Texas – Both Sites
Table of Comments

Commentor (Alphabetical)	Commentor #
Calhoun County Resource Watch (Wilson, Diane)	TX2
FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)	TX7
FutureGen Texas Team (Walden, Steven – Walden Consulting)	TX5
Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (Carrigan, Michael T.)	TX6
Sembritzky, David	TX3
Texas Commision on Environmental Quality (Weber, Thomas W.)	TX8
Texas Department of Transportation (Barta Jr., James P.)	TX4
Trainor, Eileen	TX1

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TX1. Trainor, Eileen

From: Eileen Trainor [et02@rocketmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 23, 2007 2:08 AM
To: FutureGen.EIS@netl.doe.gov
Subject: No More Coal in Texas

#1 The Associated Press analyzed state-by-state emissions of carbon dioxide from 2003, the latest U.S. Energy Department numbers available.
The review shows startling differences in states' contribution to climate change. The biggest reason? The burning of high-carbon coal to produce cheap electricity.

#2 Texas, the leader in emitting this greenhouse gas, cranks out more than the next two biggest producers combined, California and Pennsylvania, which together have twice Texas' population.

#3 No more coal. We have natural resources that we are not using: solar energy, wind energy, geothermal power, power from biomass, power from methane.

You have children or nieces, nephews, God children, children of family friends. Would you burn coal in your fireplace with these people present?

If we start now, we MAY make a difference to the future health of our children in Texas.

Thank you.

Eileen Trainor
503 Picasso Drive
San Marcos, TX 78666
512 353 4870

TX1. Trainor, Eileen

Response to Comment #1:	Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #2:	Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #3:	DOE oversees numerous projects 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 Project 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.

TX2. Calhoun County Resource Watch (Wilson, Diane)

From: WilsonAlamobay@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2007 2:56 PM
To: FutureGen.EIS@netl.doe.gov
Subject: Comments on the proposed Future Gen Project, DEIS

#1 I am a citizen and President of an environmental group. We are concerned about clean air in Texas. Due to our extremely low air quality, we are not interested in the addition of ANY coal related plants in Texas no matter what form they may take. In light of the recent approval of the Oak Grove plant, one of the dirtiest plants in the country that will significantly deteriorate further our currently unacceptable air quality, action must escalate if there is to be any hope of protecting the air and water of Texas. We oppose any and all additions of coal technology as it has become abundantly clear that the powers designed to protect us have failed. As citizens we want clean alternative energy development such as wind and solar power generation. Just the mining of coal destroys and pollutes our land.

Thank you very much
Diane Wilson
Calhoun County Resource Watch
Box 1001
Seadrift, Texas 77983t

TX2. Calhoun County Resource Watch (Wilson, Diane)

Response to Comment #1: Oak Grove is addressed in Section 3.3.3.2 and Section 3.3.4.2 of the EIS.

Additionally, DOE oversees numerous programs that are investigating and supporting a wide variety of renewable energy generation technologies, including winds, 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, and will use state-of-the-art technologies to minimize air emissions. Technologies that would not be based on coal use are not within the scope of this EIS. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.

TX3. Sembritzky, David

From: David Sembritzky [sembritzky@iname.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2007 2:05 PM
To: FutureGen.EIS@netl.doe.gov
Subject: Solar power

To Whom it May Concern,

#1 Solar power is the only way to go!

Sincerely,
David

David Sembritzky
3349 Wilshire Ave
Grapevine, Texas 76051-8727
sembritzky@iname.com

(817) 416-4234 (H)
(817) 280-3786 (W)
(817) 278-3786 (FAX)

TX3. Sembritzky, David

Response to Comment #1:	DOE oversees numerous projects 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 Project 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.

TX4. Texas Department of Transportation (Barta Jr., James P.)

Texas Department of Transportation

DEWITT C. GREER STATE HIGHWAY BLDG. • 125 E. 11TH STREET • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-2483 • (512) 463-8585

June 13, 2007

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy

FutureGen Project (DOE/EIS-0394D)

Mr. Mark McKoy
NEPA Document Manager
National Energy Technology Laboratory
3610 Collins Ferry Road
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, WV 26507

Dear Mr. McKoy:

#1 Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Department of Energy's FutureGen project. There are no identified concerns for planned highway improvements within the State of Texas regions indicated within the DEIS. However, proposed transmission and utility lines which cross state roadways will require permits from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). Permits are obtained from the TxDOT District office in which the crossing will occur. For more information about permitting in the site specific locations, contact:

Odessa, Texas Site
TxDOT Odessa District
3901 East US Highway 80
Odessa, Texas 79761
(432) 332-0501

Jewett, Texas Site
TxDOT Bryan District
1300 N. Texas Avenue
Bryan, Texas 77803
(979) 778-9600

If you have questions or require additional information, please contact Bryan Phillips at (512) 416-2534.

Sincerely,

James P Barta, Jr.

James P. Barta, Jr., P.E.
Project Management Section Director
Environmental Affairs Division

THE TEXAS PLAN
REDUCE CONGESTION • ENHANCE SAFETY • EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY • IMPROVE AIR QUALITY
INCREASE THE VALUE OF OUR TRANSPORTATION ASSETS

An Equal Opportunity Employer

TX4. Texas Department of Transportation (Barta Jr., James P.)

Response to Comment #1:	The EIS addresses transportation and traffic impacts and anticipated required road improvements; for example, see Summary Table S-12. Although not specifically called out in Table C.1-3 (Permit or Approval Requirements), DOE agrees that utility road crossing permits from cognizant TxDOT District Offices may be required and, if so, would be obtained. The text will remain as presented in the EIS.

TX5. FutureGen Texas Team (Walden, Steven – Walden Consulting)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G10.)

#1 In Figure S-14, the number of injection wells and plumes shown (10) doesn't match injection scenario mentioned in summary (at least 3 or 8 wells, depending on injection rate). Please clarify the discrepancies.

#2 **TCEQ -** In Table S-12, regarding Air Quality – Modeling results suggest a relatively higher probability of exceedances of the SO2 PSD increments and Annual PM2.5 levels that approach the NAAQS at the Jewett site. These are higher than would be expected for the rural East Texas area. The ambient air quality data used for this analysis, described in Appendix E, indicates that all monitors are located in highly urbanized areas not representative of the Jewett area. Please consider the following recommended monitoring locations as more representative alternatives for the Jewett site: Kaufman (SO2, NOx, O3 and PM2.5) - 80 mi.- would probably be the most representative and could replace Dallas North; Fayette County (SO2, NOx, O3 and PM2.5) - 100 mi - would be good second choice and probably should be used instead of Aldine; Tyler Airport (NOx and O3) would also be acceptable; Alabama Coushatta (O3) - 90 mi. - but it has limited use do to the limited number of parameters measured.

#3 **TCEQ -** In Table S-12 regarding Air Quality – The Table lists predicted concentrations from each of the four sites, and Tables E-17 and E-18 of Appendix E list the same information for Jewett and Odessa, respectively, with additional information included as footnotes to the tables. For Jewett, the 3-hr concentration is noted to be the 618th maximum concentration, and the 24-hr concentration is noted to be the 88th maximum concentration. Probabilities of exceeding the short-term SO_2 increment (both 3-hr and 24-hr) are also presented with the listed concentrations. The same approach with different ranked concentrations is also presented for Odessa (33rd maximum concentration for the 3-hr concentration). Please clarify the rationale for selecting the predicted concentrations listed for the SO_2 plant upset scenarios.

#4 Incomplete and Unavailable Information – The DEIS incorrectly suggests that the disposition of the wastewater from the on-site sanitary wastewater treatment plants for the Jewett and Odessa sites is undetermined. Please revise the information to clarify that the on-site wastewater systems will be designed according to standard industry practice to ensure that no discharge occurs.

#5 **TCEQ -** Under the heading, "Annual Monitoring Methods section," the DEIS incorrectly describes the LiDAR technology. Please correct sentence to read "LiDAR is an aerial technique that uses laser pulse travel times from aircraft to land surface…."

#6 In Table 3-3, regarding Summary Comparison of Impacts – Same comments as Table S-12 in SUMMARY

#7 **TCEQ -** Air Quality – The DEIS indicates that "Air modeling was conducted to assess the potential for impacts to ambient air quality conditions at each site from operating the proposed power plant. Because local air quality monitoring data were not available for any of the alternative sites, monitoring data from the closest attainment area to each site were used as a surrogate data for the local background ambient air quality." Information regarding the ambient air data provided in Appendix E indicates that all of the monitoring stations are located in urban areas which are not representative of the rural plant sites in Texas. The Draft EIS then misuses the "high ambient concentrations" taken from the urban background monitors and states that the $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS would be approached at the proposed FutureGen sites. Please revise the Draft EIS to clarify how unlikely this scenario would be considering the very conservative estimates of ambient background concentrations. Please consider the following recommended monitoring locations as more representative alternatives for the Jewett site: Kaufman (SO2, NOx, O3 and PM2.5) - 80 mi.- would probably be the most representative and could replace Dallas North; Fayette County (SO2, NOx, O3 and PM2.5) - 100 mi - would be good second choice and probably should be used instead of Aldine; Tyler Airport (NOx and O3) would also be acceptable; Alabama Coushatta (O3) - 90 mi. - but it has limited use do

TX5. FutureGen Texas Team (Walden, Steven – Walden Consulting)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G10.)

to the limited number of parameters measured. Also, please consider the following recommended monitoring locations as more representative alternatives for the Odessa site: Although Odessa and Hobbs NM sites are good choices, El Paso is not. Other sites that might be used are Carlsbad NM (NOx, O3 and PM2.5) -110 mi, Artesia NM (SO2 and NOx) -130 mi., Lawton OK (O3) - 300 mi, and Big Bend (O3 and PM2.5) - 200 mi.

#7

In Table C.1-3 regarding State and Federal Regulatory and Permitting Requirements – Table C.1-3 incorrectly indicates that 30 TAC 122 would require a state Air Operating Permit to be issued to a minor source if it is determined that a Title V operating permit under the federal CAA would not be required. Please revise the table to clarify that while 30 TAC 122 codifies the Texas rules necessary to implement the delegated federal Title V program, Texas has not established any additional state operating permit requirements not mandated by federal statute.

#8

In Table C.1-3 regarding State and Federal Regulatory and Permitting Requirements – Table C 1-3 cites requirements for a Hydrostatic Test Discharge Permit for Texas but does not include any similar requirement for Illinois. Please revise the table to show comparable regulatory information for both states, as applicable.

#9

In Table C.1-3 regarding State and Federal Regulatory and Permitting Requirements – Upon delegation of the NPDES program, Texas adopted the Texas Pollution Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) program. Please revise the table to reference TPDES, rather than NPDES, requirements.

#10

In Table C.1-3 regarding State and Federal Regulatory and Permitting Requirements – Table C 1-3, in reference to Solid Waste Management, On-Site Disposal of Nonhazardous Industrial Solid Waste (30 TAC Ch. 335), inappropriately describes requirements for the permitting of hazardous waste disposal. The disposal or treatment of hazardous waste is not anticipated on the FutureGen site, and associated permitting should not be applicable. Please revise the table to clarify that on-site disposal of nonhazardous waste does not require a permit in Texas.

#11

RRC - In Table C.1-3 regarding State and Federal Regulatory and Permitting Requirements – Table C 1-3, in reference to Underground Injection Control Permit includes typographical errors. Please revise the table to change "Texas Council on Environmental Quality" to "Texas Commission on Environmental Quality" and the term "projective" of oil, gas or geothermal resources in the second sentence to "productive."

#12

TCEQ - Air Modeling Protocol – The appendix notes that the TCEQ pre-processed AERMET data are required in AERMOD modeling analyses. These AERMET pre-processed data are not required. The meteorology used for Texas is conservative screening meteorology--predicted concentrations, particularly long-term averages, will be higher than would be expected if more refined surface roughness length values were used. An applicant can always run AERMET with the proper technical justification for representative selections of Albedo, Bowen Ratio, and surface roughness length in AERMET.

#13 Please revise the following text in section E.3.2.1:

"The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality's (TCEQ) Air Dispersion Modeling Team (ADMT) has prepared AERMOD meteorological data sets that can be used for air dispersion modeling in the state of Texas."

"The preprocessed meteorological data sets provided by TCEQ incorporate conservative values of the above three surface characteristics."

In Table 2-1 regarding Summary of Surface and Subsurface Features of Four Candidate Sites – The Climate data for the Jewett and Odessa sites, labeled as "Range of Seasonal Precipitation," is incorrect and actually reflects monthly seasonal averages. Please revise the table to reflect actual annual averages, comparable to the Illinois data, of approximately 42.6 inches for Jewett and 14.9 inches for Odessa.

#14

TX5. FutureGen Texas Team (Walden, Steven – Walden Consulting)

(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G10.)

Response to Comment #1:	Figure S-14 shows 10 wells. This is consistent with text in Table S-4 which states that a minimum of eight wells would be needed to support a 2.8 million tons (2.5 MMT) per year injection rate. The figure illustrates a scenario using two more wells than the minimum required to support a 2.8 million tons (2.5 MMT) per year injection rate. If Odessa were selected, the final number and position of wells will reflect more detailed site characterizations. The text also points out that a lower injection rate could require only three wells. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.
Response to Comment #2:	The issue of representative ambient air monitoring site was discussed in detail with the Site Proponent and DOE used information from data that were available. Since there are no actual monitoring stations within the ROI of the site, it would be making more assumptions as to the representativeness of any monitoring station that would be chosen. As part of the air permitting process, it would be more appropriate to consider monitoring at the site, if it is selected. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.
Response to Comment #3:	DOE used the same analytical approach for all sites as described in Appendix E. As described in Appendix E, the different maximum concentrations were used to show at what stage the increments were exceeded and to calculate the probability of that exceedance occurring. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.
Response to Comment #4:	In Section S.9.1, the text was revised as follows: "Design and construction details of the on-site wastewater systems that will employ standard industry practices to achieve zero liquid discharge at Jewett and Odessa."
Response to Comment #5:	Text in Section 2.5.2.2 has been revised as follows: "LiDAR is an aerial technique that uses laser pulse travel times from an aircraft to the land surface to obtain high resolution topography data."
Response to Comment #6:	Table 3-3 was revised to reflect changes made to Table S-12 in the Summary.
Response to Comment #7:	The issue of representative ambient air monitoring site was discussed in detail with the Site Proponent and DOE used information from data that were available. Since there are no actual monitoring stations within the ROI of the site, it would be making more assumptions as to the representativeness of any monitoring station that would be chosen. As part of the air permitting process, it would be more appropriate to consider monitoring at the site, if it is selected. Therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.
Response to Comment #8:	Table C.1-3 was revised as requested. In Table C.1-3, the description for the Air Operating Permit was changed to read: "Required for non-major sources designated by EPA, through rulemaking, and as specified by federal requirements. If EPA designated the FutureGen facility as a non-exempt, non-major source, it would be required to obtain a federal, not a state, operating permit. Texas has no State Operating Permit program."

TX5. FutureGen Texas Team (Walden, Steven – Walden Consulting)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G10.)

Response to Comment #9:	Table C.1-3 was revised as requested. Text for Hydrostatic Test Discharge Permit was added under Illinois State Permitting as follows: "NPDES Temporary Discharge Permit (General Forms 1 and 2E and Form ILG67)."
Response to Comment #10:	Table C.1-3 was revised to reference TPDES, not NPDES, requirements.
Response to Comment #11:	Table C.1-3 was revised as requested. The words "permitting under" were replaced with "requirements of."
Response to Comment #12:	Table C.1-3 has been revised as follows: "Authorization from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality is required for injection below the base of usable quality water and that is not productive of oil, gas, or geothermal resources."
Response to Comment #13:	Although not a regulatory requirement the AERMET data is required by the AERMOD modeling software for a complete analysis. The text was modified as requested to provide clarity and better describe the state's role in the modeling data.
Response to Comment #14:	Table 2-1 in the revised Risk Assessment regarding Summary of Surface and Subsurface Features of Four Candidate Sites was revised under "climate" to show the headings: "Average Seasonal Daily Temperatures," "Average Seasonal Precipitation" and "Annual Precipitation" and values were updated accordingly. Specifically, annual precipitation was revised to 42.6 inches for Jewett and 14.9 inches for Odessa.

TX6. Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (Carrigan, Michael T.)

Jul 16 07 01:58p IL AFLCIO 2175440225 p.3

534 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1705
217/544-4014 • FAX: 217/544-0225

ILLINOIS AFL CIO

55 West Wacker Drive, Suite 716
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1609
312/251-1414 • FAX: 312/251-1420

OFFICERS
Michael T. Carrigan, President
Tim Drea, Secretary-Treasurer

www.ilafl-cio.org

July 16, 2007

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

SENT VIA FAX: (304) 285-4403

Dear Mr. McKoy:

Following up on the formal comment made by staff member Mr. William Looby at the Tuscola Public Hearing held June 28, 2007, the Illinois AFL-CIO would like to request that the U.S. Department of Energy investigate further the wages presented by the Texas sites in the Socioeconomics portion of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Our research shows that both the Jewett and Odessa-area wages for construction trades are significantly higher than indicated in the draft EIS.

#1 For example, using Texas Workforce Development Board statistics, construction workers in the Jewett area make anywhere from 40 percent to 90 percent more by trade that what is indicated in the EIS. In the Odessa area, the range is smaller but not by much – from 25 percent more to 90 percent by trade.

While we acknowledge Illinois is a higher wage state than Texas and the numbers will bear that out, we believe through our ample and highly skilled workforce our construction trades will make this project a complete success.

We implore the DOE to make sure the wage rates are accurate in order to provide a complete picture of what the two states have to offer. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter and don't hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael T. Carrigan
President

ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

07/16/2007 03:05PM

TX6. Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (Carrigan, Michael T.)

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.

TX7. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

Monitoring

"Although injection-induced seismicity is unlikely, monitoring methods discussed in Section 6.4.4 would further reduce the possibility of accidentally inducing seismicity"

#1

The referenced section 6.4.4 (7.4.4) does not exist in the EIS. In fact, no section of the document thoroughly addresses the means and methods that will be used to monitor the injected CO2 plume or to provide early detection of leaks from the CO2 pipelines and storage formations.

Wage rates

"Table 6.19-3 (7.19-3) provides 2003 average hourly wages for Freestone, Leon, and Limestone counties (Ector County) for trades that would be required for construction of the proposed project. The minimum and maximum wages for these trades were not available.

#2

Wage rates for these areas of Texas are available at the Texas Workforce Commission website: http://www.tracer2.com/cgi/dataanalysis/AreaSelection.asp?tableName=Oeswage. Also, the wages sited by this source seem significantly higher than those given in the corresponding tables.

TX7. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

Response to Comment #1:

The referenced Sections 4.4.4; 5.4.4; 6.4.4; and 7.4.4 were typographical errors and the correct Section reference is 2.5.2.2. A discussion of continuous monitoring methods proposed for the FutureGen Project has been inserted into Section 2.5.2.2. These monitoring methods include the use of micro-tiltmeters that would continuously record measurable changes in surface tilt from the CO_2 plume. Also, monitoring wells would be drilled to the top of the primary seal and would house a permanent microseismic array for monitoring faint earth tremors (microseisms). Therefore, these sentences have been revised in Sections 4.4.3.2; 5.4.3.2; 6.4.3.2; and 7.4.3.2 to state "Although injection-induced seismicity is unlikely, monitoring methods discussed in Section 2.5.2.2 would alert the operator of pressure build-up that could lead to induced seismicity, where appropriate remediation strategies could be employed to prevent or minimize adverse impacts."

The text describing continuous monitoring methods (including use of micro-tiltmeters) was added to the Response and to Section 2.5.2.2. as follows: "Continuous Monitoring Methods

A Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system would continuously monitor and transmit flow rate, pressure, and temperature information from the injection wells to a central data collection point. An Eddy Covariance tower(s) would measure atmospheric CO_2 concentrations over a large area using an infrared gas analyzer and measure local meteorological variables such as wind velocity, relative humidity, and temperature. Using detectors installed at the wellheads, continuous CO_2 monitoring would also be conducted at existing wells that are within a predicted five-year plume footprint and that penetrate into the injection reservoir. An array of borehole micro-tiltmeters would be installed in shallow (25 foot [7.6 meter]) boreholes arranged in transects extending away from each injection well to the edge of the five-year plume footprint. The micro-tiltmeters would continuously record measurable changes in surface tilt from the CO_2 plume. Monitoring wells would be installed that contain instrumentation for continuously monitoring and recording pressure and temperature in or above the injection reservoir. Additional monitoring wells would be drilled to the top of the primary seal and would house a permanent microseismic array for monitoring faint earth tremors (microseisms)."

Response to Comment #2:

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.

TX8. Texas Commision on Environmental Quality (Weber, Thomas W.)

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

August 1, 2007

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

Re: TCEQ Grant and Texas Review and Comment System (TRACS) #7740, Future Gen Project (DOE/EIS-0394D)

Dear Mr. McKoy:

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has reviewed the above-referenced project and offers following comments:

A review of the project for General Conformity impact in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93 and Title 30, Texas Administrative Code § 101.30 indicates that the proposed action is located in Ector and Leon Counties, which is currently unclassified or in attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for all six criteria air pollutants. Therefore, general conformity does not apply.

#1

Although any demolition, construction, rehabilitation or repair project will produce dust and particulate emissions, these actions should pose no significant impact upon air quality standards. Any minimal dust and particulate emissions should be easily controlled by the construction contractors using standard dust mitigation techniques.

We do not anticipate significant long term environmental impacts from this project as long as construction and waste disposal activities are completed in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal statutes and regulations. We agree with a finding of no significant impact and have no objection to the release of funds for this project. We recommend that best management practices to control runoff from construction sites be utilized to prevent impact to surface and groundwater.

#2

It has been determined from a review of the information provided that an Application for TCEQ Approval of Floodplain Development Project need not be filed with TCEQ. Our records show that the community is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program and as such has a Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinance / Court Order. Accordingly, care should be taken to ensure that the proposed construction takes into account the possible Flood Hazard Areas within the community's floodplains. Please notify the community floodplain administrator to ensure all construction is in compliance with the community's Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinance / Court Order.

#3

P.O. Box 13087 • Austin, Texas 78711-3087 • 512-239-1000 • Internet address: www.tceq.state.tx.us

TX8. Texas Commision on Environmental Quality (Weber, Thomas W.)

Mr. Mark L. McKoy
Page 2
August 1, 2007

Re: TCEQ Grant and Texas Review and Comment System (TRACS) #7740, Future Gen Project (DOE/EIS-0394D)

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Betty Thompson at (512) 239-1627.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Weber

Thomas W. Weber, Manager
Water Programs, Chief Engineer's Office
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

TX8. Texas Commision on Environmental Quality (Weber, Thomas W.)

Response to Comment #1:	Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
Response to Comment #2:	Best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented for the FutureGen Project. Table 3-14 lists BMPs to prevent impacts to surface and groundwater resources.
Response to Comment #3:	The FutureGen Project will obtain all federal, state, and local permitting/approvals required for site construction and operation. This would also include Flood Hazard Area approvals and coordination with the community floodplain administrator.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK