Tuscola, Illinois
Table of Comments

T1. Cabot Corporation (Burnes, Kennett) 13-171
T2. Tuscola Fire Department (Hettinger, Steve L.) 13-173
T3. GE Service 13-175
T4. Landeck, Judy 13-177
T5. Patterson, William 13-179
T6. Patterson, Marilyn Sue 13-182
T7. BRH Properties (Robinson, Chris) 13-185
T8. Property Management (Hardwick, C. T.) 13-187
T9. McDaniel, Curt 13-189
T10. Edmiston, Catherine 13-191
T11. U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Jones, Matthew) 13-196
T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren) 13-198
T13. Tuscola School System (Burgess, Joe) 13-203
T14. Illinois Department of Natural Resources – Illinois State Water Survey (Knapp, Vernon) 13-205
T15. Carle Foundation Hospital (Cook, David) 13-208
T16. Arrow Carle Ambulance, Air Life, Air Medical Transport and Carle Regional EMS Systems (Sapp, Larry) 13-210
T17. Carle Foundation Hospital (Guffey, Anita) 13-212
T18. Looby, William 13-214
T19. Environmental Law and Policy Center (Matchett, Barry) 13-216
T20. Tuscola Stone Company (Shoemaker, Alan) 13-218
T21. Cabot Corporation (Kleiss, Dan) 13-220
T22. Clinton, Reggie 13-222
T23. Tuscola Economic Development, Inc. (Moody, Brian) 13-224
T24. CSX Transportation (Livingston, Tom) 13-227
T25. Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George) 13-229
T26. Ambitec Engineering (Yoakum, James) 13-233
T27. Kennedy, John 13-235
T28. Hanner, Dennis 13-237
T29. Robertson, Ann 13-239
T30. Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin) 13-243
T31. Schumann, Robert 13-245
T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering) *(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)* 13-247

Commentor (Alphabetical)	Commentor #
Ambitec Engineering (Yoakum, James)	T26
Arrow Carle Ambulance, Air Life, Air Medical Transport and Carle Regional EMS Systems (Sapp, Larry)	T16
Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George)	T25
BRH Properties (Robinson, Chris)	T7

Commentor (Alphabetical)	Commentor #
Cabot Corporation (Burnes, Kennett)	T1
Cabot Corporation (Kleiss, Dan)	T21
Carle Foundation Hospital (Cook, David)	T15
Carle Foundation Hospital (Guffey, Anita)	T17
Clinton, Reggie	T22
CSX Transportation (Livingston, Tom)	T24
Edmiston, Catherine	T10
Environmental Law and Policy Center (Matchett, Barry)	T19
FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)	T32
GE Service	T3
Hanner, Dennis	T28
Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)	T12
Illinois Department of Natural Resources – Illinois State Water Survey (Knapp, Vernon)	T14
Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)	T30
Kennedy, John	T27
Landeck, Judy	T4
Looby, William	T18
McDaniel, Curt	T9
Patterson, Marilyn Sue	T6
Patterson, William	T5
Property Management (Hardwick, C. T.)	T8
Robertson, Ann	T29
Schumann, Robert	T31
Tuscola Economic Development, Inc. (Moody, Brian)	T23
Tuscola Fire Department (Hettinger, Steve L.)	T2
Tuscola School System (Burgess, Joe)	T13
Tuscola Stone Company (Shoemaker, Alan)	T20
U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Jones, Matthew)	T11

T1. Cabot Corporation (Burnes, Kennett)

CABOT

June 26, 2007

Mr. Mark McKoy
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy, National Technology Laboratory
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

Kennett F. Burnes
Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer

Dear Mr. McKoy:

Cabot Corporation is pleased to offer this letter of support for the City of Tuscola in its bid to attract the FutureGen Initiative to Eastern Illinois.

Cabot has been an active member of the Tuscola business community for more than 50 years. During that time, Tuscola has provided a business climate, quality-of-life, and community values that have greatly contributed to the successful operation of our manufacturing facility. Our business and our employees have been able to succeed and thrive in Tuscola.

#1

Tuscola also provides a well-developed infrastructure that allows convenient access to major cities via railways, highways and airports. The city's commitment to the development and maintenance of this infrastructure is essential for the transport of raw materials and machinery we require, and are necessary for the export of Cabot products worldwide. The city's well-maintained water and sewer systems, good schools, affordable housing, and parks and other recreational areas, contribute to a high standard of living for Cabot employees and their families. These and other amenities help Cabot to attract and retain the skilled labor force needed to maintain our competitive advantage.

If sited in Tuscola, The FutureGen Initiative can potentially provide an opportunity for the development of new electricity generation technology with positive environmental impacts that would benefit both residents and businesses. As one of the major employers in Tuscola area, Cabot looks forward to learning more about the FutureGen Initiative.

Sincerely,

Kennett F. Burnes
Chairman and CEO
Cabot Corporation

Cabot Corporation | Two Seaport Lane | Suite 1300 | Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2019
tel (617) 342 6200 | fax (617) 342 6209 | www.cabot-corp.com

T1. Cabot Corporation (Burnes, Kennett)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T2. Tuscola Fire Department (Hettinger, Steve L.)

From: Steve Hettinger [tfdchief@tuscola.org]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2007 5:43 PM
To: FutureGen.EIS@netl.doe.gov
Subject: Comments, FutureGen Project
Dear Mr. McKoy:

My name is Steve Hettinger and I am the Chief of the Tuscola Fire Department. During the past months that we have been a finalist for FutureGen, numerous citizens in the Tuscola area have approached me. They have questioned whether TFD is prepared to handle emergencies at FutureGen, if it should come to our city. Part of their concern is that during the inevitable emergency, the environment, which of course includes them, may be impacted if TFD cannot handle the emergency. My answer has been yes, we are prepared and comfortable with our ability to meet the challenges of emergency response to FutureGen.

For fifty years, the Tuscola Fire Department has partnered and collaborated with industry to handle their emergencies, and responded with them to emergencies in the area. Specifically, the industries to our west have been involved with processes not that different from FutureGen, and over the years, TFD has been successfully involved in mitigating many emergencies at those facilities. Additionally, those industries have offered training experience for TFD personnel at facilities like Texas A & M and Pueblo Colorado to insure that we are ready for their emergencies. Each year a number of TFD personnel take part in forty hours of training at these renowned training facilities, and many additional hours at the industrial facilities in Tuscola.

#1

There have been challenges, but I believe we have met them, and industry has always been there to support us in doing so. If you ask them, I am confident that they will agree. I have been with TFD for thirty years, and have been a part of the development of emergency response to industry and emergency response operations. My Assistant Chief, George Wineland was the Fire Brigade and Safety Officer at one of the facilities to our west for thirty-five years. I believe we are ready to meet the challenge.

Thank you,
Steve L. Hettinger
Fire Chief
Building/Electrical Inspector
City of Tuscola
214 N. Main
Tuscola, IL 61953
www.tuscola.org
Office Phone: 217-253-2112
Fax: 217-253-5026
Cell: 217-369-2511

T2. Tuscola Fire Department (Hettinger, Steve L.)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T3. GE Service

FutureGen Project
Public Hearing
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Tuscola, Illinois

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

Comment Form on Draft EIS
(Please print clearly)

Must be received on or before July 16, 2007.

#1 THIS PROJECT WOULD BE AN ASSET TO THE AREA- WE SUPPORT IT 100% -

I would like to receive a copy of:

FINAL FutureGen EIS ☒ **Hard Copy** OR ☐ **CD/Summary**

The Draft EIS is available via the internet at http://www.eh.doe.gov/nepa/.

Comment forms may be mailed to:

Mr. Mark L. McKoy
NEPA Document Manager
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880
Attn: FutureGen Project EIS

Comment forms may be faxed to:

Mr. Mark L. McKoy
(304) 285-4403 (Fax)

Or sent by electronic mail to:
FutureGen.EIS@netl.doe.gov

MAIL TO: G.E. SERVICE
P.O. BOX 306
URBANA, ILLINOIS 61803

June 2007

T3. GE Service

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T4. Landeck, Judy

Dear Mr. McCoy
Our Sesquicentennial Celebration is now over and we are all very proud of the event. I wish all of you could have been here. We are now officially 150 years old! Last night at City Council we topped the celebration with a proclamation by Mayor Kleiss and a wonderful cake.

I am one of the co-authors of "Tuscola Strolling Through the Past." I hope you have seen a copy. I autographed one for Otis. He is one great guy – as you all are for all of your efforts. Tuscola would be a great sight for FutureGen – in fact the best sight. I trust you have heard and know all the reasons! **#1**

Hope to hear from you soon.
Sincerely,

Judy Landeck

T4. Landeck, Judy

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T5. Patterson, William

FutureGen Project

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

#1

I LIVE ON THE N.W. CORNER OF THE TUSCOLA SITE. I STILL HAVE CONCERNS WITH COAL DUST AND NOISE, EXCESIVE TRAFFIC.

WE HEARD AT THE MEETING THAT THE CHEMICALS TO BE USED AT THE POWER PLANT WILL OR MAY CAUSE A LOW GROUND FOG. WILL IT CAUSE PITTING OR CORROSION ON METAL, AS DID CABOT & U.S.I. CHEMICALS. IN WHAT AMOUNTS WILL AMMONIA BE USED.
WHAT ARE THE CHANCES OF CRACKED FOUNDATIONS DUE TO VIBERATIONS FROM UNLOADING COAL

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS ☐ HARD COPY ☐ CD / SUMMARY

NAME WILLIAM A. PATTERSON ORGANIZATION

ADDRESS 751E CR 1050N CITY TUSCOLA STATE IL ZIP 61953

E-MAIL ADDRESS WILLIAM.PATTERSON@NETCARE-IL.COM

T5. Patterson, William

Response to Comment #1:

The EIS addresses the point of noise associated with coal unloading at the Tuscola Site in Section 5.14.3.2. Noise is anticipated to be generated from unloading/loading activities such as the movement of containers, placement of coal feedstock on conveyor systems, and surficial contact of rail containers with other metallic equipment. Based on the estimated number of coal deliveries to the proposed power plant site, DOE predicted an hourly Leq of 69 dBA from unloading/loading activities at the rail yard using noise prediction equations provided in Table 5-6 of FTA's Noise and Vibration Assessment guidance document. This estimate assumes that the coal unloading facility would not be enclosed in a building. DOE anticipated little or no increase in the noise level at the three closest residences (SL-1 [the Patterson residence], SL-2, and SL-3) along CR 1050N because the coal unloading/loading area would likely be located near the southern boundary of the proposed site, which is approximately 0.5 mile from the closest residential receptors.

DOE did not evaluate the impacts of intermittent noise and vibrations that may be generated by rail car shakers if they are used to loosen coal material from the walls of the rail cars during unloading activity. The noise and vibration associated with rail car shakers would be considered if they are included in the final design.

It is not known at this time if the coal unloading facility would be enclosed in a building or not. As noted above, the EIS analysis assumes that it would not be enclosed. The particulate matter (PM) emissions estimated for the emissions envelope include dust from material handling including coal dust. As stated in Sections 4.2.3.2; 5.2.3.2; 6.2.3.2; and 7.2.3.2, PM emissions from coal unloading and handling are not expected to appreciably change air quality because emissions would be reduced by minimizing points of transfer of the material, enclosing conveyors and loading areas, and installing control devices, such as baghouses and wetting systems. The FutureGen Project is in the early stages of design and, although the major features of the project are known, the engineering design plans for the coal handling operation (i.e., equipment specifications) are still in the development phase.

It is anticipated that project-related traffic during construction and normal plant operations would cause ambient noise levels to increase at sensitive receptors located near the assigned transportation routes. As noted on the EIS summary Table S-12, noticeable traffic noise impacts (a 3 dBA or more change in the ambient noise level) were predicted to occur at receptors located along the CR 750E (up to 14 dBA) and CR 1050N (up to 7 dBA) roadway segments leading to the proposed power plant site. Noise mitigation measures, including evenly distributing project-related trips throughout the day, or scheduling more deliveries on rail, could be considered to limit the number of project-related trips, particularly heavy trucks, passing by these residential receptors during construction and normal plant operations. However, these potential mitigation measures would not be decided upon until a site is selected and the design is finalized.

T5. Patterson, William

Response to Comment #1:

EIS Section 5.14.3.2 addresses the potential impacts of ground-borne vibrations from coal unloading activity on the closest cluster of receptors near proposed Tuscola power plant site. Based on FTA's vibration impact assessment screening methodology, it was concluded that no vibration impacts are anticipated because none are located within the 200-foot distance screening threshold. The closest residential receptor (SL-8) that could possibly be affected by ground-borne vibrations generated by project-related rail deliveries is approximately 320 feet from the CSX rail line, along the western side of the City of Tuscola.

The following has been added to EIS Sections 4.2.3.2; 5.2.3.2; 6.2.3.2; and 7.2.3.2 under the discussion of Local Plume Visibility as follows:

"Evaporated water would be pure water, although water droplets carried with the exhaust air (called drift) would have the same concentration of impurities as the water entering and circulating through the tower. Water treatment additives could contain anti-corrosion, anti-scaling, anti-fouling and biocidal additives which can create emissions of VOCs, particulate matter, and toxic compounds. The drift is not expected to cause excessive pitting or corrosion of metal on nearby structures or equipment due to the relatively small amount of water released and the presence of trace amounts of anti-corrosion additives. Similarly, the treatment additives are not expected to cause noticeable adverse impacts to local biota due to the very small amounts released."

"However, as a best management practice, the drift rate and associated deposition of solids could be reduced by employing baffle-like devices, called drift eliminators."

The estimated amounts of ammonia used by the project are discussed in Section 2.5.6.4 and in the Materials and Waste Management sections of the EIS: Section 4.16.3.2, Table 4.16-6; Section 5.16.3.2, Table 5.16-6; Section 6.16.3.2, Table 6.16-6; and Section 7.16.3.2, Table 7.16-6.

T6. Patterson, Marilyn Sue

FutureGen Project
Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory
PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

Live on North West Corner I Concerns! Noise From TRAIN Coal CARS, Dust From Coal, Is The TRAIN CAR unloading going, to be inside A Building?
The heavy TRAFFic That Will be Coming by here,
#1 AND Missing The Corner, ~~Smom~~ Semi's Coming AROUND The Corner, Now Are in The YARd.
I AM Still Concerned About Water.
What ARe The chances of CRACKed FoundATion Due to ViBerATions From unloading CoAl. (we have A Basement.)

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS ☐ HARD COPY ☐ CD / SUMMARY

NAME Marilyn Sue Patterson ORGANIZATION

ADDRESS 751 E Co. Rd. 1050N CITY Tuscola STATE Ill. ZIP 61953

E-MAIL ADDRESS

T6. Patterson, Marilyn Sue

Response to Comment #1:

The EIS addresses the point of noise associated with coal unloading at the Tuscola Site in Section 5.14.3.2. Noise is anticipated to be generated from unloading/loading activities such as the movement of containers, placement of coal feedstock on conveyor systems, and surficial contact of rail containers with other metallic equipment. Based on the estimated number of coal deliveries to the proposed power plant site, DOE predicted an hourly Leq of 69 dBA from unloading/loading activities at the rail yard using noise prediction equations provided in Table 5-6 of FTA's Noise and Vibration Assessment guidance document. This estimate assumes that the coal unloading facility would not be enclosed in a building. DOE anticipated little or no increase in the noise level at the three closest residences (SL-1 [the Patterson residence], SL-2, and SL-3) along CR 1050N because the coal unloading/loading area would likely be located near the southern boundary of the proposed site, which is approximately 0.5 mile from the closest residential receptors.

DOE did not evaluate the impacts of intermittent noise and vibrations that may be generated by rail car shakers if they are used to loosen coal material from the walls of the rail cars during unloading activity. The noise and vibration associated with rail car shakers would be considered if they are included in the final design.

It is not known at this time if the coal unloading facility would be enclosed in a building or not. As noted above, the EIS analysis assumes that it would not be enclosed. The particulate matter (PM) emissions estimated for the emissions envelope include dust from material handling including coal dust. As stated in Sections 4.2.3.2, 5.2.3.2, 6.2.3.2, and 7.2.3.2, PM emissions from coal unloading and handling are not expected to appreciably change air quality because emissions would be reduced by minimizing points of transfer of the material, enclosing conveyors and loading areas, and installing control devices, such as baghouses and wetting systems. The FutureGen Project is in the early stages of design and, although the major features of the project are known, the engineering design plans for the coal handling operation (i.e., equipment specifications) are still in the development phase.

It is anticipated that project-related traffic during construction and normal plant operations would cause ambient noise levels to increase at sensitive receptors located near the assigned transportation routes. As noted *in* the EIS summary *Table S-12*, noticeable traffic noise impacts (a 3 dBA or more change in the ambient noise level) were predicted to occur at receptors located along the CR 750E (up to 14 dBA) and CR 1050N (up to 7 dBA) roadway segments leading to the proposed power plant site. Noise mitigation measures, including evenly distributing project-related trips throughout the day, scheduling more deliveries on rail, or purchasing the properties on the proposed site could be considered to limit the number of project-related trips, particularly heavy trucks, passing by these residential receptors during construction and normal plant operations. However, these potential mitigation measures would not be decided upon until a site is selected and the design is finalized.

EIS Section 5.14.3.2 addresses the potential impacts of ground-borne vibrations from coal unloading activity on the closest cluster of receptors near proposed Tuscola power plant site. Based on FTA's vibration impact assessment screening methodology, it was concluded that no vibration impacts are anticipated because none are located within the 200-foot distance screening threshold. The closest residential receptor (SL-8) that could possibly be

T6. Patterson, Marilyn Sue

affected by ground-borne vibrations generated by project-related rail deliveries is approximately 320 feet from the CSX rail line, along the western side of the City of Tuscola.

FutureGen would not draw groundwater from the power plant site, so water supplies should not be reduced in this area. The buildings and parking lots of the FutureGen facility would reduce infiltration of rain water locally, but recharge over the area extent of the shallow aquifers tends to support the idea that recharge is not likely to be noticeably diminished when a comparatively small part of the recharge area is rendered less permeable by buildings and parking lots. Contamination of shallow aquifers is a possibility with any power plant facility. FutureGen would be constructed with cement catch basins or pads beneath many facilities where contamination would be most likely to originate. Spill control plans would be developed and implemented to further reduce the chance of soil and groundwater contamination. If coal or ash are stored in open areas, consideration would be given to the placement of liners beneath these materials.

T7. BRH Properties (Robinson, Chris)

FutureGen Project

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

#1 WE LOOK FORWARD TO THE FUTUREGEN OPERATION IN TUSCOLA, ILLINOIS

HOPE TO HAVE YOU HERE –

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS ☐ HARD COPY ☐ CD / SUMMARY

NAME CHRIS ROBINSON ORGANIZATION BRH PROPERTIES

ADDRESS P.O. BOX 306 CITY URBANA STATE IL ZIP 61803

E-MAIL ADDRESS

T7. BRH Properties (Robinson, Chris)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T8. Property Management (Hardwick, C. T.)

FutureGen Project

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

#1 I HOPE THIS TECHNOLOGY MAKES ITS WAY TO TUSCOLA, SITE. I SURE WOULD PLEASE ME—

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS [X] HARD COPY [ ] CD / SUMMARY

NAME C. T. HARDWICK ORGANIZATION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

ADDRESS P.O. BOX 306 CITY URBANA STATE IL ZIP 61803

E-MAIL ADDRESS

T8. Property Management (Hardwick, C. T.)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T9. McDaniel, Curt

FutureGen Project

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

#1 Dear Mark - I went to both Public Hearings and was very impressed with the FutureGen Project. I have lived in Tuscola for 63 years and Tuscola would be the perfect site for FutureGen. We have all the water that is needed, I worked for 23 years at the Chemical Plant Equistar, and they would by the Hydrogen. Also Cabot would by the Hydrogen and we have a great work force in the Tuscola Area. All things considered, Tuscola would be the best site for this FutureGen Project. Thank you
Curt McDaniel

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS ☐ HARD COPY ☒ CD / SUMMARY

NAME Curt McDaniel ORGANIZATION Small Business man & Semi Retired

ADDRESS 509 Cherry St CITY Tuscola STATE IL ZIP 61953

E-MAIL ADDRESS

T9. McDaniel, Curt

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T10. Edmiston, Catherine

July 14, 2007

Environmental Manager Mark McCoy
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Tech Lab
P.O. Box 880
244 Morgantown, W. Virginia 26507-0880

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is a list of questions I would like to have answered regarding the Public Hearing for FutureGen in Tuscola. I know people in that area who are concerned, and I attended the first hearing there.

Please mail the answers to Catherine Edmiston, 601 W. Adams St., Abingdon, Ill. 61410. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Catherine Edmiston

Catherine Edmiston
Montgomery Co. Landowner

Phone (309) 462-2796
<edmiston@abingdon.net>

Montgomery Co. Landowner
Citizens Against Longwall Mining

Catherine Edmiston
601 W. Adams St.
Abingdon, IL 61410

edmiston@abingdon.net
(309) 462-2796

T10. Edmiston, Catherine

July 14, 2007

Questions to be answered about FutureGen:

#1 1. "Everybody wants to see FutureGen come to Illinois." Because it is a coalfired plant, that statement is debatable. Why have you not developed other sources of energy, other than coal, that do not pollute, and do permanent damage to the State of Illinois? These government grants could go to develop wind power, or hydro-electric power, or solar power!

