different -- there are wholesale exemptions
- 23 for certain economic activities. Farm equipment. I
- 24 mean, you know, and I understand why. But being in
- 25 a mineral extraction industry, I understand why we

- 1 have to do things farmers don't do.
- With that being said, I think it's
- 3 important -- I'm not -- we're not saying and have
- 4 never said that our blasting activities shouldn't be
- 5 regulated. We're not saying that. We're saying
- 6 that our blasting activities already are heavily
- 7 regulated by the State of Illinois.
- 8 Those blasting -- and that regulatory
- 9 program has worked very well. We're getting less
- 10 complaints of our operations because of the work
- 11 they're doing. The professionalism of our blasters,
- that function of the program Willard set up and Jim
- 13 administers, the professionalism makes our --
- 14 frankly, our blasters that come out of our state the
- 15 best in this nation. That's improved the quality of
- 16 work that we do. That's improved the quality of
- 17 blasting and production that we do. That's also
- 18 reduced the number of violations.
- When this program first was
- 20 implemented, I was then working for the association.
- I can assure you there were a number of violations
- 22 that the State wrote to my members, and by and
- large, they were good violations. And it took some
- 24 training. It took some -- we went through some
- 25 teething problems, some education of our folks to

```
1 figure out what to do, how to figure out the
```

- 2 paperwork, how to do the things right.
- 3 And now we have an excellent track
- 4 record with the State. We don't get many violations
- 5 from DNR because our folks are doing the right
- 6 thing. And it's no coincidence that the complaints
- 7 that we have to contend with has, in our industry,
- 8 go down every year. And we're frankly proud of that
- 9 record. Because the complaint of the system
- 10 means -- a complaint of the system means that a shot
- 11 hasn't been set up right, and we're wasting money.
- Because if a shot is not efficient, that energy, as
- 13 these gentlemen have said, has escaped out of the
- 14 hole, and that energy has been used to push the
- 15 rock. That's money. That's a lot of cost.
- MR. PIERCE: If I can add to that.
- 17 Everything Mr. Henriksen just said is in
- 18 addition to the fact that there is more
- monitoring being done today than there's ever
- 20 been done yesterday. Just because the cost of
- 21 technology has gone down, just like any other
- 22 computer system. And we are monitoring -- the
- 23 industry is monitoring more today than they
- ever have.
- There are shots that we, as a company, put

1

22

23

24

25

off that may have five monitors set up. Just

```
because if you have a blast here and you have
 3
          houses on all four sides, we want to know, not
           just when we get a violation. We want to know
           that we're keeping our numbers down. And
 5
 6
           because you can't hear it, you don't have a
           feel for it. You have to monitor. So the
 7
           monitoring is being done. It's being done.
 8
 9
      BY BOARD MEMBER RAO:
10
                Mr. Pierce, you recommended that the
11
      monitoring procedures that have been proposed under
      910 doesn't address explosive blasting the way it's
12
13
      being proposed right now, and you said you follow
14
      certain procedures under DNR's regulations. Are
      those, you know, the monitoring procedures and the
15
      equipment used for, you know, to monitor blasting,
16
17
      does that apply only to blasting at mine sites? Or
      it may be generally applicable to any other
18
19
      explosive blasting?
20
                (By Mr. Pierce) It would apply to any
21
      type of blasting because the air blast or the energy
```

that you get from the atmosphere from any type of

frequency because air moves very slowly. It's going

to be low frequency. So those type of instruments

blasting is the same. It's going to be low

- 1 would apply to all types of blasting, yes.
- 2 Q So even if the Board decides to, you know,
- defer to DNR for, you know, blasting for mining
- 4 industry, it would make sense to amend our rules to
- 5 cover other, you know, non-exempted blasting
- 6 appropriate monitoring procedures?
- 7 A I would agree with you. And, again, my
- 8 experience and expertise is limited in sound, but
- 9 when I read through 910, I'm very familiar with
- 10 that's exactly what you're monitoring there is
- 11 sound.
- 12 And blasting, even construction
- 13 blasting that has the explosives closer to the
- 14 surface so there's more noise out of it, a higher
- level, it's still low frequency. It doesn't fit.
- 16 And it's still transient. It's still that couple of
- 17 seconds.
- 18 BY BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON:
- then? I mean, if you're saying it's not sound, but
- 21 it's pressure? Would a shot that you guys take on a
- 22 typical aggregate mine violate the rules the way
- they're written currently?
- 24 A (By Mr. Pierce) Potentially, yes, but
- 25 unnecessarily.

```
1 And let me give you a couple examples
```

- 2 with some numbers. I wish I had a chalkboard. I
- 3 love to draw pictures.
- 4 Anyway, for instance, if a lot of
- 5 mines are blasting near the perimeter of their
- 6 property -- I'm going to say, let's say, within
- 7 200 feet of their property line, where then you may
- 8 have a street. And, for instance, up in Chicago, we
- 9 may have an interstate, which is another hundred
- 10 feet or more to get across that. And then you may
- 11 have a property or a yard or a baseball field. And
- 12 so actually the structure where people are going to
- 13 be hanging out is literally a thousand feet away or
- 14 seven hundred feet away.
- 15 So with the monitoring up to the
- 16 property line at a hundred feet versus really where
- 17 we need to be monitoring, a thousand feet away, this
- is a huge difference in what you're getting off of
- 19 this.
- 20 And then the geometry of a blast. If
- 21 you're down in this hole, you know, down in the hole
- down here, and you're monitoring right on the edge
- 23 here, actually, there's a zone in there where you're
- 24 not going to get anything. And from noise or
- 25 pressure, it's going to come over that. So if

- 1 you're required to monitor here, the better place
- 2 may be back here, or vice versa. I mean, it goes
- 3 both ways.
- 4 But my point when I brought up the
- 5 location of the monitoring, especially that the
- 6 property line versus something that you're
- 7 protecting, this is constant. This is always going
- 8 to be here.
- 9 So no matter what the effect is
- 10 between the source and the receiver, this is going
- 11 to remain constant. And it's something you can
- 12 design for. As a blaster, if I know that I'm
- 13 shooting to this, to protect this, I can design for
- 14 that. I can redirect my blast in a different
- 15 direction through delays that we use. But if I know
- that today somebody is going to be monitoring here,
- 17 it's going to change everything. You know, change
- 18 the way I shoot that blast. And so it could go
- 19 either way, I guess, is what is my answer to your
- 20 question.
- 21 BY BOARD MEMBER RAO:
- ${\tt Q}$ What you said brings up another question I
- 23 had about, you know, the complaints, going from the
- 24 property line to a structure, you know, the
- 25 protected structure as Mr. Henriksen said in his

- 1 pre-filed testimony.
- 2 So when you start mining activities
- 3 if -- you know, I don't know how you do it. Maybe
- 4 you try to protect the structure which is nearest to
- 5 your blasting operation. You know, if that's the
- 6 case, you know, some time in the future, if somebody
- 7 decides to put some other structure closer, then
- 8 will you monitor to protect the --
- 9 A (By Mr. Pierce) The DNR regulations
- 10 require that, and that does happen. And it's a
- 11 constant thing of when, okay, now, they're building
- 12 this building. When is it protected? Is it the day
- 13 they do the foundation? Well, the foundation,
- 14 you're not really protecting it. It's when they get
- 15 the super structure on it.
- But, yes, we encounter that
- 17 especially in the Chicago area on a daily basis of
- 18 moving our instrument from site to site. Not only
- 19 because the structure may -- a new structure may
- 20 come in, but depending on where we are in the
- 21 quarry. We may have to set up a different
- 22 instrument or a different location today than what
- 23 we did yesterday. That's very common.
- 24 O Okay. I had one more question about this
- 25 monitoring equipment.

```
1 I think Mr. Henriksen earlier
```

- 2 testified that if at all the Board decides to
- 3 regulate your industry, that we should make sure we
- 4 write in the rules that the monitoring equipment,
- 5 you know, should be used according to the
- 6 manufacturer's specifications. Something to that
- 7 effect. And my question is, are there any, you
- 8 know, standards for blasting seismograph, just like
- 9 ANSI has a number of standards for monitoring sound,
- 10 and you know, instrumentation? Do you have
- 11 similar --
- 12 A The answer is absolutely "yes." And,
- 13 again, I refer to that, the International Society of
- 14 Explosive Engineers, which is a professional body of
- 15 blasters from all the manufacturers. I think to
- date, or today, there's about eight manufacturers of
- 17 blasting seismographs.
- They all sat at that table, and they
- 19 all came up with a standard, not only for their
- 20 instruments, but for maintaining the instruments,
- 21 for installing the instruments for analyzing the
- 22 data. And that was published, and it's in the
- 23 society's handbook of blasting. It's a whole
- 24 chapter in there on just seismograph and blasting
- 25 monitoring. And that is the industry standard right

- 1 now. And every state recognizes that.
- 2 One -- and if I could just talk about
- 3 that for a minute, because in 910, one of the
- 4 requirements is to have the microphone on 5-foot
- 5 stands, which is the way blasting seismographs were
- 6 20 years ago, because they were using a different
- 7 microphone at that time. Now, with the type of
- 8 microphones they're using, they literally can have
- 9 them at ground level because we're measuring the
- 10 pressure. Pressure doesn't change, and it doesn't
- 11 have the reflective surface. I think you're talking
- 12 25 feet? They say 5 feet. So it's a totally
- 13 different standard because it's a different thing
- that we're monitoring with a different type of
- 15 microphone.
- Another thing that's in 910 is not to
- 17 monitor if the wind is over 12 miles an hour. As a
- 18 blaster, if the wind is coming towards you, I have
- 19 to account for that if I have to monitor over there.
- 20 I have to take that into account. I have to take
- into account and control more of what overpressure
- 22 I'm going to cause. So in one sense, the blasting
- 23 requirements, the blasting seismograph requirements
- or standards are a little bit stricter, but they're
- 25 more appropriate.

1

22

23

24

25

Q

Okay. I'm sure we'll be able to find a

```
2
      copy of this standard on the Web site or some place,
 3
      but would it be possible for you to provide the
 4
      correct citation to the standard sometime in the
 5
      comments? Or if you have it right now.
 6
                I can give it to you right now. It is
      isee.org, and they will have it all on their Web
 7
 8
      site as the blaster's handbook. It's their
 9
      handbook.
                BOARD MEMBER RAO: Thank you very much.
10
                HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: Anything else?
11
           All right. Are there any questions from anyone
12
13
           else? Okay.
                MR. HENRIKSON: How long will the record
14
           be kept open?
15
                HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: That's where I'm
16
17
           going now.
                First of all, I want to thank all three of
18
           you for your testimony and the information
19
20
           you've given us today. It was very helpful at
21
           the last hearing. It's even been more helpful
```

at this hearing. We appreciate it.

We tried very hard to update our regs, and

it sounds like we're a little behind maybe on

blasting. IDNR, they've apparently updated

1	their regs much before we did. And we thank				
2	you very much for the information.				
3	The Board's procedural rules say that a				
4	hearing record shall be held open at least 14				
5	days after receipt of the transcript. Our				
6	transcripts are generally available within like				
7	10 days, 10 working days, I think it is, for a				
8	regular transcript. So I'm just going to go				
9	ahead and pick September 30th, which should				
10	give us plenty of time as a date to close the				
11	record in this proceeding.				
12	I will do also a written hearing officer				
13	order of that effect. But at this time, we				
14	will ask that all comments be submitted by				
15	September 30th.				
16	Dr. Girard, do you have anything else?				
17	BOARD MEMBER GIRARD: Just to say thank				
18	you for your time. You've been very helpful.				
19	And we look forward to getting the transcript				
20	and seeing again all the good information we've				
21	got in the record. And we'll come up with the				
22	best rule we can.				
23	MR. HENRIKSON: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER TIPSORD: And we thank you				
24	very much. And with that, I think we're adjourned. Thank you, gentlemen.				
25	[END OF HEARING.]				

Τ.	NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE						
2	T AND MARTE MOLIC - Contisted Charthard Reserve						
3	I, ANN MARIE HOLLO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Illinois, CSR# 084-003476, and a duly commissioned Notary Public within and for the State of						
4	Illinois, do hereby certify that the preceding matter came before me at the offices of the Illinois Environmental						
5	Protection Agency, Illinois Pollution Control Board Hearing Room, 1021 North Grand Avenue, Springfield, Illinois;						
6	That the said proceeding was reduced to writing, and						
7	this transcript is a true and correct record of the proceeding.						
8							
9	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal on September 9, 2005.						
10	My commission expires April 5, 2006.						
11							
12							
13	Notary Public						
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							