#2 2. Longwall mining will damage 205,000 acres of farmland in Montgomery County (Hillsboro-Litchfield area) and this is just "the tip of the iceberg". From our research, we have found that fresh water supplies can be destroyed, aquifers, wells and springs drained, and earthquake-like damage to farmland, timber, homes and buildings, roads, bridges and even cemeteries, which these ruthless companies have got permission to mine under, taking nearly 95 percent of coal, dropping the surface five feet with earthquake like damage. FutureGen will be contributing to the destruction of Illinois by using coal for their energy source. Also, what pollutants will still go into the atmosphere , even with "clean coal" use? FutureGen contributes to global warming?

#3 3. The storing of CO2 underground has its hazards. If it escapes, in a cloud, it is an asphyxiant and can kill people, and animals in just a breath or two. I am not impressed with the State of Illinois taking over the liability! How careful would a corporation be, in squestering it underground, when the company knows it isn't liable for any accidents? What citizen wants to pay his tax money out for liability insurance for a corporation?

#4 4. How will CO2 stored underground in large amounts affect the water supplies, and aquifers? Temperatures get warmer as you go further underground? What difficulties will that cause in storing large amounts?

#5 5. How will sequestration of CO2 affect land and property values on the surface?

#6 6. Will FutureGen be piping in CO2 from other places to store? What are the hazards of running a pipeline across country with CO2?

Cathy Edmiston
Catherine Edmiston

T10. Edmiston, Catherine

Response to Comment #1:

DOE oversees numerous programs that are investigating and supporting a wide variety of renewable energy generation technologies, including wind, solar, and hydro. However, the particular goal of the FutureGen Program is to demonstrate an advanced power generation facility based on fossil fuels, specifically coal. Hence, technologies that would not be based on coal use are not within the scope of the FutureGen Project.

Response to Comment #2:

The effects of long-wall mining for coal are well known and well described in general. FutureGen does not aim to change mining techniques, and for the proposed project DOE has no decisions that would affect coal mining. FutureGen would test coal from various locations in an effort to demonstrate operations of its technologies on a variety of coal types and qualities. For purposes of the project, it is not envisioned that coal would be consumed from only one or even just a few locations. FutureGen is intended to facilitate the development of technologies that would allow the recognition of the President's goal of a zero emissions, coal-based power plant. While such a power plant is not yet within the realm of economic practicality, the FutureGen Project would have very low emissions of conventional pollutants. Reducing carbon dioxide emissions, the greenhouse gas of greatest concern from coal-fired power plants, is an ambitious goal of FutureGen, with a target of >90 percent captured and permanently sequestered in deep saline formations.

Other emissions, such as sulfur, NOx, particulate matter, mercury, slag, ash and even water emissions, are also targeted for significant reductions compared to state-of-the art technologies.

Response to Comment #3:

Carbon dioxide can be an asphyxiant when it displaces air. Therefore, DOE assessed the risks of leaks from the underground storage and the potential for harm, including asphyxiation. The risks of severe consequences from a leaking reservoir appear to be very low and are much lower than for the capture and pipeline transport of the CO_2. Under the Clean Coal FutureGen for Illinois Act (Public Act 095-0018), the State of Illinois would assume ownership and liability at a specified point in the process (when the CO_2 is conveyed into the injection well), the liability would be limited in scope (e.g., it would not cover intentional mishandling of the CO_2 or non-compliance with applicable regulations), and the liability would be covered by any insurance purchased by the State, to the extent that insurance is available. Because the sequestration of CO_2 in saline aquifers represents a first-of-a-kind venture that benefits the public in general, it is not unreasonable to arrange for liability sharing for this project.

Response to Comment #4:

Carbon dioxide stored underground in the FutureGen Project is not likely to affect water supplies. Carbon dioxide stored underground primarily presents two potential hazards to water supplies (including aquifers used for drinking water): (1) leakage of the CO_2 upwards into underground sources of drinking water and surface waters, and (2) displacement of native fluids into underground sources of drinking water and surface waters. If CO_2 migrates up into water supplies, the water could become carbonated (like soda pop) and, therefore, would be more acidic. The increased acidity could dissolve more mineral matter into the water as well as make the water less habitable (a concern for surface water). If displaced native fluids (primarily the concern would be with salt water) migrate up into water supplies, the water supplies could be rendered unsuitable for their intended uses (e.g., it could become too salty for drinking water and for freshwater aquatic life) until the displaced fluids are flushed out (or move downstream). The conclusions in DOE's Risk

T10. Edmiston, Catherine

Assessment is that there is very little risk of CO_2 migrating up into underground sources of drinking water and surface waters. The risk is also very low for displaced native fluids moving up into underground sources of drinking water and surface waters. Potential consequences are further explained in the Risk Assessment and in the site-specific Environmental Information Volumes (see, e.g., FG Alliance 2006c or FG Alliance 2006d, *S*ection 8.4, Receptors and Environmental Impact Thresholds). The current DOE view is that the risks and potential consequences of leakage and displaced fluids are likely to be outweighed by the risks and potential consequences of global climate change resulting from our society's failure to take action.

On average, earth temperatures do increase with depth. It is anticipated that the routine practice of measuring the temperature in the target reservoir would be honored for this project. The engineers would then assess the potential for adverse effects, either from thermal expansion of the CO_2 or from thermal shock to the well bore and reservoir rock as cooler CO_2 is injected into warmer rock. Typical reservoir temperatures observed in the oil and gas industry range up to around 300 degrees Fahrenheit. At the Mattoon and Tuscola sites, for example, the reservoir is predicted to have a temperature of about 130 degrees Fahrenheit. The CO_2 captured in the FutureGen power plant would also be at elevated temperatures at the time of capture. Recent analyses have estimated the temperature of CO_2 entering the pipeline at 95 degrees Fahrenheit. If it is piped to the sequestration well, the CO_2 would cool down, especially during times of cold weather. This would not be a concern at Mattoon, where the injection well is located at the power plant site. But, for Tuscola, where the pipeline would be 11 miles long, the CO_2 would arrive at the well head with temperatures ranging from around 65 degrees Fahrenheit in the winter months to perhaps 93 degrees Fahrenheit during the summer, if no insulation is installed around the pipeline (FG Alliance, 2006d).

The cooled CO_2 would then perhaps be injected into a warmer reservoir. As the CO_2 travels down the well bore, it is heated by the surrounding material (surrounding rock and well materials that conduct heat) and by the weight of the overlying column of CO_2. As the CO_2 reached the top of the reservoir, it would have a temperature estimated to be in the range of 87 degrees to 109 degrees Fahrenheit (FG Alliance, 2006d). As a result, the well bore would cool down, the surround rock would cool down, and the reservoir where the CO_2 is being injected would cool down. As planning work progresses, the engineers would assess whether the drop in temperatures would cause damage to the well by thermal contraction of various components. They would also assess whether cooling on the rock surrounding the well, cooling of the reservoir rock, and cooling of the cap rock (seal) would cause new cracks to form or would enlarge existing cracks and fractures in these units. DOE and the Alliance would conduct these assessments as data (such as the reservoir bulk thermal conductivity, the rock's coefficient of thermal expansion, and the rock's tensile strength) are gathered during the detailed characterization phase, and the results should be reported along with the Supplement Analysis that would be prepared by DOE at the conclusion of the characterization phase. If it appears that a problem could occur, either insulation would be installed around the pipeline to reduce cooling of the CO_2, or heaters would be installed in the pipeline near the well head to raise temperatures to safe levels. A safety shutoff might also be installed to prevent injection of CO_2 that is too cool following periods of pipeline shutdown or heater shutdown.

T10. Edmiston, Catherine

Response to Comment #5:	DOE does not know how the sequestration of CO_2 would specifically affect land and property value; however, land surface rights could be affected the same as occurs with oil and natural gas exploration and production. Subsurface mineral rights (or pore space rights) could become more valuable if geologic sequestration becomes a routine practice.
Response to Comment #6:	Except at the Odessa Site, FutureGen would store only the CO_2 generated in the FutureGen power plant. The only exception would be an initial test injection of CO_2 trucked or piped from another source to verify the suitability of the intended target reservoir(s). At the Odessa Site, CO_2 from FutureGen may be co-mingled in a commercial pipeline with CO_2 from other sources before a quantity equal to that produced by FutureGen is sequestered in the target reservoirs. At the Odessa Site, the opportunity would exist to sequester more or different CO_2 than would be captured by FutureGen. Pipeline hazards are thoroughly reviewed in the Risk Assessment (available in electronic form on the FutureGen Project EIS CD and on the websites where the EIS can be downloaded).

T11. U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Jones, Matthew)

Public Hearing Oral *Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)*

MATTHEW JONES: I'm not sure which direction I'm supposed to face here.

My name is Matthew Jones. Real brief. I am representing Congressman Tim Johnson who most of you all know. Congressman could not be here, obviously; they were

0029

out in Washington, D.C. voting. But he is en route to come back home. Never the less, he wanted to me express to all of you that, obviously, we all know how important this project is. But more importantly, that, not only as Congressman Johnson but a lot of you local, state and federal officials have all been working together.

And that's one of the rare benefits of an opportunity like this is to actually see people working together. And I know, in this time of age, regardless if you're republican or democrat, it's nice, it's refreshing to see a project for the common good and everybody working together.

#1

And, obviously, with all of that said, we want to bring it to Illinois. And I realize we're in the Tuscola site, but we represent both cities. Now, I'm not going to lie. I'm from Arthur, Illinois; and I'm from Douglas County. I have been for six generations. Well, not me personally, but my family. So I want to see it right here for the obvious reasons, the jobs, the environmental impact and, obviously, the energy.

But from Representative Congressman Johnson, we just want to bring it to Illinois; because it's, obviously, going to impact everyone directly or indirectly. And it's for the common good for everybody. So, I didn't have a big

0030

long speech prepared. I know I'm under the 5 minutes. So I hope that will be pleasing to everybody. But thank you very much for inviting us, and I will definitely relay that there was a large support here in the Tuscola site.

So thank you very much.

T11. U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Jones, Matthew)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

WARREN RIBLEY: Good evening. Mark, thank you. It's great to see this turnout as Mike Mudd indicated. Thank you, residents of Tuscola, Douglas County and surrounding counties. Great to see your interest in this project.

My name is Warren Ribley. Not to be confused with Ripley of Ripley's Believe It or Not.

I am Director of Operations for the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. On behalf of Governor Rod Blagojevich and DCO Director Jack Lavin, it is my pleasure to welcome back the US Department of Energy, FutureGen Alliance and their teams to Illinois for another round of public hearings that represents the next critical step in this important selection process.

We've been actively engaged for more than 4 years.

0031

As you can see, there's a high level of energy and excitement surrounding FutureGen and, clearly, its impact it would have not only on our state but our nation and, really, across the world. **#1**

I want to thank Mayor Dan Kleiss and Brian Moody as well as all the attendees here tonight for your continued participation and enthusiasm about this project that's continued throughout the process.

Again, I'd also like to recognize Bill Hoback, Director of the Office of Coal Development, DCO, and his team, who really have been our resident experts and advocates for FutureGen.

FutureGen is, indeed, the future of energy; and we're here to tell you that Illinois is ready for FutureGen.

We reach this point with quiet confidence and high anticipation; and we've benefited from the input of people throughout Illinois including planners, elected officials, business leaders, farmers, and some of the top scientific and engineering talent anywhere in the world.

There may be no economic development project in the history of this state -- that's the truth -- that approaches the scope of FutureGen and its potential impact, not only on us here but, again, around the nation and the world. So think about that. It's pretty awesome.

T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)

0032

A new Southern Illinois University study that the governor just recently released found that FutureGen would have actually a much larger economic impact than the 1,300 construction jobs and the 150 permanent jobs that the Department of Energy has estimated would he created. The study found that, during the 4-year construction period, there would be more than $1 billion in economic impact statewide to Illinois. And there would be more than 1,200 spin-off jobs that would be created.

Once FutureGen is operational, the study shows it will generate a hundred thirty-five million dollars annually and total statewide economic output with $85 million estimated annual increase right here in Douglas and Coles County. And, additionally, it will create 300 full-time jobs elsewhere statewide and spin-off.

And the local communities here in East Central Illinois and the hard-working people that live in Douglas and Coles County, you've really met every challenge to date to bring FutureGen here and should be applauded for that.

This region wants to show the world how to use coal cleanly, how to capture and store CO2. We've worked creatively and cooperatively on solutions to complex problems and nurtured each other as valued partners in this endeavor which will pay dividends to us and across the

#1

0033

United States and the world for decades to come.

We have said all along that FutureGen, that Illinois is the place for FutureGen based on the merits of these two site, alone. And we feel more confident about that with each passing day.

Some of the best minds in the state have helped us in reaching this stage. We've had top to bottom cooperation, as mentioned earlier, from not only all levels of government but also including the private sector.

We wouldn't be here today if we didn't absolutely have the best local partners in Brian Moody, Angela Griffin, from Coles County, and their respective FutureGen teams. They're all to be applauded.

However, as we head down the homestretch, I'd like to reiterate all the distinct advantages that Illinois offers FutureGen, starting with our geology.

Illinois is blessed with the geology to demonstrate this breakthrough technology as well and probably better than anywhere else in the United States and, in our estimation, including that of our competitors in Texas. We have deep Vict porous sandstone. I hope you have had a chance to see in some of the demonstrations that the safety margins of at least two cap rock seals that have never, ever been penetrated.

T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)

0034

Illinois, in addition, offers a platform from a geology standpoint that will maximize the transferability of the FutureGen technology to sites throughout the United States and the world. We've been examining and documenting this potential, with the help of the top scientists in the region, for more than 3 years. And we're very confident in those results.

Water is our next advantage. Both sites offer more than ample water for FutureGen needs. Pretty well demonstrated that here this week. And thank you for our rain. And to do so at a reasonable cost without negatively impacting current or future water supplies in our region.

Location. Among other advantages, our sites are almost ideally situated in relation to the nation's major coal fields, saving the Alliance millions of dollars in rail costs as well as further minimizing the carbon profile of the project of shipping the coal in.

Leadership. I will bring that up again. This project has garnered bipartisan support from elected officials in Illinois, in Congress as well as in Springfield; and we, as a state, particularly under Governor Blagojevich, have never lost faith in the long-term potential of Illinois coal.

Research capacity. We do have leading coal research

#1

0035

institutions supporting Illinois' bid for FutureGen, including Southern Illinois University and our partner state, Indiana, Purdue University, which are two of the top coal research centers in the nation.

We have the University of Illinois just a few miles to the north. It's a premier research university with a number of, four engineering, with the number four engineering program of any college in the country right here in our backyard. And, of course, a top state university, Eastern Illinois University, just down the road.

Investment. You've committed the investment. Illinois' investment package includes an unmatched $17 million grant to the FutureGen Alliance. In addition, we have committed the Illinois State Geological Survey and some of the nation's top scientists in their fields to oversee the long-term monitoring of the CO2 once it is captured and stored.

We also have history on our side. As we've emphasized the last round of the FutureGen hearings, Illinois is a coal state, not an oil and gas state. We're a coal state. We've demonstrated our belief in coal and investments of millions of dollars in the development of technology of clean coal.

T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)

0036

We have, within the past several weeks, permitted, through the Illinois EPA, the first two coal gasification projects to be advanced anywhere in America in the last 20 years. And we're very close to permitting and breaking ground on a gasification project in the far northwestern part of the state, in East Dubuque, that will make nitrogen fertilizer from coal, quite significantly, beginning producing for US consumption the first and, producing the low sulfur diesel fuel made from Illinois coal.

Fundamentals for FutureGen are in place with the water. We have the geology. We have the location. We have the economics. We have the research. We have the political leadership, and we have the community support.

With science on our side and all of these strategic assets, we are confident that the world's cleanest coal plant will be built in this state. We're all here today because we share in this vision and we believe in the possibilities of this facility to change the way we look at energy production.

As we stated, FutureGen needs Illinois. Illinois needs FutureGen.

Thank you very much.

#1

T12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Ribley, Warren)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T13. Tuscola School System (Burgess, Joe)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

JOE BURGESS: Good evening. Joe Burgess, Superintendent of Schools. I also have the pleasure, over the last 3 years of also being part of the Tuscola Economic Development Board that, those of us from Tuscola commonly know as TEDI.

I think we owe a lot to Brian Moody for the work of the development that this project has come along with and thanks; and thank you, Brian.

(Applause.)

Special welcome to those of you who are visitors of our community. I hope you found it friendly and enjoyable but also informational.

Our school system, when we saw that we were going to be one of the finalists, took a very proactive action

0040

towards that. We know that, now that we're on, not only the national map, the world map, that Tuscola's potential for growth, regardless of whether FutureGen becomes part of our community or not, is great.

The planning stages are set. Our board of education is, has set that through planning meetings, talking about the impacts of growth and what that will do to our, not only to our community but to our school buildings and to

#1 our educational system.

With that, I'd like to thank the forefathers of our school system. All three of our buildings are easily added on to. Potential for growth and space is there. We would welcome the opportunity for those students, because those students will be getting a first-class education.

Those of you from the Department of Energy, I'm sure, are aware from your friends No Child Left Behind that you have in Washington, D.C. with the Department of Education.

Our elementary, this year, was recognized by Washington, D.C. as a Blue-Ribbon School. So we could offer your students that would be coming to Tuscola as a part of our system a First-class National Educational program.

Lastly, I would be remiss, as educational leader, not to well you that we would look forward to also the

0041

educational opportunities that FutureGen could potentially bring to our students. The technology. The science. Those are all things that we're very excited about. We would look forward to partnering with you, allowing our students and our staff to learn from you and, hopefully, you learn from us.

So welcome you to Tuscola. We hope you're part of our lives soon, and take care. Thank you.

T13. Tuscola School System (Burgess, Joe)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T14. Illinois Department of Natural Resources – Illinois State Water Survey (Knapp, Vernon)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

VERNON KNAPP: My name is Vernon Knapp. I'm the Assistant Director for the Center of Watershed Science at the Illinois State Water Survey. The survey is a division of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. I'm also the leading service monitor technologist for the Water Survey's Water Supply Planning Program.

My involvement with the FutureGen in Illinois began over a year ago when I prepared the state's water supply assessment of its proposed sites. Also over the past year, I have provided technical feedback regarding Tuscola's site plan to build upon the existing water supply capabilities and also reduce their dependence on, dependence on the Mahomet aquifer as a supplemental water supply source.

0042

Natural flows in the Kaskaskia River augmented by the continually growing amount of waste water discharge into the river by the Champaign/Urbana southwest treatment plant remained the predominant sources of water supply for the Lyondell Equistar water withdrawal.

#1 The possibility of increased use of the Mahomet aquifer is a concern for many because the aquifer is a water supply source for many communities in the region.

The Lyondell Equistar Company and its predecessors have a long history of pumping water from the Mahomet aquifer dating back to the 1950's. The supply from the company's Mahomet aquifer belt can be substantial with individual well yields exceeding 1,500 to 2,000 gallons per minute.

Although these wells can provide an abundant source of supply, there is a lessoning for their use, in part, because of a continuing distance of waste water effluence into the river.

On-going studies by the Water Survey may lead to an even further reduction of Lyondell Equistar's need for the Mahomet aquifer. As part of our agency's water supply planning activities for the Mahomet aquifer we are conducting discharge measurements on the Kaskaskia River to more accurately quantify the amount of low flow in the

T14. Illinois Department of Natural Resources – Illinois State Water Survey (Knapp, Vernon)

0043

river.

Based on this chart taken this spring and summer, we estimate the river has as much as 2-and-a-half times the amount of flow during low-flow conditions as previously estimated for determining supplemental water needs.

I've also reviewed the proposed water withdraw practices for supplying the FutureGen facility as prepared by Jim Crane, Douglas County Engineer. These proposed practices would be expected to further and substantially diminish the frequency of the Mahomet aquifer's use as a supplemental source.

There are two key components that would reduce the need for Mahomet aquifer water. The first is to reuse the treated waste waters from the Lyondell Equistar facility, replacing the existing discharge into the Kaskaskia River and, thereby, removing the need to augment low flows in the river for the purpose of waste water pollution.

#1 The second component is the construction of additional, substantial reservoir storage at the site of the Kaskaskia River withdrawal. Such that, during the dry periods, the stored water can be used for supply instead of the need to augment flow in the river for withdrawal.

With the development of these two proposed components and the continually growing amount of waste water being

0044

discharged into the river, there is a high degree of confidence that supplemental water from the aquifer would be needed only for perhaps a few months during the most severe drought conditions.

We recognize that future operation of the Mahomet wells, in these severe drought conditions, could have impact on nearby existing and proposed wells. However for the short periods that the aquifer may be called upon, we have no reason to expect long-term, aquifer yield limitations.

Thank you.

T14. Illinois Department of Natural Resources – Illinois State Water Survey (Knapp, Vernon)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T15. Carle Foundation Hospital (Cook, David)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

DAVID COOK: Good evening. My name is David Cook, the Vice President of Carle Foundation Hospital.

Our hospital stands ready to serve the health-care needs of FutureGen's construction crews and future employees. We wholeheartedly support your proposal to locate a plant in Central Illinois.

Carle Foundation Hospital is the area's Level 1 trauma center. We're a 305-bed facility located in Urbana, about 25 miles from here.

0045

The hospital recently completed a $65 million addition to accommodate significant growth in patient volumes and plan for additional growth. With over 400 physicians on our medical staff, Carle Foundation Hospital offers services to patients needing higher levels of care, including intensive care, open-heart surgery, perinatal services.

#1

Other Carle Foundation Services include Champaign Surgery Center, Carle RX Express, Carle Therapy Services, Carle Home Services, Arrow Carle Ambulance and Air Life Helicopter Transport. We feel that, with all of these services in place, we can very clearly meet the needs of any expanded.

We'd be honored to serve your health care needs and look forward to a bright future together here in Central Illinois.

Thank you.

T15. Carle Foundation Hospital (Cook, David)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T16. Arrow Carle Ambulance, Air Life, Air Medical Transport and Carle Regional EMS Systems (Sapp, Larry)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

LARRY SAPP: Good evening. My name is a Larry Sapp. I'm also with Carle Hospital, but I represent some different departments. I represent the Director of Arrow Carle Ambulance, Air Life, Air Medical Transport and Carle's Regional EMS systems.

On behalf of these departments and Carle Foundation Hospital, we fully support FutureGen locating in Illinois. Arrow ambulance, air life, and Carle EMS have a long standing, collaborative relationship with Douglas County, the City of Tuscola, the surrounding communities and townships.

Douglas County's foresight, led by representatives from Tuscola, has developed an aggressive system, service and education and prevention in the EMS industry. Arrow Carle Ambulance offers advanced life support ambulance services through a network of eleven ambulances strategically deployed from locations throughout Champaign County and northern Douglas County. **#1**

Air Life, within minutes, can provide critical care and air transport services to the patients in our region. Derived through agreement, an agreement with Archer Medical and Air Methods, Air Life is also located at the Carle Foundation Hospital.

Our EMS Department at Carle Foundation Hospital provides educational opportunities and system membership to many public and private organizations including large industries such as FutureGen. Each one of these departments, as well as the entire Carle Foundation, look forward to welcoming FutureGen into our area and into Illinois.

Thank you. And we look forward to the opportunity to serve you.

T16. Arrow Carle Ambulance, Air Life, Air Medical Transport and Carle Regional EMS Systems (Sapp, Larry)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T17. Carle Foundation Hospital (Guffey, Anita)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

ANITA GUFFEY: I think I'm the last one from Carle. But thank you for listening to us.

My name is Anita Guffey. And I'm the Director of Emergency Preparedness for Carle Foundation Hospital. And I, on behalf of Carle Foundation Hospital, would like to reiterate our support for the gen, the FutureGen Project moving into Illinois. Carle's participation at Illinois Department of Public Health is a lead hospital for this entire region which includes 22 counties. And we're charged with leading the area in disaster emergency preparedness.

#1 While we never hope to have to deal with any kind of natural or man-made disaster, we are prepared. Carle Foundation Hospital has stockpiled supplies and equipment that we keep in trailers, and we're available to respond anywhere in the region to help in the need of a crisis or disaster.

0048

We can provide care, medical care to victims anywhere within Region 6. Our trailers are equipped to set up a field hospital anywhere they may be needed.

So we also have a mobile decontamination trailer that's kept at Carle and is available 24/7 that can respond anywhere needed in this area with a team.

So we work very closely with local, state, and federal authorities in all aspects of emergency planning, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. So Carle Foundation Hospital and Emergency Preparedness Department is eager, very eager to form a good working relationship with the FutureGen Project as you move into Illinois.

T17. Carle Foundation Hospital (Guffey, Anita)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T18. Looby, William

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

WILLIAM LOOBY: It's a long walk from the back.

I just, basically want to bring up for everyone here what I think, and I haven't heard yet, but our greatest resource in this state, I believe our work force. Our organization represents nearly a million members in this state and tens of thousands in the East Central Illinois region. Highly skilled, highly trained work force that's quite used to and quite motivated on getting projects,

0049

bringing projects in on time and under budget.

#1 The other thing, along those lines, being very succinct here, is that our review of the, of the EIS, we believe there's some inconsistencies in the wage data from the Texas sites. And we just wanted to, we'll be following that up with, with written comments. But we believe that should be more or at least a second review or more thorough review of that.

But, again, thank you for coming; and thank you for letting me speak too. So thank you.

T18. Looby, William

Response to Comment #1:	Wage rates included in the EIS have been reviewed and are accurate. The Davis-Bacon Wage Determination rates were used and are issued by the Department of Labor under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts. The Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor determines prevailing wage rates to be paid on federally funded or assisted construction projects. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.

T19. Environmental Law and Policy Center (Matchett, Barry)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

BARRY MATCHETT: Good evening. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm Barry Matchett. I'm with the Environmental Law and Policy Center. We're a Chicago-based organization that works throughout the Midwest. And we are an organization that very frequently is opposed to coal.

I think, today, we have lawsuits against four coal plants around the Midwest. But not this plant. We are supportive of FutureGen. We are supportive of both Illinois sites. We are supportive for three very specific reasons.

0050

First, FutureGen represents the opportunity for our country and for our state to utilize Illinois coal and to utilize this research. We have a vast reserve.

Right now, the Illinois coal plants burn about 85 percent western coal. That doesn't seem right to us as citizens of Illinois. It certainly doesn't seem right to us from an economic perspective. And we can use the technology that FutureGen will utilize to burn Illinois coal in an environmentally responsible way. And we are enthusiastic supporters of that.

Number 2, and the thing that seems to be the point of most of the conversations this evening. It sequesters the CO2, the carbon dioxide output from coal plants.

There's no debate. Carbon dioxide is causing global warming. There's a solution to this situation, so that the catastrophic, apocalyptic role of the event at some port will happen, can be averted. This is the solution. We can sequester CO2 that's used, that's created when you burn coal. And we are enthusiastic supporters of this FutureGen. And using Illinois' specific geology is the solution. And we are keen on seeing that happen here in Illinois.

#1

And Number 3 -- And I thought the point that you brought up, sir, was, Mr. Oliver, was particularly

0051

salient. This, as a technology transfer opportunity for an American technology to be exported to our friends in the developing world, China and India, in particular, who have massive populations, which are all seeking our way of life and our electric needs and they're seeking to do it by using coal, needing us to succeed. We need to succeed for them, and they need to succeed by using the stuff that we do here in Illinois.

We need to have this project here. We need to have it work so that the Chinese, as they move from where they are today to where they will be in 2020 and they're burning a ton of coal, are sequestering carbon, that they're not part of the warming problem, they're part of the solution because we gave them the technology. We sold them the technology. And that's reason to support this project and the reason the Environmental Law and Policy Center is a strong supporter of this project.

So I appreciate the opportunity to speak with the panel; and thank you this evening.

T19. Environmental Law and Policy Center (Matchett, Barry)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T20. Tuscola Stone Company (Shoemaker, Alan)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

ALAN SHOEMAKER: Hello. I'm Alan Shoemaker, General Manager of Tuscola Stone Company.

0052

On behalf of our Tuscola Stone Company, I would like to thank you for your consideration of our community for your project.

Should you select our location, we will stand by and support your project and your construction needs. Your proposed site is located just 4 miles from the deepest quarry of the State of Illinois. We have been in business and serving this area for over 35 years with 16 full-time jobs. **#1**

Our rock reserve is over 300 feet deep. We produce all types of construction aggregates for our community and our agricultural limestone for our farmers.

We believe it would be an honor to participate in a project that involves a science that could change the world to provide energy. We fully support FutureGen. Like every good project, it begins with a solid plan. A sold plan must be supported with a solid foundation. It should be nice to know that materials for your foundation can be supplied from just four miles away.

Thank you very much.

T20. Tuscola Stone Company (Shoemaker, Alan)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T21. Cabot Corporation (Kleiss, Dan)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

DAN KLEISS: Good evening and welcome. I am Dan Kleiss. I'm the Manager of Human Resources for Cabot Corporation, Tuscola facility. On behalf of our chairman, I'd like to read a letter that he has written.

Dear Mr. McKoy: Cabot Corporation is pleased to offer this letter of support for the City of Tuscola and its bid to attract the FutureGen initiative to Eastern Illinois.

Cabot has been an active member of the Tuscola business community for more than 50 years. During that time, Tuscola has provided business climate, quality of life and community values that have greatly contributed to the successful operation of our manufacturing facility. Our business and our employees have been able to succeed and thrive at Tuscola.

Tuscola also provides a well-developed infrastructure that allows convenient access to major cities via railways, highways and airports. The city's commitment to the development and maintenance of this infrastructure is

#1 essential for the transport of raw materials and machinery we require and are necessary for the export of Cabot products worldwide.

The city's well-maintained water and sewer systems, good schools, affordable housing and parks and other recreational areas contribute to a high standard of living for Cabot employees and their families. These and other amenities help Cabot to attract and retain the skilled labor work force needed to maintain our competitive advantage.

If sited in Tuscola, the FutureGen initiative can potentially provide an opportunity for the development of new electricity generation technology with positive and environmental impacts that would benefit both residents and businesses.

As one of the major employers of the Tuscola area, Cabot looks forward to learning more about the FutureGen initiative.

Sincerely, Kenneth F. Burns, Chairman and CEO, Cabot Corporation, Boston, Massachusetts.

Thank you very much.

T21. Cabot Corporation (Kleiss, Dan)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T22. Clinton, Reggie

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

REGGIE CLINTON: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to speak. Arcola are the neighbors to the south of Tuscola here. And I want to let the board and the group doing the study realize that we have officially, the Board of Education, has gone on record as being in support of this project.

0055

We feel, not only the benefits of the, this would bring to our area. Mr. Burgess touched on it earlier. The Tuscola schools and all the local school districts around here are able to provide a quality education for the families and the workers that come here.

The other aspect of education I think we missed is not only what we can provide to the workers and families but what the workers and families and FutureGen could offer to our local schools, universities, and community colleges in the area. **#1**

One unique thing that I want to mention, that I drove up here -- I'm from Arcola to the south so that those in the audience will understand this example -- but FutureGen recognizes and represents cutting-edge technology, economically, ecologically friendly. What better picture to be a PR statement for that, that on one end of the spectrum you've got FutureGen plant out here and, on the other end of the spectrum, you have the community of the simple life people, the Amish community, coexisting, friendly, together, in that process. I think it's a unique opportunity that this part of the state offers.

We would welcome, and we do welcome FutureGen when you do locate in Illinois. Thank you.

T22. Clinton, Reggie

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T23. Tuscola Economic Development, Inc. (Moody, Brian)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

BRIAN MOODY: Well, good evening everyone. I was running around like a busy bee ahead of time and didn't sign up on the speakers list so I got at the beginning, so my comments might sound a little strange. Because I was going to thank you all in advance. So I guess I'm thanking you at the end now.

I want to welcome you all, again, back to the community on behalf of TEDI, the Douglas County Engineer Jim Crane, and the Douglas County Task Force for FutureGen.

Our local team really wishes to offer our congratulations and offer our thanks to the team from DOE, from FutureGen, from the associated companies and consultants on the putting the Draft EIS. We really appreciate both the professional and personal sacrifices that so many people in this room made to get this document done, this, to really make this analysis possible. And we are quite proud of you for doing that, as we are of ourselves.

Our overall review has found that the EIS is consistent with the information that we provided from the

0057

#1 local task force, and we feel it's a very solid characterization of our site here in Douglas County. If you haven't seen it, which I hope you have seen it, it's truly an impressive document.

We also want to make sure we thank the various members of our local task force, the various government agencies, the citizens and our local industry partners, many of whom are here tonight. Without all these folks, we just would not have been able to provide the information that was necessary for the environmental impact volume and then, now, for the Draft EIS. So we owe a great debt to those folks.

To the audience tonight -- I really want to emphasize, and the reason I wanted to get my name a little higher on the list -- this is really your night. This is really your opportunity to comment about FutureGen. We've been out talking about this project for, forever it seems sometimes. We hope you've learn a great deal about the project. We've tried to get that information out to the best of our ability. But this is really your chance to ask questions, regardless of, of the talk about positive or negative and the competition that goes on between the four sites.

It's important for the, for this project, as a whole,

T23. Tuscola Economic Development, Inc. (Moody, Brian)

0058

that these comments get made so these folks can look at these issues and make sure we are considering everything that might be impacted in the area. That's very important to us and to me personally. We've done this in an effort to obtain your true thoughts, your comments and your concerns. And this way, again, the DOE and the FutureGen Alliance can address a lot of these concerns.

I'm going to say it one more time. We sincerely want your comments on the Environmental Impact Statement. There are so many details and so many levels of analysis, and it's easy for all of us who have worked on this to let little details slip through the cracks. And so much of going through the draft versions and all the back and forth is finding those things and making sure that we have looked at them thoroughly. So I want to make sure you do make those comments.

#1

Again, I want to thank everyone throughout this process. We've had exceptional community support, a lot of people have spent a lot of late nights on a lot of different projects to get all this work put together. We've really appreciated it.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to share our community with you and for your questions today and in the past. Thank you very much.

T23. Tuscola Economic Development, Inc. (Moody, Brian)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T24. CSX Transportation (Livingston, Tom)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

TOM LIVINGSTON: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Tom Livingston, from CSX Transportation. I'm joined by Scott Walters, from CSX Transportation, who runs our coal division for the northern part of the country.

CSX is the largest eastern US freight railroad. We are pleased to wholeheartedly support the Tuscola site. It was accurately said earlier that, that Illinois is a coal state. That is very true. But it is also a rail state. And they are linked by history and by industry.

Illinois and Tuscola knows how to do coal. They know how to do rail. There is no more environmentally friendly way to haul this nation's freights than by rail. It takes about a gallon of gas to haul a ton of freight 400 miles.

So we are convinced that there is the least learning **#1** curve for Tuscola than any of the sites. CSX operates along 23,000 miles of track, and we see an awful lot of towns. But we are proud of our association with Tuscola

0060

and the organizers here who have the people, energy, and the talent to join the 17,000 rail employees in the State of Illinois to make this work and to make it work successfully.

I also want to echo the partnership with Representative Rose and the Congressional delegation and the State of Illinois.

So we know that Tuscola, from a rail perspective, gives FutureGen the greatest chance for success, in our minds, as operators of rail and critical transport for this project. Thank you.

T24. CSX Transportation (Livingston, Tom)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T25. Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

GEORGE WINELAND: I am George Wineland. That's W-I-N-D-L-A-N-D.

I would like to talk briefly in regards to the impact study. Believe me, I did read it three different times. It's like reading the Federal Register. More of you can laugh at that than some.

First of all, if I may, my involvement with the project is from a number of standpoints. I, first of all, am the Assistant Fire Chief for the Tuscola Fire

0061

Department. I'm responsible for, as the safety officer and also as the coordinator for a twelve-man, hazardous material response group.

And how did that come about? I had 35 years with the chemical plant just to the west as a safety requirement for 34 years; and 33 of those years I lived at the plant, physically lived at the plant. My home was there.

#1

So I know the impact of understanding and the concerns involved in regards to the environmental and the personal impact. As being the vice-chairman of the LEPC, which is dictated by the State of Illinois under the Right to Know Act and also as Cochairman of the Douglas County Emergency Management Association, we have looked through the impact study with quite a bit of detail.

I certainly want to appreciate this evening. I had spoke to a number of people around at the different projects and questioned in regards to a few of the statements that was made within the impact study.

First of all, the amount of exposure to the various chemicals at one point in the study, they made mention that it is similar to a petrochemical operation. Well, we, as Tuscola, have had a lot of experience dealing with chemical plants.

In regards to, a lot of the things I was really

T25. Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George)

0062

concerned, I'm a native of Tuscola. I am not a native of Tuscola, I'm sorry, but of Illinois. I'm kind of a transplant. I came out of the industry, the operation in Peoria, Illinois; and we came down here in 1957 to take over the fire protection and the emergency response activities for the plant. We have seen many of these chemicals, processes, that certainly, that is well described in the study. It's quite detailed.

And being a native of Illinois, I have one question. I have never seen the Kirkland's snake. You went through so much depth of detail in the habitat that surrounds our area is ideal for the Kirkland's snake. I have never seen one of those. The Indiana bat, I have seen.

But we have spent considerable amount of time, through Joe Victor, as the chairman and coordinator for the Tuscola Emergency Management, in studying the response activities, according to your description within the study, that we feel very strongly that we have the capabilities that, in case of an emergency, we will be able to respond for, for any type of activity that may arise.

I believe, by reading the information, that looking at all of the different aspects of the operation itself, all of these are very proven processes throughout the country or throughout the world. The thing that FutureGen,

#1

0063

I'm understanding, has done has collectively put all of this together, these processes here in the Tuscola area.

As being associated with the chemical plant and the concerns that they had initially with available water, one of the reasons I came to Tuscola to hire in at the USI, at that time, was due to the fact that we were in competitents with National Distillers in producing alcohol products. They had a new process; and I wondered as I, many people have asked today, well, first of all, where is Tuscola. And I found the same answer that I have given a number of times. It's 25, 30 miles south of the University of Illinois. But when I came down, I appeared, when we looked at the resources and the distribution, and I certainly appreciate the comments from CS and X -- at that time, when we came in here, it was B and O was the distribution system -- that is capable of transporting the products that were manufactured.

But the thing that really hit me is the river that was flowing into our reservoir and, at that time, the water system we were providing Apollo water over at Tuscola, as well as Arcola and our industry. But that river only starts 28 miles north of here, which was amazing to me how we could use that vast amount of water and we did. At that time, we put in 5 artesian wells into the aquifer at

T25. Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George)

0064

Bondville; and, periodically, during drought season, we had to pump in. But the drainage and the output of waste water products certainly supplemented what our needs were, and we had that retention.

We, through the Emergency Response, I believe we have the capability of providing a safe, working environment. I'm sure that the company, when building the operation, will be in compliance with the OSHA requirements, the Department of Labor through the State of Illinois and also through the National Fire Protection Association, to develop their facility.

Again, I want to personally thank the gentlemen and all of the ladies that I had the opportunity to speak to; and they have refreshed a lot of the information that we had some questions on.

Thank you very much.

#1

T25. Assistant Chief, Tuscola Fire Department (Wineland, George)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T26. Ambitec Engineering (Yoakum, James)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

JAMES YOAKUM: James Yoakum, Y-O-A-K-U-M.
James Yoakum, I'm Project Manager from Ambitec Engineering, a local support person for the large engineering procurement stress management firm here in
0065
Illinois.
I've been involved in numerous, industrial construction projects and operations across both East Central Illinois and across the nation. I also grew up in Southern Indiana and was the son of a coal miner. So I
#1 understand the importance of Midwest coal and the differences between good coal and bad coal and needing to find a good application for, for the coal we have here. So I'm very excited about this project.
Mainly, as a local technical resource and a resident of Tuscola, I'm excited about this opportunity and what's at stake. We have outstanding local, technical resources, contractors and future employees to support all phases of the FutureGen Project. We're glad you're here. We hope you stay here.
Thank you.

T26. Ambitec Engineering (Yoakum, James)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T27. Kennedy, John

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

JOHN KENNEDY: Good evening. I'm John Kennedy. I'm a manufacturing manager and an intent engineering personnel at one of our local facilities.

I just want to state that, in these days in this

0066

county and in this world, energy is a real commodity. And there's a lot of not in my backyard attitudes in the country, in the world, today. And I guess the one thing I want to state is that you're not going to find that here with this project in Tuscola.

#1 You know, if it was a nuclear plant, there would be opposition. No doubt. If it was a oil refinery, there would be opposition; no question. But from the things that I've seen, the literature that I've read, there's a lot of positives for this program. And I think that you'll find that, as a community, we're going to pull together. We have pulled together. We're going to be active, and we're going to help bring this to our town.

It's a positive thing. I don't see negatives. And I think it's something that we can all get on board and support.

Thank you very much.

T27. Kennedy, John

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T28. Hanner, Dennis

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

DENNIS HANNER: My name is Dennis Hanner, and I'm a local resident of this area. I grew up here. My

0067

parents raised me and my siblings. I have raised my children here. My grandchildren, part of them, are being raised here. And I hope my great grandchildren are.

As I look at this project and I've attended the meetings that we've had in the past, there's been questions I had.

One was the water. Every time an article appears in the newspaper, I've taken time to read it to find out what it says and what it's talking about. The water question

#1 has been answered in my mind. The natural habitat question has been answered in my mind. The safety of the plant has been answered in my mind.

The noise level. Some people ask that. Is there going to be a problem with the noise. Well, as the crow flies, we live about a mile from Lyondell. They make noise, but it is not a problem for our life.

I guess the best way of saying it is, I feel comfortable with the problems with the possibility of FutureGen being located here. To me, it is a great thing; and it's, I just feel good about it. I guess that's the best way of saying it.

Thank you.

T28. Hanner, Dennis

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T29. Robertson, Ann

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

ANN ROBERTSON: My name is Ann Robertson, and I'm a resident of Tuscola. And the young man who mentioned that he had been here for six generations, I'm a little older than he is. I have, I'm five generations in East Central Illinois and six generations for Southern Illinois. So this project is very near to my heart.

And I, and I just want to say how pleased I am that you're here. It's been wonderful to sit here in this audience and see the wonderful community and the recognition of the resources that we have here. Because we do live in a beautiful place. And even though I was raised in this area, I married an immigrant, and we gallivanted around the country for about 20 years and lived in other countries. So I've had the opportunity to see some other places, and we came back here.

And you missed the drought. We had about 3 weeks of drought here. So the gentleman who said we had abundant water, a few weeks ago, we wouldn't have said that; and we would have been a little worried about our crops here.

But we do have a lot of resources. Unfortunately, though, those of you who know me from church know that I sit in the back pew; and I hardly ever come up to the front

0069

#1 of the, of the congregation unless it's to take communion or something.

So this is hard for me to be up here and talk about this. And I have to raise some issues. And I do have a few things that I want to share with you, partly from a book, because I'm a writer/resource person. I'm not a public speaker.

This is a book called Big Coal. This has been donated to the Tuscola Public Library. And Chapter 9 addresses the Illinois coal industry and talks about FutureGen, specifically. So, I want to encourage you to check it out from the library or buy it from your local book store. Okay.

Now, because my eyes are not as good as what they used to be, I'm going to have to read a few quotes from this book, just to kind of share with you. So just bear with me here while I find my place.

This book, by the way, was not written by a tree hugger. We lived in California, and so we were exposed to the folks that hug the old growth trees. And when I saw my first one, I realized why they did it. They are beautiful trees.

But this is not one of those people. He's a very well-respected journalist who has researched coal, the coal

T29. Robertson, Ann

0070

industry in depth.
And on Page 212 to 213, he talks specifically about FutureGen or 'NeverGen,' as it's affectionately known to some people in the industry. He believes and his research suggests that it will turn out to be just another expensive government boondoggle. It would be foolish to bet on FutureGen as a solution to America's energies problems. He concedes that there are certainly some research potential in FutureGen.
However, it's, he also says that it's hard to fine anyone without a vested interest in the project who really believes that FutureGen is anything but an expensive, political decoy to make it look like the coal industry is doing something big and important while, in fact, it is doing very little.
Not my words. His words. Based on research.
Mr. Goodell gives examples in several areas of the book that coal companies have a pattern of using decoys including language like: Clean coal technology.
And this buys time for the coal industry so they can continue to conduct business as usual and cash in before the economic hurricane of global warming hits.
The truth is that coal mining is anything but clean. And my mother's farm in Southern Illinois, right now, is

#1

0071

being threatened by longwall coal mining.
Now, one of the things, and I know you're good people and you have done a wonderful job. We're very happy to have you here. Okay. But one of the things that irritates me about FutureGen and the coalition is what a wonderful opportunity to make the coal companies face up to the environmentally devastating practices that they are currently using in coal. And you have not addressed those issues. And these issues need to be addressed.
Anyone here in Illinois can go to Southern Illinois, and you can see where farmland has been devastated because of coal mining. There are independent farmers and groups that have combined in almost a David and Goliath battle to fight the coal companies and protect their farmland.
Now, they aren't against coal mining. They are against the type of mining methods, right now, that are destroying their land and the water supplies. So we need to face up to these realities.
I did not get copyright to print out some of the photographs that are on various web sites now that show what longwall mining look like, or I would have brought them with me here tonight. But I encourage you to go and take a look at some of those web sites or visit over by Litchfield and some of the other areas in Southern

T29. Robertson, Ann

0072

Illinois.
So, on page 251, the author, here, goes and says, the most dangerous thing about our continued dependence on coal is not what it does to our lungs or mountains -- and I'd like to add our fields and water here -- or even our climate, but what it does to our minds. It preserves the illusion that we don't have to change our thinking.
It is important to see that the barriers to change are not technological but political. And I guess this why I'm sharing with you today.
20 or 30 years ago, FutureGen may have been a great project. But right now, in fact, I talked with an environmental policy expert in the Department of Defense this afternoon; and he believes that by the time FutureGen is built, if it's built -- by the way the DOD has bought into solar technology, not coal technology -- he believes that it will be a dinosaur. And it's moving us in the wrong direction. We have to focus on sustainable energy.
So what does that mean for Tuscola and some of the other communities that have embraced this and, certainly, for our state that would benefit so much from some economic change and some jobs and putting some extra folks to work here with the wonderful talents that we have. Because we do. We have all the talent here that you would ever need

0073

to do this project. And we have all the support and
#1 education here that you would ever need to do this project.
But what if we changed the project? What if we made it truly sustainable energy? There are a growing number of scientists that believe that the money spent right now on coal technology is wasted money, that, in fact, that same money, spent on solar technology, wind technology, or biomass would be far better used and a far better support of our taxpayer dollars.
So I'm sharing this with you today, not because I'm trying to be argumentative; because I'm not. I, in fact, I tend to be somebody who just wants to encourage and support; and I'm not a cheerleader, exactly; but you know, I do want to, to be supportive. But I can't be supportive of this. You know, I have to be truthful about the issues that exist.
But I do want to provide you with more information. And what I have done is put together some web sites of various information regarding sustainable technology and other choices that we could make rather than moving in this direction that would truly put us on the map as the future community.
Now, when I was at the coffee shop, they had green paper; so, of course, I had to put it on green paper. But

0074

I'm going to put it over there on the table; and, if anyone is really interested in seeing an alternative or looking at some alternatives, it will be over there.
Thank you very much.

T29. Robertson, Ann

Response to Comment #1: The effects of long-wall mining for coal are well known and well described in general. FutureGen does not aim to change mining techniques, and for the proposed project DOE has no decisions that would affect coal mining, as coal mining techniques are not within the scope of the FutureGen Project. Additionally, DOE oversees numerous projects on a wide variety of renewable energy generation technologies, including wind, solar, and hydro. However, the particular goal of the FutureGen Project is to demonstrate an advanced power generation facility based on fossil fuels, specifically coal.

T30. Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)

Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

CHAPIN ROSE: Thank you. And I apologize for being late. We were in this overtime session. We have to be back at 9 a.m. tomorrow. But I hope that the fact that I'm here to tell you how important I view this project.

And with that, I want to begin; and I don't want to bore the folks who were in Mattoon the other night, but welcome. Welcome to Illinois. Welcome to Tuscola this time. I absolutely hope that you have enjoyed your visit. I know that this is a wonderful community, a wonderful place to live. And I just heard Mr. Ribley tell you a little bit about why we think Illinois should be the new home of FutureGen.

I want to highlight, just for a second, a few things. The geology is here. The geology is here. We have the cap rock seals. They have not been perforated, unlike our competitor's state.

The technology is here. The University of Illinois is 20 minutes to the north. Eastern Illinois is 20 minutes to the south. And SIU and their coal development laboratory is not too far beyond that.

Finally, and I think most importantly, the coal is here. As I understand this project, it's designed

0038

specifically to find an economic use for the high sulphur, so-called bad coal. That bad coal is strewn all about the State of Illinois. All about Kentucky. All about Indiana. And, you know, we've been outreaching to our

#1 neighbors and our neighboring states to bring them on board in order to bring this project home.

Something else I want to just talk about. And I think Matt Jones from Tim Johnson's office touched on, is the unprecedented scope of the cooperation this has brought on. The governor's office, Governor Blagojevich's office; the DCO; Director Lavin, who was at the Mattoon meeting; Mr. Ribley; Tim Johnson; John Shimkus; our congressional delegations; our local folks. You know the Mayor of Tuscola is over here, Mayor Kleiss. The Mayor of Mattoon. I have, in my 5 years of office, never seen anything like this. Never seen anything like this.

On the floor of the House of Representatives today, I, a Republican, had a conversation with the Democratic Speaker of the House about FutureGen. This is unprecedented in its scope, the cooperation to bring this project to the State of Illinois.

I want to close my remarks, again, by welcoming you and Chairman Mudd and the members of the panel. We appreciate you being here. I hope that your stay was

0039

enjoyable. If there's anything we can do to make it more so, please let us know. My office is certainly at your disposal.

And, finally, I just want to reiterate. The technology is here. The geology is here. The coal is here. We want FutureGen here in Illinois. So thank you very much, and I hope you enjoy the rest of your stay

T30. Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T31. Schumann, Robert

FutureGen Project

Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of the FutureGen Project
U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

TUSCOLA

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2007.

#1 Robert is 1/4 participant in The Schaaemann family Trust 10 Acres of Trust is/was held in option for the CO2 sequestration site for the Tuscola plant

I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE FINAL FUTUREGEN EIS [X] HARD COPY [X] CD / SUMMARY

NAME Robert Schumann ORGANIZATION

ADDRESS 1393 Martingals CITY Eugene STATE OR ZIP 97401

E-MAIL ADDRESS

T31. Schumann, Robert

Response to Comment #1: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Groundwater impacts.

"At Tuscola, under low-flow periods, the Kaskaskia River water that would serve as the plant's process water could be augmented with water drawn from the Mahomet Aquifer."

"Lyondell-Equistar Chemicals currently draws its raw water supply from an existing intake structure along the Kaskaskia River, and supplements its water supply during low-flow conditions by pumping water from wells near Bondville, Illinois, which are screened in the Mahomet aquifer. **#1** This supplemental water is conveyed to the intake structure at Lyondell-Equistar Chemicals via the Kaskaskia River."

It should be noted that an error was recently discovered in the Kaskaskia River stream gauge at Tuscola. New measurements indicate that water flows in the Kaskaskia River have been significantly larger than previously reported – as much as 2.5 times larger. The Illinois State Water Survey is conducting further measurements to complete a new calibration curve for the stream gauge. As a result, it is anticipated that augmenting the river's flow with water drawn from the Mahomet Aquifer will be required even less frequently than predicted.

Noise from train operations.

Noise levels for the Tuscola Site during coal unloading would increase by less than 3 dBA at the three closest residential receptors and by up to 12 dBA at 12 other residential receptors within **#2** approximately 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) of the site boundary.

The numbers in this statement are reversed. The larger 12dBA increase would be at the closest receptors and the <3dBA increase at the others. Also here and in Sections 4.14 and 5.14, it should be noted that noise impacts at the closest receptors can be mitigated by 5-10 dBA if earthen berms are constructed along the site perimeter. Planting of trees also mitigate noise levels somewhat.

Description of surface water crossings by utility corridors.:

"the proposed CO2 pipeline at the Tuscola Site would cross <u>seven</u> surface waters,"

#3 Section 5.7.3.1 of the draft EIS, page 5.17-11, says," The proposed CO2 pipeline would cross <u>four</u> surface water bodies: one unnamed tributary to the Tuscola No. 4 drainage ditch, and three unnamed tributaries to the Kaskaskia River." Also, the study of wetland areas associated with the Tuscola site conducted by Hey and Associates found that the CO2 pipeline would cross only <u>one</u> wetland as stated in Section 5.8.3.1 on page 5.8-8. These statements are contradictory. We believe **<u>one</u>** surface water is the correct number.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Tuscola groundwater impacts

Operations:
Process water source; treated wastewater primary source, ultimate source is the Kaskaskia River.
Shortterm
impacts from supplemental use of groundwater. Aquifer: Mahomet (supplemental only), Aquifer capacity: 16 to17 million gallons per day (61 to 64 million liters per day)

#4 The primary source is an industrial reservoir filled with water from the Kaskaskia River. While the river flow may include quantities of treated waste water and some treated waste water may be returned to the reservoir, the river is the main water source.

Also, the aquifer capacity, stated for the Tuscola site as 16 to 17 million gallons per day (MGD), is too low to be the yield for the entire Mahomet aquifer. The potential yield from the Mahomet and overlying aquifers was estimated to be 445 MGD (Visocky and Schicht, 1969). The 16 to 17 MGD figure may be the total pumping capacity of the wellfield used by the Tuscola chemical company that pumps groundwater from the Mahomet aquifer and discharges to the Kaskaskia River. A well capacity of 12,000 gallons/min converts to 16+ MGD.

Existing Air Quality

#5 "The nearest non-attainment areas are located in Indianapolis, Indiana (152 miles [244.6 kilometers] away) and Vigo County, Indiana (71 miles [114.3 kilometers] away)."

This location is correct; however the distance appears to be in error. IEPA had originally provided information indicating that the distance to the nearest nonattainment area (O_3) is 86.3 miles not 152 miles.

Cities within ROI

#6 "Tuscola is not within 50 miles (80.5 kilometers) of any of the 10 largest cities in Illinois. The closest of the 10 largest cities to Tuscola is Springfield to the west."

While technically correct, the twin cities of Champaign and Urbana, when considered as a single metropolitan area, would be the sixth largest in the state, and is only 24 miles north of Tuscola.

Thickness of optional reservoir

#7 "At the Tuscola Site, the St. Peter is estimated to be over 200 feet (61 meters) thick with good lateral continuity and permeability."

The correct figure is 100 feet. The St. Peter at Mattoon is known to be 200ft thick, but the value for Tuscola is in doubt, but is estimated at 100ft. Other references to this thickness in the EIS correctly use the 100ft. figure.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Powerplant site surface geology

"The surficial geology of the power plant site includes glacial deposits that are likely 40 to 250 feet (12.2 to 76.2 meters) thick."

While the thickness of the surficial deposits may have this large range in thickness within a 5 to 10 mile radius of the Tuscola site, at the site itself, the thickness is about 180 to perhaps about 220 or a little more. This is based on several pieces of information. There is a tributary bedrock valley mapped on the statewide bedrock topography map. In addition, the site is on the east flank of the Arcola moraine, a late Wisconsin feature of the Lake Michigan lobe. The glacial sediment in the moraine is a few 10's of feet thicker than surrounding plain. The ISGS drilled two test holes on the south side of the site with the GeoProbe last year and were stopped by resistance to drilling at about 42 feet. A paleosol was encountered at this depth, developed in older glacial deposits. (There are two paleosols developed in older glacial deposits at the nearby Tuscola quarry, one at about 20 feet, and one at about 35 feet).

There are few water-well records and engineering boring records that penetrate the glacial deposits and encounter rock. None are at the site, but ones near the site indicate a thickness of about 200 feet. At the town of Tuscola, records indicate a thickness of about 120 to 150 feet, and at the nearby Tuscola quarry it is just 40 feet thick.

#8 We suggest replacing this statement with the following"

> "The surficial geology of the power plant site includes glacial deposits that are about 200 feet thick. The site is underlain by a tributary to the Pesotum bedrock valley segment of the Mahomet bedrock valley system which has an elevation as low as 450 feet at the site. Within a 5-mile radius of the Tuscola site, the thickness of unconsolidated deposits ranges from less than 50 feet to more than 200 feet. At the Tuscola Quarry, 4 miles east of the Tuscola site, the thickness of unconsolidated deposits is about 40 feet."

Sources of information:

Herzog, B.L.. B.J. Stiff, C.A. Chenoweth, K.L. Warner, J.B. Sievering, C. Avery, 1994
Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, Illinois
ISGS GIS Database
GISDB_BEDGEO.IL_Bedrock_Topography_1994_Ln

Illinois State Geological Survey, 1994
Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, Illinois
ISGS GIS Database
GISDB_QTGEO.IL_Drift_Thickness

Hansel, K., Berg, R. C., Phillips, A.C., and Gutowski, V.G, 1991, Glacial sediments, landforms, paleosols, and a 20,000-year-old forest bed in east-central Illinois: Geological Society of American North-Central Section 33rd Annual Meeting, April 1999, Illinois State Geological Survey, Guidebook 26, 31p.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Nearby wells

"The Tuscola Site subsurface ROI is surrounded by operating and abandoned petroleum exploration and production wells, with several hundred within 5 miles (8.0 kilometers) of the proposed injection site, and likely approaching 100 within 2 miles (3.2 kilometers)."

#9 According to ILOIL (http://runoff.isgs.uiuc.edu/website/iloil/viewer.htm), there are 197 operating and abandoned oil and gas wells within a two mile radius of the Tuscola injection site. Of the 197 wells, 9 are active gas storage wells operated by NGPL in the Cooks Mills Consolidated field in the Cypress sandstone, 5 are active oil wells in the Rosiclare, McClosky, and St Louis at Cooks Mills, 90 are plugged Rosiclare oil wells at Cooks Mills, 37 are plugged Rosiclare oil wells in the Chesterville East field about 1.5 to 2.0 miles N-NW of the injection site, and 56 are plugged dry holes. All the dry holes had Mississipian targets, except 3 drilled to Devonian, and 3 to the Trenton.

Seismic activity

#10 "The most recent seismic event, on December 6, 2006, was a 2.7 magnitude earthquake centered 101 miles (162.5 kilometers) from the midpoint between the power plant and sequestration site."

The 2006 date is incorrect. Chapter 4 references this same event as occurring in 2005.

Impacted aquifers

#11 "Because neither the specific aquifer to be used for the water supply nor well locations have yet been selected, the analysis addresses a number of aquifers that could be used."

The process water supply source description and the analysis that follows this statement clearly indicate that the Mahomet aquifer is the only aquifer that might be impacted (indirectly) by the water supply from the Kaskaskia River.

CO2 Plume Radius

#12 "Reservoir modeling indicates that the largest plume radius would be approximately 1.2 miles (1.9 kilometers) over 50 years of injection at a rate of 1.1 million tons (1 MMT) per year."

The radius here is incorrect. In all other references to the Tuscola plume radius the number given is 1.1 miles (1.8 kilometers).

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

#13	Historic preservation at powerplant site. "IHPA concurrence with the results and recommendations contained in the archaeological survey report is pending." On January 30, 2007, IHPA concurrence was received stating that no significant historic, architectural, and archaeological resources are located in the proposed project area. This letter is attached in Appendix A of the EIS.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Response to Comment #1:	This information will be taken into account as the design process progresses; therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #2:	Noise levels for the Tuscola Site during coal unloading would increase by less than 3 dBA at the three closest residential receptors and at four other residences within 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) of the site boundary. Text in Table 3-13 was revised as follows: "Operations: Sound enclosures, barrier walls, earthen berms, or dampening devices could be used whenever possible. In addition, alternate site configurations could be considered in order to position noise-producing equipment away from the impacted receptors (Mattoon and Tuscola)."
Response to Comment #3:	The EIS provides separate discussions of surface water resources (i.e., streams/draws) and wetlands. Therefore, the statements in the EIS regarding impacts to surface water crossings and wetland crossings at the Tuscola Site are not contradictory. The one wetland in the CO_2 alignment (confirmed by Hey and Associates) is classified as a PUB (Palustrine pond, Unconsolidated Bottom) and has been added to the Surface Water discussion. The EIS, however, has not been revised to include stream discussions in the wetland sections. The following text revisions have been made: Table S-12 and Table 3-3 - the pipeline stream crossings for Tuscola have been changed from "7" to "4" (this number was incorrectly presented in the EIS impact tables). Text in Section 3.1.7 for Tuscola has been revised from "seven" to "five" surface waters. This revision corrects the stream crossings to four, and also includes the PUB surface water wetland, totaling five surface water crossings. In addition, text in Section 5.7.3.1 under the CO_2 pipeline has been revised as follows: "The proposed CO_2 pipeline would cross five surface water bodies: one wetland (pond), one unnamed tributary to the Tuscola No. 4 drainage ditch, and three unnamed tributaries to the Kaskaskia River."
Response to Comment #4:	Table 3-3 and S-12 were revised to say: "Aquifer capacity: 445 million gallons per day (1.7 billion liters per day) for the Mahomet and overlying aquifers (Visocky and Schicht, 1969)." A footnote was added to say: "Figures represent estimated additional aquifer capacity, not total capacity. Lyondell-Equistar well field currently has a capacity of 16 to 17 million gallons per day (61 to 64 million liters per day)." The primary source of process water is an industrial reservoir filled with water from the Kaskaskia River. The 16-17 million gallons per day estimate is for the well field belonging to the chemical company, and it is located near Bondville, approximately 20 - 25 miles north of the site. The water from this well field is used to supplement natural flows in the Kaskaskia River and is conveyed to the plant by the river. The 445 million gallons per day figure from Visocky & Schicht is for the entire Mahomet aquifer over its entire area, which includes Champaign-Urbana.
Response to Comment #5:	DOE confirmed the distances from Tuscola to the cities listed in the EIS using Google Maps. The text will remain as presented in the EIS. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

T32. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8.)

Response to Comment #6:	DOE confirmed the distances from Tuscola to the cities listed in the EIS using Google Maps. The text will remain as presented in the EIS. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #7:	The text in Section 5.4.2.1 was revised as follows: "At the Tuscola Site, the St. Peter is estimated to be over 100 feet (30 meters) thick with good lateral continuity and permeability."
Response to Comment #8:	The Commentor's more specific estimate is encompassed by the range that is stated in the EIS. Because there is no certainty that the range in the EIS is incorrect, the text will remain as presented in the EIS. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #9:	The text *in Section 5.4.3.2* has been revised from "approaching 100 within 2 miles (3.2 kilometers)" to "between 100 and 200 within 2 miles (3.2 kilometers)." Physically counting the number of wells on the listed website (GIS interactive map) showed 187-197 wells in the sections within a 2 mile distance depending on exact site location, but only 146-156 wells were within a 2-mile (3.2-kilometer) radius circle. These numbers vary slightly based on location of the sequestration site in the section but are still significantly higher than the stated 100 wells in the EIS for the 2 mile radius. To further clarify information provided in the comment, the Trenton is limestone strata of Ordovician age that in some locations has been altered to a dolostone, increasing its porosity. This strata is well above the Mt. Simon target reservoir.
Response to Comment #10:	The date in Section 5.4.2.2 was revised to December 6, 2005.
Response to Comment #11:	The following text was deleted from Section 5.6.1.2: "Because neither the specific aquifer to be used for the water supply nor well locations have yet been selected, the analysis addresses a number of aquifers that could be used."
Response to Comment #12:	Text in Section 5.6.3.2 was revised as follows: "Reservoir modeling indicates that the largest plume radius would be approximately 1.1 miles (1.8 kilometers) over 50 years of injection at a rate of 1.1 million tons (1 MMT) per year.
Response to Comment #13:	The text in Section 5.10.3.1 was revised as follows: "IHPA concurrence with the results and recommendations contained in the archaeological survey report is pending." has been deleted and replaced with "On January 30, 2007 IHPA concurrence was received stating that no significant historic, architectural, and archaeological resources are located in the proposed project area (see Appendix A)."

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK