FUTUREGEN 2.0 PROGRAM

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

JUNE 9, 2011

I N D E X

MAIN SPEAKERS:	PAGE
Cliff Whyte	5
Jeff Hoffmann	11
Mike Long	16
Ken Humphreys	20
Cliff Whyte	31
PUBLIC:	
Brad Zeller	37
Kelly Hall	39
Andy Davenport	40/98
David Davenport	49
Jeffrey Niemann	56
Elizabeth Niemann	62
Richard Johnson	68
William Hawks	69
Catherine Edmiston	72
Patty Rykhus	77/101
Alan Rider	82
Reginald Jordan	84/99
Joyce Blumenshine	86
Terry Denison	91
Ginny Fanning	95

FUTUREGEN 2.0 PROGRAM

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

JUNE 9, 2011

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING, on the 9th day of June, 2011, between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 9:30 P.M. of that day, at the Jacksonville Elks Lodge, 231 West Morgan Street, Jacksonville, Illinois 62650, before Robin A. Enstrom, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand Reporter, and a Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois.

A P P E A R A N C E S

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:
Mr. Cliff Whyte
Mr. Jeff Hoffmann
Mr. Tom Sarkus
Mr. Nelson Rekos

AMEREN ENERGY RESOURCES:
Mr. Mike Long
Mr. Steve Whitworth
Mr. Mitch White

FUTUREGEN ALLIANCE:

Mr. Ken Humphreys
Mr. Gordon Beeman
Ms. Gretchen Hund

POTOMAC HUDSON ENGINEERING:

Mr. Fred Carey

Ms. Cynthia Ong

Ms. Andrea Wilkes

Ms. Amanda Tyrrell

Court Reporter:

Robin A. Enstrom, RPR, CSR

Illinois CSR #084-002046

Midwest Litigation Services

15 S. Old State Capitol Plaza

Springfield, Illinois 62701

217.522.2211

800.280.3376

* * * * * * *

(Meeting commenced at 7:00 P.M.)

MR. WHYTE: Welcome to the Department of Energy public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0.

My name is Cliff Whyte, and I am a NEPA compliance officer with the Department of Energy out of Morgantown, West Virginia.

Let the record show that the meeting began on June 9, 2011, at 7:03 P.M., at the Jacksonville Elks Club, in Jacksonville, Illinois.

First, I'd like to thank the club for allowing us to use this venue this evening, and, of course, I'd like to thank all those who are in attendance tonight.

As part of its compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE has determined that an environmental impact statement or EIS, as you'll hear it referred to, should be prepared for this project. The EIS will analyze and describe the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and project alternatives.

Let me be clear that this is a scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. FutureGen 2.0 is not the same project considered under the initial FutureGen

although it shares several concepts such as carbon capture and storage. In addition DOE has or is considering approving other projects in the area, such as the Taylorville Energy Center, and these projects are not part of or related to the FutureGen 2.0 program.

One of the first steps in preparing an EIS is to conduct a public scoping meeting. A public scoping meeting is an opportunity for the public to participate in the evaluation of possible environmental impacts that are associated with the proposed project. It's also an opportunity for the Department of Energy to listen to your concerns about the proposed project -- whether they be environmental issues, economic impacts, social matters, health and safety concerns. The goal is, when we leave here this evening, to determine what are the major issues that are on the mind of the public. Our goal is also to determine what major topics we need to cover in the environmental impact statement.

For your convenience, there are comment sheets also available where you signed in this evening. These can be used to provide written comments. You'll also find that there is an

opportunity on there to mark if you would like to receive a copy of the draft environmental impact statement -- be that hard copy, on CD, or via e-mail a link to the website where it will be posted.

During the informal session tonight, DOE and several of the contractors and project representatives -- we were quite busy this evening, and that's a good thing. We appreciate the turnout this evening. Got to meet a lot of new folks this evening that I hadn't had the opportunity to speak to before and got to hear a lot from you, and that was informative for me. And I appreciate those who took the time to come to the -- or were able to come to the informal portion of the program. We'll continue to do that after the formal portion this evening as long as time allows.

During the formal session tonight, we're going to give some history of the FutureGen project. Also, Ameren Energy Resources and the FutureGen Alliance will each give brief presentations or an overview about their project. I'll give a little bit of background on the National Environmental Policy Act and talk a little bit about the anticipated schedule for the NEPA process.

At that point we will begin the formal comment session, and we will have a couple of elected officials who have asked to speak this evening, and then we'll go down those -- a list of those who preregistered to speak this evening, and then there was a list in the back there of folks who signed up to speak as they came in this evening. And, finally, I'll ask if anybody who didn't sign up on any list has anything they'd like to say this evening or if we have any repeat speakers who would like to come back up.

So we're going to try to limit those comments to five minutes in duration because it looks like we are going to have a number of folks. But whether they be written comments that are turned in, oral comments that are spoken here this evening, faxes, e-mails, what have you -- they count the same in the administrative record. And my contact information is on those comment sheets.

The public scoping period will last through June 22nd, which is a Wednesday, not quite two weeks from now. So if -- even if you submit comments this evening and you think of something later you'd like to add, you're welcome to do so. That comment period will be open for at least two weeks, and DOE

will, to the extent we can, accept late comments. So when you get them in, we'll do our best to incorporate those if practical.

This evening I would like to recognize a few folks who we have with us. I understand Bill Meier is here this evening, Dick Rawlings, and Brad Zeller, the county board chair. I understand we have Mr. Kelly Hall, who is going to represent the mayor of Jacksonville this evening. Ginny Fanning, the executive director of the Jacksonville Area Chamber, and Terry Denison from the Jacksonville Regional EDC is with us this evening. So thank those folks for being here.

Also like to introduce to you a few folks from the FutureGen 2.0 team. Representing the Department of Energy, the gentleman on the end is Mr. Tom Sarkus. He is a division director with the Department of Energy. Seated next to him is Jeff Hoffmann. He's a project manager with the Department of Energy. Mr. Nelson Rekos is seated over here. He's also a project manager with the Department of Energy.

With Ameren Energy Resources we have Mike Long, who is the plant manager; Steve Whitworth,

manager of the environmental services; and Mitch White, the plant technical services supervisor.

With the FutureGen Alliance we have Ken Humphreys. We also have Gordon Beeman, and Gretchen Hund, who is the stakeholder involvement manager.

And I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank the different state agencies that are represented here this evening, especially Sallie Greenberg in the back there with the State of Illinois Geological Survey. She does a lot of hard work in setting up these models and talking the folks through to give you an idea of carbon sequestration, and we appreciate that.

Also this evening, the folks that are sort of running the logistics for this meeting, Potomac-Hudson Engineering. They're a contractor that DOE has retained to write the environmental impact statement at our direction. We have actually the president of Potomac-Hudson Engineering, Fred Carey, with us this evening. He's being assisted by Cynthia Ong, Andrea Wilkes in the back when you came in, and Amanda Tyrrell. Those folks do a great job.

With that I think it's time for us to get on to the formal presentations. The first one will be

DOE's role and some background information from Jeff Hoffmann.

MR. HOFFMANN: I'd like to start -- can everybody hear me in the room? Okay. I'd like to start by giving a very brief overview of what FutureGen 2.0 is.

The U.S. Department of Energy has awarded $1.05 billion to the two primary recipients. The partnership of Ameren, Babcock and Wilcox, and American Air Liquide have been awarded $590 million to test an oxy-combustion technology at utility-scale Meredosia, Illinois.

The FutureGen Industrial Alliance has been awarded approximately $460 million to develop a pipeline and sequestration infrastructure as well as visitor/training/educational facilities.

The FutureGen 2.0 project is a government-industry partnership with the industry partners bringing cost share, and the total project cost -- or total project value approximately $1.3 billion.

The primary objectives of FutureGen 2.0 are to validate the technical feasibility and economic viability of near-zero emission energy from coal.

It's also to verify the effectiveness, safety, and permanence of CO2 sequestered in deep saline formations.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. You need to slow down.

MR. HOFFMANN: Sorry. You're not the first one.

COURT REPORTER: I know.

MR. HOFFMANN: It also intends to establish the standardized technologies and protocols for CO2 measurement, verification, and accounting, typically referred to as MVA.

And important also is to gain domestic and global acceptance of the FutureGen 2.0 concept, facilitating broad deployment of the oxy-combustion technology coupled with CCS.

This slide here illustrates the Department of Energy's major demonstrations program. The Department of Energy, for the past two and a half decades, has been doing similar types of demonstration projects and test projects, developing and demonstrating large-scale clean coal technologies on a utility -- on the utility scale, for example, 100 megawatts and larger. This program has facilitated

moving technology from pre-commercial development to wide-scale commercial deployment. We view FutureGen 2.0 to fit near the tip of this arrow, testing and evaluating a technology that is suitable both for application in the large existing fleet of coal-fired boilers and other steam-based electricity generation, as well as an attractive option for new plants to be built to provide electricity into the future.

This slide represents a number of the projects that are currently being funded out of NETL. What this slide illustrates is approximately seven to eight projects that are large scale and are evaluating carbon capture and sequestration both on power plants as well as industrial plants. The projects that are being managed out of DOE and NETL represent a variety of technology, including IGCC or integrated gasification combined cycle, the technology that would have been used at FutureGen in Mattoon had it gone to completion, as well as post combustion capture, and FutureGen 2.0 is the only oxy-combustion capture in the portfolio.

I'd also like to point out that of the projects depicted here, the majority of them are evaluating carbon capture and sequestration in

depleted oil fields for enhanced oil recovery. The three projects highlighted, including FutureGen 2.0, are plans to evaluate carbon capture and sequestration in deep saline formations.

A very high overview of what carbon sequestration is. Carbon sequestration is basically taking carbon dioxide either out of the air, as in terrestrial sequestration where CO2 is absorbed from the air by plants/animals and incorporated into the biomass, which the incorporation in the biomass is known as terrestrial storage, or point source capture, such as capture that we're trying to test and evaluate at the Ameren plant, the power plant capturing the CO2 and transporting it to sequestration. That point source capture can also be conducted at ethanol plants and other plants and industries that have a high CO2 footprint.

The geologic storage can be stored in saline formations, as we're attempting to do here in FutureGen 2.0, or depleted oil and gas wells, as I had mentioned previously, as well as other formations such as unmineable coal seams, basalts, and shales.

I'd like to emphasize storage in saline formations. This slide here represents some estimates

out of the National Carbon Sequestration Atlas that's produced by NETL as well as some of their partners. What this slide illustrates is that of the three primary formations where CO2 can be stored, including oil and gas fields, saline formations, and unmineable coal seams, saline formations have the greatest storage potential. At least in order of magnitude, greater than the oil and gas fields and unmineable coal seams combined.

I'd also like to point to the figure in the middle -- saline formations with the blue distribution -- to illustrate that, of the three primary formations, saline formations have the broadest distribution and offer one of the closest CO2 sinks for the existing fleet.

I'll close with a slide that talks a little bit about the history of the FutureGen program. FutureGen was originally conceived in the early part of the last decade. It was officially kicked off with March 2004 report to Congress which depicted and described an integrated research initiative with the objective to establish the feasibility and viability of producing electricity from coal with near-zero emissions.

As most of you are probably aware, the original FutureGen had progressed down a pathway, and the FutureGen Alliance had selected Mattoon, Illinois, as the location for the original FutureGen which would have been an IGCC coupled with CCS sequestering CO2 in the Mt. Simon formation in that area of the state. In August of 2010, Secretary Chu announced FutureGen 2.0 as an alternative approach to achieving near-zero emissions with a -- near-zero emission electricity -- electric power from coal, again coupled with CCS and again sequestering it in the Mt. Simon formation.

The point that I'd like to raise here is that, while the technology on the power plant side has changed from FutureGen 2.0 -- the original FutureGen, the goals and the objectives remain the same: to, again, develop and prove the technology, a clean coal near-zero emission technology with carbon capture and sequestration.

And with that, I'd like to introduce Mike Long to describe the Ameren project.

MR. LONG: Good evening. My name is Mike Long, as Jeff said, and I'm the manager of the Meredosia station. Tonight what I'd like to do is provide you with an overview of Ameren Energy

Resources, who we are; an overview of the Meredosia project; and description of oxy-combustion technology.

You're all probably aware of Ameren. Ameren is a corporation that within it has three companies: Ameren Missouri, Ameren Illinois, and Ameren Energy Resources. Ameren Energy Resources as a company had -- is a merchant -- has a merchant fleet of power stations. What that means is that we sell our power to the open non-regulated market.

We have 6,250 megawatts of generation capacity, and last year we produced just shy of 30 terawatt hours of electric production. Our markets are to municipals, cooperatives, power marketers and the like, and that is taken care of for us by another company within AER called Ameren Energy Marketing, and they are responsible for taking the energy that Meredosia produces and selling it to the open market.

The project team: Of course, Ameren Energy Resources, as being the owner/operator of Meredosia, is a part of the team. Babcock and Wilcox are responsible for the boiler island and the gas quality control system. Air Liquide, the air separation unit and compression purification unit; and URS, which was hired by Ameren to be responsible for

the balance of plant and an interconnection of the new facility to that.

Now, when I mention "balance the plant," what that basically means is, in this project, the existing turbine generator and the systems that support that generator will remain. So that's referred to as balance of plant, and the new boiler and associated equipment with their separation unit and gas quality control system will be added to that.

Okay. If you look at Meredosia itself, if you look at the picture, the tall stack on the left part of the picture here -- that is associated with units one and two. The fuel of units one and two is coal. There's another stack on top of the building right there. That is unit three. It is currently operating, and its main fuel is coal as well. I don't know if I mentioned, but the operation of units one and two is currently suspended.

The unit that we're interested in is unit four, and it is located in the yellow triangle area. Unit four was built in 1975. The slide says it's currently idle. It is operational. It's primary fuel is oil. As a result of that, it doesn't run a lot. So what that means is it doesn't have a lot of

operating hours on it, which make it an ideal candidate for this project. The turbine itself is in very good shape. You kind of liken it to a car that sits in the garage all week and you just take it out on Sunday. That's a good analogy for this unit. It's also a 200 megawatt unit, which is an appropriate scale for the next step up in this technology.

Okay. So what is oxy-combustion? Basically, the air that we breathe is approximately 80 percent nitrogen, 20 percent oxygen, and in the normal combustion process, that air is used to combust fuel, and the same volume of air that is used to combust that fuel ends up as CO2 and nitrogen.

In the oxy-combustion process, what we're simply doing is removing the nitrogen from the air and using the oxygen for the combustion, but as part of that process, we have to recirculate some of the CO2 back into the process to take up the volume that was left by the nitrogen.

The plant configuration is basically in three parts. The boiler island or power block is a new oxy-combustion boiler and conventional environmental cleanup equipment, which are -- would be like a baghouse and a scrubber.

On the front end is the air separation unit which separates the oxygen from the air that is used for combustion in the boiler. The flue gas goes through the environmental cleanup equipment. The CO2 is then recycled back, as we mentioned in the last slide, into the boiler for the combustion process. And that small part of volume that is left, if you recall from the last slide, has a highly concentrated stream of CO2. That is sent to the compression purification unit where it's compressed and sent to the pipeline for sequestration.

And I'd like to introduce Ken Humphreys from FutureGen Alliance.

MR. HUMPHREYS: Well, good evening, everyone, and thanks very much for taking time away from home to be here. I want to share a few thoughts with you and then look forward to hearing what a number of you have to say.

In terms of FutureGen 2.0, I am the CEO of the FutureGen Alliance, and so I lead this consortium of companies that have a strong interest in electric power generation and specifically coal. Our ten member companies produce about a third of the coal in the United States. They are also global in scale.

The U.S.-based companies: Alpha, Consol, and Peabody. Also participating in this project with us are Caterpillar, who you know well. They are one of the biggest mining equipment manufacturers in the world. And Joy Global also an equipment manufacturer. Anglo American is from South Africa. In the lower corner, Xstrata is from Australia. Rio Tinto is from the UK, and I think you know -- at least one of those utilities -- Exelon quite well, and then also LG&E, which stands for Louisville Gas and Electric.

Couple of things these companies have in common is they feel the pressure of ever-tightening environmental requirements. They know that there is increasing concern about what should we do with carbon dioxide that today is released freely into the atmosphere, and they all believe that technology is an important part of the solution to address both those environmental issues and also keep electricity affordable and available for homes and businesses, not just in the U.S. but around the world.

A second thing that they all have in common is they are contributing money to this project to push the project and the technology forward. They gain zero in the way of profits. They've foregone all

of that. They ask for no control over the technology. They're doing it strictly from a strategic standpoint that this is a novel kind of technology we need to have in order to move the industry and the planet forward in a more environmentally responsible way.

So what we were proposing to do is -- there you see the Meredosia plant, and, of course, Mike just walked you through what upgrades will happen at that plant. On the back end of the plant -- get the pointer to work -- right there we will compress the CO2 that comes from the plant up to about 2,200 psi. That turns it into a fluid which behaves like a liquid. Then you can pump it. It moves through a pipeline that is approximately 30 miles long to a storage site that is south of Ashland. It is west of Route 123. And at that point it is injected deep into a geologic formation nearly a mile below the surface.

And just one -- couple of things about this graphic that I want to highlight is just thinking about the fact there is nearly a mile of solid rock between the CO2 that is stored and the surface. We get our well water around here in the top couple hundred feet. Of course, we farm -- or you farm on the surface. That distance is about equivalent to the

height of four Empire State Buildings. So the scale, the depth, is enormous, and we'll talk about that more in a minute.

The reason we're doing this is we want to be able to demonstrate how you site, how you permit, how you insure, how you operate in an integrated fashion a power plant that has novel oxy-combustion technology and then safely store that CO2 that would otherwise go up in the atmosphere.

The volume of CO2 that would be stored is 39 million metric tons. The storage site itself would have a very comprehensive suite of monitoring technologies. It is our clear intention to have a lot of redundancy in the monitoring and essentially you might say gold-plated monitoring. We want to try as many different techniques as possible so we have an incredibly thorough understanding of how the CO2 behaves in the subsurface and we know how we can subsequently commercialize this process in other parts of the world.

As Jeff Hoffmann from DOE mentioned, another important characteristic of what we're responsible for is making a substantial investment with DOE in visitor, education, and research

facilities that would help advance carbon capture and sequestration technology. Those investments would also happen in Morgan County. And by doing all these things, it helps meet the overall goal of providing a pathway to future commercial siting in other parts of the country and other parts of the world of near-zero emission coal plants.

Little bit more about the CO2 pipeline. CO2 pipeline technology is very mature. There's 3,600 miles of CO2 pipeline that operate in the U.S. today. It's operated for decades, has an impeccable safety record.

In our case, it's actually a relatively small pipeline, 12 inches in diameter. It's buried no less than four feet below the surface, a bit deeper in agricultural areas, and if we have to do something like go under a road or a stream, then it would be even deeper.

The pipeline itself would be located on an easement, and we've set the minimum distance from any residences or businesses to be 150 feet. Legally you can put a pipeline within 50 feet of a home or a business. It's safe to do that. But we've tried to create a bigger buffer zone just to add to what we

hope will be overall comfort with the pipeline.

And, then, of course, as you route it, you want to make sure -- it doesn't have to go in a perfectly straight line. You want to make sure that you avoid wetlands and parks, and it will be sited accordingly.

Another part of the surface infrastructure are the CO2 wells. There are both wells -- several -- for injecting CO2. There are many more wells that support the monitoring, and I'll say a little bit about that. And we're going to make every effort to design the placement of those wells and how they look to be something that's compatible with existing surface uses.

Selecting the storage site. The FutureGen Alliance has literally years and years of experience looking at the criteria that make for choosing a premium quality storage site. And Morgan County, among the sites that competed, rises to the top of that list. It's just outstanding on a number of different characteristics, and that is certainly the case, that we would hope to site it here.

We do have two alternative sites, one in Douglas County and one in Christian County, which

might raise the question why would we go to an alternate. Well, over the course of the summer, we'll drill a geologic characterization well so we can firsthand look at geology and affirm that what we believe is the case is true about this geology -- it's high quality. If for some reason it's not, we have these alternative sites. All three of those, as you heard from DOE, will be evaluated in the EIS.

I wanted to say a little bit more about the geology. You saw in the first picture where we had a well going down 5,000 feet. This is a little bit more detailed diagram of what that 5,000-foot geologic column looks like. And one thing to note here is this is where you farm. You get your well water in the top couple hundred feet.

If you move down about a thousand feet under the earth, you see that first blue layer. That's a shale. It's also called a caprock. If you saw the demonstration in the back, you certainly know that caprocks are dense, non-porous, and impermeable. So it keeps fluid from either moving up through it or down. We also call that caprock a geologic seal.

Slightly below that you're at a little bit more than a thousand feet, in that range. Near the

Morgan County site there are some small oil and particularly gas resources that exist. Those resources have existed there for millions of years. There are, in fact, some wells nearby that produce some of that gas.

You might be interested to know that CO2 naturally occurs in the subsurface, and so that gas actually includes today some CO2 that is mixed within it. But I think it is worth noting it's been there for millions of years at roughly a thousand feet, hasn't migrated up in the well water, hasn't done damage to surface farmland.

You drop down a little bit further, and you have another layer of this dense shale. So that's the second geologic seal that you have that prevents things from moving up. We're storing CO2 way below that.

You go down here a little bit further, that's right around 2,000 feet deep or so, there's something called the St. Peter sandstone. Not at our site but in many sites around Illinois people store natural gas in that formation. We're injecting CO2. But for decades they safely take natural gas, inject it into that formation, normally in the summer.

They're bringing it from places like Canada, and then in the winter, when it's cold, they draw it back out, and it gets used locally. So I think it's worth noting at this depth it's common to have natural gas storage. It can operate very effectively. It doesn't migrate to the surface.

We're still only halfway down to where we're ultimately looking to put CO2, which is the Mt. Simon sandstone, that very thick yellow band at the bottom. Immediately above it is one of the -- is the thickest of the three shale seals that will help contain the CO2.

And beneath the Mt. Simon, down here at the very bottom, you have solid granite. And when you're down here at this depth, you're talking about geology that's on the order of half a billion years old, and it's a very stable formation to work with, and it's one of the reasons that it's such an attractive geological formation to store CO2.

In addition to storing the CO2, I mentioned we're going to monitor it. And monitoring will be done with a whole range of different wells with seismic approaches, which is sort of like taking a sonogram of the earth. You can do some of these

sonograms by driving trucks over the surface. There are also specialized vertical seismic profile techniques where we can actually put tools down in the ground thousands of feet and it can monitor the behavior of the CO2.

Also, while virtually impossible to have an impact up here near the surface, we will have an array of soil monitors and well water sampling activities ongoing so that we can demonstrate to the world that, long before we start, here's what well water and soils look like and that there is no change in those over time.

The other thing that a really extensive monitoring program does is it allows you to watch literally on a routine basis, annual basis, how the CO2 is behaving when you put it in the subsurface. And if it behaves differently than you think it might, meaning it moves a little slower or a little faster, you can adjust your engineering approach, and if you got a problem, you can stop long before you have any significant negative consequence.

And so, in summary, before I turn it back to DOE and then we listen to you, I think this really is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. It would be the

world's first near-zero emission plant, capture more than 90 percent of the CO2, take all the traditional pollutants and drive them close to near-zero levels. It would be -- the storage site would be fully integrated with the Ameren plant, and what does that do? Well, that helps you use things like Illinois basin coal, which isn't always the cleanest coal in the country when you get it out of the ground, but allows you to use that more cleanly in power plants, and that equals jobs, that equals economic growth for Illinois.

We're also going to create a substantial amount of construction jobs and permanent jobs between the two sides of the project. Most of the construction jobs do come on the power plant side of the project. We are looking to work with landowners who are interested, and we will certainly compensate them for the use of the deep geology under their property, and we'll also -- they will share in a royalty stream.

So one of the things that we hope we can show here is farming can continue and, in a very compatible way, you're providing an additional revenue stream for the American farmer and landowner.

The other thing is it definitely increases the tax base in Morgan County and generates more revenue. And, then, finally, these research facilities we've talked about. That's a 25 to $50 million investment in the community.

So I thank you very much for giving me a bit of extended time there and look forward to hearing what you have to say as well.

Thanks.

MR. WHYTE: Again, I'm Cliff Whyte, and I'll try to move through the NEPA discussion fairly quickly, but I want to give you an overview about why we're here this evening, what NEPA is, and give you a brief explanation of that process moving forward.

The National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA has been around for more than 40 years. It applies to all federal agencies. When federal monies or federal actions or federal decisions are being made, the NEPA process is supposed to guide those so that informed environmental decisions can be made as projects are evaluated. It's a national charter, and it certainly promotes environmental considerations to be involved in the decision-making.

One of the central tenets of NEPA is the

availability of high quality information, and I've had a discussion with a number of folks in the audience this evening about the availability of information and trying to make sure that it's presented in such a way that is understandable to the public and it is available.

We also want to make sure that there's accurate scientific analysis that's used and that we solicit expert agency comments. And by that I mean certain resource areas such as the state historic preservation office need to be consulted, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Army Corps of Engineers as it pertains to wetlands and so forth. So there's a lot of different agencies out there that have very specific expertise that we'll draw on throughout the process.

Last but certainly not least is public involvement, and that brings us to why we're here this evening. This EIS -- it was determined that an EIS would be prepared back in November. The notice of intent appeared in the Federal Register on May 23, 2011. That starts the clock, if you will, on the NEPA process. It's a 30-day public scoping period, and because of the May 23rd publication, the scoping

comments should be received by DOE by Wednesday, June 22nd.

What is an environmental impact statement? It's a compilation of a lot of the data and analysis that I mentioned a little earlier. EIS's are tailored to the specific project; however, they all have common components, and those are listed here. Some of the more -- the purpose and need for agency action and the proposed -- a description of the proposed agency action and description of the reasonable alternatives are always sections that draw a lot of interest. Certainly the proposed project and project alternatives; a description of the affected environment; analysis of potential environmental consequences; a list of those agencies, organizations, and persons that were contacted; and, of course, the public participation and responses to public input that's received.

As many of you saw on one of the posters here this evening, for the FutureGen 2.0 project we're early in this process. We are at the first opportunity for public comment -- for formal public comment.

A draft environmental impact statement

will be prepared at the -- well, it's already being worked on, but it will be prepared based on the comments that we receive here this evening and the analysis that's required to be an EIS, and we anticipate that that will be coming forth in the spring of 2012.

Again, there will be an additional public comment after the EIS is a draft format. That will include a public meeting similar to this before a final environmental impact statement will be prepared and a record of decision ultimately issued. The projected time frame on that is at this point the fall of 2012.

This slide basically reiterates those same dates that I just provided you.

And that gets us back to the purpose of the scoping meeting. This process this evening helps us shape the draft EIS, to find out what's on the minds of the stakeholders, to find out what issues you'd like to see addressed, what data you believe should be incorporated or collected or needs to be considered, and what analysis you'd like to see performed.

On the comment sheets that I referred to

earlier this evening, my contact information is again there. There's a toll-free telephone number and an e-mail address, a fax number, my mailing address. If you can get me information, it goes into the record regardless of the method by which you provide.

Moving along, we're getting to the part of the evening where the actual formal comments will be accepted. We do have a couple of government officials who have asked to speak. We'll go down that list, and, then, again, we'll go to the list of those who preregistered, then the list of those who registered tonight, and then open up to those who have not registered but would like to speak.

A copy of the transcript of this meeting will be available online. It will be on the DOE website. Probably be two or three weeks before that official transcript is posted, but it will be posted.

Because we do have a number of speakers this evening, I'll ask you to limit your comments to five minutes. Because I want to focus on you and listen to the comments, I'll ask Fred over here in the front row to let me know when we're getting close to the five-minute mark, and I'll let you know from the front. I'll ask at that point -- you don't have to

stop speaking immediately but please finish the thought that you're on. If we have additional time, we'll have the opportunity for you to come back up and finish.

Also, a reminder that this is not a question-and-answer session. This is your opportunity to be heard on the record with what your comments, your issues and concerns that need be incorporated into the draft EIS are.

Please also remember that the court reporter is here in the front. We'll ask that you please clearly state your name when you come forward before you begin your comments, and please spell your name for the record so that we make sure that we have it correct.

If our court reporter begins to fall behind, she'll let me know, and I'll give you a sign to please slow down a little bit. We want to make sure that we get everybody's comments.

And, finally, I ask that we all be respectful. The idea here is to collect everyone's public comments. With the number of folks we have in a relatively small room this evening, I'll ask that you be respectful, and whether you agree or disagree

with comments that are being read into the record or spoken into the record, please be respectful.

With that I will ask for the microphone for our stand over here, and also the first speaker this evening will be county board chair Brad Zeller. Please come to the podium.

MR. ZELLER: First, I'd like to thank Mr. Whyte and Department of Energy for coming to Jacksonville. We look forward to seeing you here many more occasions and Mr. Humphreys. Ken, it's always good to see you, and, Mike, thanks for coming up to Jacksonville.

Well, this process started for us with a bang last -- early last fall when Senator Durbin came to Meredosia to announce that FutureGen 2.0 -- they were going to retro the Meredosia power plant as we've learned here in more detail. But we were excited about that -- the Morgan County board -- for the general area because we were hearing all the rumors that the power plant was for sale and that they were going to mothball the whole power plant. So to us that was a great opportunity for us, with the new technology and clean coal, to keep a power plant open in Morgan County and provide numerous jobs for the

next 30 years for that area.

And we know -- if you know Meredosia, it has been a depressed area because the industry has been leaving Meredosia for the last five to seven years approximately. So we were excited for that, and we were looking forward to that project and its continuity.

Then comes the next decision that we were going to be able to put a request for proposal in for the sequestration site. When we found out that our land, the Mt. Simon formation, was more than adequate, and our distance to the power plant was, of course, the most valuable asset, I think, or one of the best assets that we had, we were excited about that part of the project as Morgan County board members trying to generate jobs and revenue for our county.

So when we were fortunate enough to be able to get that part of the project, we were extremely excited as board members. We understand the concerns that the citizens have. We understand the concerns of the area farmers. I happen to live close to that area. So I know a lot of people personally, and it's been a difficult process for us.

But at a county board level, we have had a

great working relationship with Mr. Humphreys and the FutureGen Alliance. They have been open to all of our questions. They have been courteous to all comers. We have had meetings in the area with the farmers and that was much appreciated on our part, and we know that Ken's door is always open, Department of Energy's door is always open. So we feel very comfortable with the way this process has developed so far.

We're looking forward to the project and its completion. We're looking forward to the construction jobs. We're looking forward to the service jobs, and we're looking forward to $1.3 billion invested in Morgan County.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: The next speaker this evening will be Kelly Hall, Jacksonville Community Development Director who is representing the mayor.

Please also remember folks, we have folks in the back. So please hold the mic up close. It isn't picking up real well. Want to make sure we get everybody's comments.

Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: My name is Kelly Hall. I'm the Community Development Director with the City of

Jacksonville, and we would like to welcome everyone to Jacksonville. We think we have a fine community here. I've got a little cheat sheet here so I don't leave anything out.

On behalf of Mayor Ezard and the elected officials of the City of Jacksonville, we want to express our enthusiastic support of the Ameren and FutureGen project. The benefits to the county of Morgan and our community are tremendous at the very least and a blessed boost to our local economy.

Be it known that the City of Jacksonville will enthusiastically continue to provide any assistance needed in the complete support of this project.

Thank you all again for coming to Jacksonville and have a good evening.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

We'll now go to the speakers who preregistered. The first preregistered speaker is Andy Davenport.

MR. A. DAVENPORT: Okay. My name is Andy, A-n-d-y, Davenport, D-a-v-e-n-p-o-r-t, and I live one mile -- can't see my writing without taking those off. I live one mile east of Berea Church on Davenport Road

in eastern Morgan County. My son, David, and I farm a thousand acres of family-owned farmland within a five mile radius of the center the proposed FutureGen carbon dioxide sequestration site.

I would also add that my family has farmed in the Morgan-Sangamon County area since before the Civil War, and I've been farming to pass it on to my son, and any risks associated with that that endangers that farm and the future generations -- my FutureGen is sitting beside me back there in my son's farm.

Okay. We represent over 330 local residents, homeowners, farm owners, and farm tenants in the Ashland-Alexander area who signed a petition strongly opposing the FutureGen underground carbon dioxide storage site five miles north of Alexander on the west side of Old State Route 123 --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you slow down?

MR. A. DAVENPORT: I'll never get through it.

-- centered on what is known locally as the Beilschmidt farm.

We have delivered copies of this petition to the Morgan County commissioners, the Jacksonville

Regional Economic Development council, state Representative Jim Watson, state Senator John Sullivan, U.S. Representative Aaron Shock, U.S. Senator Dick Durbin, and to Governor Pat Quinn.

This petition has been ignored by the FutureGen Alliance in selecting Morgan County for their carbon dioxide storage site even though none of the other three counties in consideration for the site, to our knowledge, submitted a petition against it.

I would like to add a few lines here that aren't associated with the environmental concerns, but no one has brought up about the economic part of it: Ameren's statement to their own employees that the Meredosia power plant tried to keep the increase in power cost to 35 percent with carbon capture and storage. The Department of Energy projects a 40 to 67 percent increase in electric rates with CCS in general.

Research done at Harvard University determined the realistic cost of CCS would be around $150 per ton of carbon dioxide or $.20 per kilowatt hour. Analysts suggest a price ceiling of only $35 per ton to be economically feasible for cap and trade

purposes.

If the carbon capture upgrade at the Meredosia power plant were to be done for all four burners and other coal-fired plants in Illinois were to convert to CCS technology, the cost would be astronomical to electricity consumers.

Okay. I realize the purpose of this meeting is for environmental safety concerns, not to debate the high cost of CCS. The carbon dioxide captured at the Meredosia power plant must be placed under about 2,000 pounds pressure -- psi pressure to keep the gas in liquid form to transport by pipeline to the sequestration site for injection into the Mt. Simon sandstone formation. Natural gas pipelines typically use half that pressure.

In an April Farm Week -- which is the Farm Bureau publication that goes around to farmers statewide. In an April Farm Week publication interview, FutureGen states the top of the Mt. Simon sandstone layer at the storage site is 4,450 feet below the ground surface. However, a map provided at FutureGen's own website shows that depth to only be 3,600 feet. FutureGen's own publication, Request for Site Proposals, on page 24, paragraph 4.1.4, states

that the top of the Mt. Simon sandstone layer must be at least 3,500 feet below the surface to ensure safe storage by keeping the carbon dioxide in supercritical condition, in liquid form. Is the depth to the top of the sandstone formation thus barely adequate by FutureGen's own standards?

Also, in the same Farm Week interview, Sallie Greenberg, assistant director of the Illinois Geologic Survey's Advanced Energy Initiatives, states the proposed carbon dioxide reservoir would be separated from shallow -- less than 80-foot deep -- groundwater supplies by nearly a solid mile of very impermeable shale, limestone, and other rock. Wouldn't that depth be 3,600 feet if the carbon dioxide plume rose to the top of the Mt. Simon sandstone formation?

At an April 26, 2011, meeting held at Berea Church solely for Cass-Morgan Farm Bureau members possibly affected by the FutureGen project, Dr. Robert Finley, director of the Advanced Energy Initiative, Illinois Geologic Survey, stated that the pore space in the Mt. Simon formation was saturated with brine four to five times saltier than the ocean. This is unlike the oil recovery projects we hear about

where that pore space is available. In this case, he says that the pore space is saturated with brine.

He also stated that the carbon dioxide would be in liquid form at the injection depth. As farmers, we use hydraulic systems every day, and we know and respect the force created when liquids are placed under high pressure like that used to inject the liquid carbon dioxide. Liquids are not compressible. We believe that injecting very large quantities of liquid carbon dioxide under extremely high pressure over a period of 30 years will force either the carbon dioxide, the brine, or a combination of the two to either travel a great distance laterally, depending on porosity, or migrate to the surface at the first available crack or fissure available. The question of what eventually occurs may only be answered with the passage of time, perhaps 20 or even 30 years.

Also, a NOVA program aired on public TV on April 27, 2011, showed a carbon dioxide sequestration site at an Algerian natural gas power plant in North Africa where the earth's surface was detected as moving upwards as carbon dioxide was pumped a mile deep into a porous rock formation.

Also, it seems to be a great oversight to allow the circular thousand-acre carbon dioxide sequestration site centered on the Beilschmidt farm to have a major stream, Indian Creek, pass through 4,400 feet or eight-tenths of a mile to the northen part of the sequestration circle. The Indian Creek is formed by springs and field tile outlets near the Morgan and Sangamon County line, actually on our farm, follows a generally east to west course through and drains the northern quarter of Morgan County, entering the Illinois River above Meredosia. Any leakage of brine or carbon dioxide from the sequestration site would be most likely to occur near or in the creek as it follows the lowest part of the landscape.

Brine, carbon dioxide or carbolic acid, and any toxic material carried with that contaminating the creek would be catastrophic and affect groundwater, wild and domestic animals, fish, plant life, and farm fields along the creek. An alternative to this site must be found to avoid polluting this major stream.

A study published in the Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering titled Sequestrating Carbon Dioxide in a Closed Underground Volume, by

Christine and Michael Economides, engineering professors at Texas A&M University, concludes 5 to 20 times more pore space than originally thought is needed for carbon dioxide storage, and it renders geologic sequestration of captured carbon dioxide profoundly non-feasible.

While some FutureGen advocates have dismissed this study, why has FutureGen's CEO Ken Humphreys said the project sequestration site may need to be expanded to 2,500 acres or as much as 10,000 acres? Is that related to this study?

We conclude by commenting that agriculture and coal mining are counterproductive. I grew up in Pawnee in southern Sangamon County, and we lost 20 acres of our farm to subsidence for coal mining. We ended up selling the 20 acres to a local church, and they built the church on five acres and the other 15 acres is underwater.

The older practice of coal mining that required roof and pillars left to prevent mine subsidence and the newer method of longwall mining that removes the entire coal vein and allows the entire landscape to subside completely creates drainage problems which severely impact farm fields

above the mines. Continued mining, especially of the longwall method, if accelerated by the adoption of CCS throughout the state, which requires 35 to 40 percent more coal to produce the same amount of electricity, would be detrimental to agricultural production.

We wish the Department of Energy would have used the $1 billion of taxpayer money given to FutureGen to research alternative energy sources other than coal. Developing hydrogen power from water would be much cheaper and safer with none of the environmental hazards. With coal and carbon capture sequestration, we are simply trading an environmental hazard above ground for one below.

Morgan County farmland is way too valuable a resource to risk with this 30-year FutureGen experiment.

Abraham Lincoln's quotation at the top of Mumford Hall in the College of Agricultural at the University of Illinois is worth noting: "Illinois' wealth lies in her soils and in their wise development."

Thank you very much.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. The next speaker is David Davenport.

MR. D. DAVENPORT: Hi. My name is David Davenport. That was my dad, and I farm in northeast Morgan Country near the sequestration site.

Morgan County farmland is some of the most productive agricultural land in the entire world. It's often at or near the top of the list for average corn yield by county for the State of Illinois. In 2004 it was the first county ever in the State of Illinois to average 200 bushels per acre. The northeast corner of the county were the proposed FutureGen carbon dioxide injection site is proposed is some of the most productive ground in the county.

My family owns and farms a field that has yielded over 250 --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Slow down.

MR. D. DAVENPORT: Okay. My family owns and farms a field that has yielded over 250 bushels per acres in past years.

So why are we risking such highly productive ground for an experiment with potentially damaging consequences for the property and dangerous consequences for people?

If you listen to the FutureGen Alliance and its proponents, pumping thousands of tons of

carbon dioxide into the ground will be so safe none of us should worry. One of the things we've been told over and over is how stable the carbon dioxide will be deep below the surface, and it will have almost no chance of escaping to the surface because of our shale layer above the Mt. Simon formation.

But as the University of Michigan study said, in defining why carbon dioxide sequestration was not only not the answer to global warming but potentially dangerous, quote, "The earth's plates shift and move, and pressures can build beyond expected measurements. Life and nature change. Such flexibility is part of their very definition."

It's extremely shortsighted of us to only consider whether or not the carbon dioxide will remain where we put it for 30 years or 50 years or even several hundred years. The plan is to find a permanent storage site for CO2 for this experiment to not be a waste of time and taxpayer money.

In a meeting with geologists associated with FutureGen, we asked them what would happen in the event the monitoring wells showed the CO2 was escaping to the surface, and their answer was that the project would be shut down. But when asked what would be done

about the CO2 already in storage that was leaking to the surface, we received no answer.

In a recent publication by FutureGen of their frequently asked questions, they state, quote, "If there is any deviation from our plan, the project will be required to make adjustments to the injection strategy or cease operations," end quote.

So I guess that CO2 would continue to migrate to the surface, eventually poisoning our groundwater and making our area uninhabitable, while also making our land unproductive for growing crops.

Also, Dr. James Singmaster, a retired environmental chemist from UC Davis, pointed out that we all concern ourselves with carbon dioxide when considering carbon sequestration, but what are the other byproducts? Mercury, cadmium, and oxides of nitrogen will be dirtying water from the carbon sequestration process.

COURT REPORTER: Slow down.

MR. D. DAVENPORT: The carbon sequestration process also uses tons of somewhat toxic and highly flammable chemicals. So the dangers will not only be at the waste site but also at the power plant.

Another interesting point FutureGen makes is how they state over and over that CO2 is non-hazardous. That is simply not true. On the CDC's website, they state that exposures to CO2 at 10 percent concentration are, quote, "immediately dangerous to life." This project will be handling 97 percent pure CO2. So according to the CDC, that is almost 10 times the concentration of CO2 needed to kill someone.

So back to the waste site. What will happen in the event the carbon dioxide is released at the injection site or really anywhere along the pipeline that will stretch the width of the county? Carbon dioxide is heavier than air. So when released in quantity, it hangs in a cloud at ground level.

On August 21, 1986, Lake Nyos in Cameroon, released a large cloud of CO2 as a result of geologic activity. Around 1,700 people from nearby villages and thousands of animals were asphyxiated. Obviously CO2 is very hazardous in this case.

This kind of catastrophe could result from something as accidental as someone hitting the pipeline with a backhoe or something as major as a geological shift which will happen eventually.

A quick viewing of how the Earth was made on the History Channel will tell you the Earth is constantly changing, and it's shortsighted of us to consider this technology safe because we're pretty sure nothing is going to happen to the geography for a while.

So our state and our county are supposed to trust the FutureGen Alliance, an alliance of mining companies, coal companies, coal exploration companies, et cetera, to develop this technology because it's good for the environment and it's going to stop global warming.

Many environmentalists strongly disagree and see this technology for what it truly is: Trading one environmental hazard for another while burning a significant amount more coal to produce the same amount of energy for consumers, resulting in higher consumer prices and more profits for the coal industry.

FutureGen wants to talk about the broad-based public support it has in Morgan County. The truth is, where the injection site will be located, there is broad-based opposition. Landowners, farm owners, and homeowners in the area immediately

around the site are not happy about being the guinea pigs for this experiment.

Jacksonville banks, colleges, and businesses have heard the potential for growth in their community while taking on none of the risk and of course they are supportive. But I wonder how many Jacksonville residents have researched unbiased sources on carbon dioxide sequestration to see the estimates of how much it would cost consumers in the long run if this technology is adopted.

I encourage the Department of Energy to thoroughly explore the impact upon our wetlands and water sources, the various health and safety issues involved, the socioeconomics and impact upon our public services. The latter point I make because nothing has been said about enhancing our local infrastructure to be able to appropriately respond to any environmental accidents.

I also have a couple comments on previously made comments. Is that okay?

MR. WHYTE: It's your five minutes.

MR. D. DAVENPORT: Okay. Commissioner Zeller noted that he was happy about the FutureGen project because it would mean $1.3 billion invested in

Morgan County. But when you think about it, it's not $1.3 billion invested in Morgan County. It's invested in FutureGen. They have to spend money to buy the hardware for the project, which I don't think we make the pipeline here in Morgan County. I don't think we make parts for the power plant. Do we have a drilling company in Morgan County that can drill a mile down into the ground? Do we have a company that lays CO2 pipeline? A lot of this money is being invested in places other than Morgan County.

Also, Mr. Humphreys noted that the -- is it St. Peter's formation where the natural gas is stored? It's underneath the layer where the oil has stayed for million of years, and I think, if he researched with farmers around Waverly, he'd find that some of them feel that the CO2 -- or, I mean, the natural gas stored in that formation is not permanently stored underground and they have leakage there.

Also, I'd like to comment on Mr. Hoffmann's slide showing widespread saline formations across the country which probably also includes less inhabited areas and areas where the ground is not so productive. Why would we not do an

experiment like this to see how the CO2 is going to react in saline formations in an area where there's not so much risk to farmland and also people?

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. The next speaker that's registered is Jeffrey Niemann.

MR. NIEMANN: Okay. My name is Jeffrey Niemann. J-e-f-f-r-e-y, Niemann, N-i-e-m-a-n-n. And I am an heir -- one of the heirs to the Beilschmidt family farm trust, and I am not in favor of CCS nor FutureGen 2.

I'd like to make one point to Andy. One of the comments he asked at a previous meeting that I did not answer is the fact that there are heirs and you know us, and the reason that we did not stand up at those particular meetings is the fact that the farm itself is held by a trustee. And even though there's only three years left for 50 percent of the land and another two years after that for the other 50 percent, we have no control over any of the decisions made that go on the Beilschmidt farm. We are totally -- basically, we've been -- for the most part, we have not been notified or consulted prior to the issuing of any agreements. Okay? That clarifies that point.

I'd like to say that I am -- I've worked a number of years in the petroleum industry. I've worked somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 years, and I have worked as a health and safety specialist in these industries. Most of these were overseas -- Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of Bahrain -- and I had a large experience with GIFs and WIFs. These are gas injection facilities and WIFs, water injection facilities. And as such, I am not particularly in favor of gas injection for a number of reasons. I'll cover these in just a few moments.

I'd like to also add that I was seven years with the Illinois EPA, and some of the questions that you raise or some of the comments you made I thought were very appropriate because one of the biggest problems we had in the Illinois EPA was remediation of anything in the ground, whether it be groundwater or gas, anything that is dissolved in the ground. It's a long, costly proposition.

And this leads to the next point which is one that you made, and that is basically CCS is not a solution to the problem of air pollution. Merely it means polluting the land instead of the air. The CO2 will remain in the ground longer than 30 years.

Everybody's been referring to 30 years as the project. But the thing is the project is expected to run a considerable amount of time, and if you look into the health and safety of the people, who are going to look at the health and safety of the people, say, in 50 years? A hundred years? A thousand years?

This seems rather a long period, but I'll never forget up in Chicago we were drilling a hazardous waste well, and we pulled up a newspaper, and we clearly read the newspaper that had been deposited in this site back in the early '50s, and this was in the mid '90s. So when you put something away, it may be out of sight, but it's still there, and it still may have to be answered to in years to come.

Now, I'm going to say some things first in case I run over five minutes. One of the things that I looked at, when the project came forward, some of the numbers were quoted for jobs in the Journal-Courier. I found that the numbers were rather high. I felt they were exceptionally high for the type of work that was being performed and the type of facility that was being constructed. These are similar to the ones that I ran across in the oil industry.

Now, for example, people said there will be 75 jobs for -- at the sites of the injection wells. I even have a picture of a CCSI pilot project at East Bend-Cincinnati Arch polite site, and it shows a photograph of a man standing next to an eight-foot pipe. That eight-foot pipe is the injection well. And you can see, looking around him in the surrounding area, not a thing. There is no reason to have 75 people associated with an injection site.

In my experience, we've had somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 injection sites, and we had basically one roving outside operator that visited that site once a day just to verify that there was nothing unusual going on, any unusual leakage or any unusual problems. Like, we had at bulldozer run into one, and it hadn't leaked. It just bent the thing. But you don't need that type of personnel.

I looked at the plant that they had at East Bend, and I looked at that and I said a hundred people? A hundred operators? My estimation is you would have two outside operators, a boardman, and a senior control operator. That's four people. Four shifts to make it 24/7. That's 16 people. Plus you'd probably pick up an additional five people in

maintenance for that facility.

I talked with people regarding the power plant. They had no idea what the numbers would be. But based on what I see, I don't see the numbers in the facility.

The second thing I'd like to point out is the plant itself. Okay? You'd have supposedly a hundred people, but one of the things was said was there would be 2,000 involved in construction. Looking at the plant, I looked at the vessels, I looked at the fin fans, I looked at other reactors that are present, and those are basically -- as you said, Andy, they're made in a -- or I guess your son -- these are made at different facilities. These will be fabricated and either brought up the river or brought by a railroad to be sited on project.

The actual area of the plant -- you couldn't get 2,000 people on it. Somebody would fall off the edge. So you're going to have maybe 2,000 people involved in the construction, but this is going to be stretched over a period of time because you're going to have, obviously, the people working on the foundation. Then you're going to have structural people come in. Then you're going to have boiler

operators fitting the vessels. Then you're going to have -- follow up with instrumentation, cables, electricity. These are all different crafts that will occur at different times, not full-time jobs for the entire construction, as we were led in the Journal-Courier article.

Okay. The other thing -- there's a couple other things that bother me with the numbers that also had to do with visitors. I don't see a lot of visitors coming to this particular site. I mean, in the East Bend-Cincinnati Arch pilot program --

MR. CAREY: Mr. Niemann, can you -- we can -- if there's time at the end, you can come back up here.

MR. NIEMANN: Okay. That's fine.

Let me say this: I think the best approach right now would be for this committee to go to this site and get the facts: validate the numbers in the drilling site, validate the numbers of working people at the plant, verify if there's any -- been any new construction in hotels and restaurants and everything else that have been talked about. Because I think it would be a crime for the people in Jacksonville to be promised all these jobs and they

not come to pass.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you, Mr. Niemann. We'll come back to you as time allows at the end.

The next preregistered speaker is Betty Niemann.

MS. NIEMANN: My real name is Elizabeth Niemann. Most people know me as Betty. It's N-i-e-m-a-n-n. I am Jeffrey's wife, who is a Beilschmidt heir and Beilschmidt family farm trust beneficiary.

Frankly, I'm opposed to CCS and therefore FutureGen 2. To me, taking carbon dioxide from the air and putting it into the ground is not zero emissions. Taking something from the air and putting the same thing into the ground is just taking it from one place and putting it in another without doing anything to it. So it's polluting -- taking pollution from one spot and putting it in another.

I have performed an extensive Internet research on CCS -- and it's out there folks, and you can be overwhelmed by it -- with it's various methodologies for carbon capture. I have talked to people by telephone on CCS, and I'm still not

convinced the science is there for an environmentally safe deposit of CO2 into the ground all in the name of creating jobs.

Looking at the social and economic impact for EIS of this proposed FutureGen product, according to the Compass Coal website, which quotes SNL Energy on the 23rd of May of this year, the normal gross output of the Meredosia power plant would be 200 megawatts. We've seen that. With a maximum output of 215 megawatts. After oxy-combustion is put into place, the net would be 140 megawatts. That's a difference of 60 megawatts or 30 percent loss of output of the power plant. This percentage loss is reiterated throughout many websites on discussing the oxy-combustion method.

Illinois House Bill 14 is trying to put into place the ability to increase the electric rate structure so that Ameren's investors would obtain a faster payback on the initial cash outlay. Thus electric rates could go up at least 30 percent if HB 14 passes.

Given the new increase in Illinois state income tax, the question is can Morgan County residents, Ameren -- Illinois Ameren customers, and

potential new businesses and industry afford the cost of FutureGen to add to the economic -- gross economic structure of Morgan County over the next 30 years.

On Heartland Coalfield Alliance's website, which leads to the SourceWatch website that talks about Mountaineer plant in New Haven, West Virginia, this is an up-going and research project. I called ADP, the power company behind the project, along with DOE. This process for capture is Alstom -- and that's A-l-s-t-r-o-m -- patented chilled ammonia process. And when I tried to find out what the energy load on the power plant for that capture process was -- i.e., how much is it going to cost or what is going to be the power reduction on the plant -- I got "That information is proprietary." So who knows how much more power is required by the capture process, and what it will do to West Virginia electric rates.

Colin Kerr from Weyburn, Saskatchewan, who has an injection well on his property, says that several times a year two to three men inspect the wellhead and not the 75 as hyped by the media for FutureGen.

The scary bit for me -- and maybe Ms. Greenberg can correct me on this -- was the report

given by Lauren Hunt at the Geological Society of America 2004 Denver meeting that talks about gas migration within the Mt. Simon and Eau Claire formations at Troy Grove, Illinois. Given that the report talks about natural gas, there is a potential for the sequestered CO2 to behave the same way. The report stresses heterogeneity due to the discontinuous shale layers in sandstone within the Mt. Simon layer. That means they're not the same consistency. It's not sandstone in the Mt. Simon layer, but it's a mixture. And because of this heterogeneity, the gas may migrate along the discontinuous pathway. So if you have two adjacent to each other, the gas can go up between them.

If this is not closely monitored over the next 10, 20, 30, 50, 100, or 500 years, the sequestered CO2 could migrate to the surface and has the potential to do catastrophic damage to the environment.

The New Albany formation present in Morgan County is also a formation that can be rich in shale gas. It is not a solid layer, but it has cracks and fissures within it. FutureGen sites this layer as a possible cap for the CO2 as it could migrate to the

surface.

My research revealed that a draft and final EIS for the FutureGen project in Mattoon, Illinois, revealed that along with the CO2 to be sequestered there's H2S, hydrogen sulfate, rotten egg smell, of approximate 30 percent. For those of you who don't know that, hydrogen sulfate is a very toxic and lethal gas, and it also likes to stay low to the ground and in the low areas. What I want to know is H2S -- will H2S be in the pipeline from the Meredosia plant to the sequestered well site.

MR. CAREY: Ms. Niemann, we're running up on time.

MS. NIEMANN: The land targeted by Jacksonville Regional Development Corporation in its proposal to the FutureGen Alliance and the Alliance's selection for this injection site has been in my husband's family since William Beilschmidt, who came from Germany, purchased it before his son Henry married Lizzy Talkemeyer in 1892. The heavily wooded land was cleared by blood, sweat, and toil. It has been the family homestead until the death of their two last remaining offspring, William and Oley Beilschmidt.

Bill and Oley established four trusts so that charitable community entities could benefit. They also established the Beilschmidt Family Farm Trust of 399.35 acres so that the homestead land would pass to succeeding generations as they were very strong in family. It is this legacy of Bill and Oley Beilschmidt that my husband and I hope to preserve for farming and not a dump site for CCS in the political correctness to create jobs and to curb global warming.

Another of my EIS concerns is that, when the beneficiaries entered the house to remove memorabilia and select family heirlooms, a straight-line crack was visible from one side of the house to the other. Inspection proved that this was caused by a shift in the supports from -- for the center beam on the dirt floor of the basement. It is my understanding that this has been remediated, but given the hundred-plus years of the age of the house, it is my opinion that any seismic activity, even for this EIS investigation, drilling, and wellhead maintenance in the fields near the house, might further exacerbate the shift and cause structural damage to the homestead.

I thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

I want to remind folks, as we start to go on here in the evening, written comments or comments that are e-mailed or faxed are given the same weight as those that are presented up here this evening. So please bear that in mind.

Our next speaker comes off of the list that signed up this evening, and it is Richard A. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: My name is Richard A. Johnson. Richard, R-i-c-h-a-r-d A. J-o-h-n-s-o-n. Thank you.

My responses are going to be very short. But I am in favor of this particular project because I feel from my observations that it will help the community. It will provide economic -- real economic impact for us and also the educational aspect. We are in the center of an educational center with the colleges and state schools, and I feel that this -- the economic impact will be great along with the educational impact.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

I apologize. There was one more

preregistered speaker. John Rentz.

MS. RYKHUS: I spoke with John earlier on the phone. He got called out of state on business.

MR. WHYTE: Okay. Please let Mr. Rentz know that he can submit his comments with the other way. Thank you.

The next speaker then is Bill Hawks.

MR. HAWKS: First of all, I won't be near as long as these gentlemen and ladies were before me. They obviously prepared and did their homework. They're to be applauded definitely.

My name is Hawks, William Hawks. W-i-l-l-i-a-m, Hawks, H-a-w-k-s, like a bird, from Decatur, Illinois.

Mine's going to be very short. Just a few notes I've been writing down as I've been listening to these people. My wife and I -- it says -- they say you're going to have monitors of the wells. We seen your charts back there. People, I think you need to move those monitors a lot farther out than the 2,500 acres they're talking about.

Why did you choose Morgan County to store the CO2 when the sandstone formations are only 600 meters or approximately 2,000 feet thick in this area?

In Fayette County, which would be the preferred place to do this, by the way, the sandstone locations are 1,800 and 2,400 meters or about 8,000 feet thick, a lot more area to store your CO2 you have to store.

Third, you have picked the riskiest place to store the CO2. So if there is a problem, what are you going to do for the landowners? And I don't think the $100 million you have prepared is going to be anywhere near enough in the future to take care of anything that might come about.

Safety-wise: I was talking to the young lady back here. She said, well, they pipe CO2 and they pipe natural gas all over the United States. Natural gas is a lot more dangerous than CO2. Well, that's fine until the pipeline explodes. You have natural gas -- that's true, a pipeline explodes. I've seen pipeline explosions. I'm a 32-year veteran of Decatur Fire Department. I've pulled people out overcome by CO2. There are a lot less people killed by natural gas, in a gas and natural gas explosion pipeline, than there would be a CO2. CO2's heavier than air. It's going to go -- travel quite a ways before they get -- they got -- this system's going to shut down right away. They can't shut it down quick

enough if it's in a populated area where people aren't going to lose their life.

You say that natural gas or natural C -- natural CO2, this gentleman just said, hasn't came above the ground. It's natural CO2 and hasn't came above that vapor or barrier or that -- or layer. They're saying it hasn't came above that. That's correct. Again, that's natural CO2. It's not under thousands of pounds of pressure and been put under the ground.

There's no way you can guarantee that this is going to not come up through the ground. There's no way they can guarantee it. A gentleman from out in California -- Kurt Zenz House is his name. He's the proprietor or the head honcho of what's called C12 company in California -- said that Morgan County is a very bad place to store this gas. It has no dome or structure to contain the CO2. They say there is. This gentleman disagrees. There's a lot of people out there that disagree with it.

Could it be that this company has chosen Morgan County, again, where there's only a couple thousand feet of this stone to put this CO2 in, to save money or costs? People, they can say what they

want, but it's not about jobs. It's about profit and saving money to this company.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

I apologize if I don't pronounce this correctly. Catherine Edmiston? If you'd like to give -- if you'd like to remain seated, I can --

MS. EDMISTON: No, that's all right.

MR. WHYTE: Okay.

MS. EDMISTON: I live in an adjoining county, but I also own family farmland -- part of it.

COURT REPORTER: I need your name. I'm sorry.

MS. EDMISTON: I'm Catherine Edmiston, E-d-m-i-s-t-o-n.

But I am a member of a group called Citizens Against Longwall Mining, and my primary concern is the coal-fired plant because coal is destroying our streams in Illinois as well as our farmland. The modern methods, longwall mining and strip mining, has this effect on our farmland.

And we know -- I've been to the Bureau of Water of the IEPA at their annual meeting for the last five years and have asked them the number of miles of

streams in Illinois. They put that out several years ago in a book. No longer do they put it out. They do not tell us. So we know that some of our fresh water streams are probably being destroyed by mining, and they don't want us to know about this. So I wanted to let you know that. They should be keeping track of the water that's lost in Illinois, and this is a big problem that OSM should be handling for the sake of the citizens of America and especially Illinois. Modern mining destroys water, and once it's gone, it is forever.

And then there's the problem of contamination. Coal refuse cannot be stored in a permanent structure and allowed to contaminate groundwater, but it's happening in Illinois. These refuse structures must be lined, but a new mine by a coal mine in Macoupin County is going to be allowed to dump its refuse in an unlined waste impoundment used by the old mine, and there's a law that those waste impoundments must be lined now. So how can the new owner be permitted to do this? These are things the public needs to know about coal.

Then the problem of storing CO2 underground, which may be a dangerous way of burying

our problems. These federal stimulus funds are being used, $1 billion for Morgan County, Illinois, storage place for CO2 for the Tenaska plant. It can be a big problem, and you pointed that out in this testimony very ably. How do we know it can be stored responsibly and safely? Isn't it more practical to spend these funds on alternative energy to make our electricity?

Jacksonville has three colleges and a school for the deaf and a school for the blind as well as many citizens who are very concerned about this CO2 storage area only 3,500 feet underground. Wouldn't that $1 million of federal stimulus funds be better spent on developing alternative energy for this electricity?

It's a well-known fact that coal mines in Illinois are allowed to operate and endanger their miners with many violations in their operations. Why isn't something done about it? Now, this is a hearing for the Office of Surface Mining. These are accidents waiting to happen. How do you know this plant will not be working with violations?

We are aware -- let's see. I don't believe I'll bring that statement up. I was going to

bring up the fact that Illinois doesn't have a 2 percent tax on coal sold out of state and that could bring in hundreds of thousands of dollars to the State of Illinois, but we don't -- we don't charge that. And there's 15 other states in the United States that do.

Why doesn't the Office of Surface Mining take that into account and make a law that all states should charge tax and the proceeds from that should go for black lung disease expense, land reclamation, abandoned mine sites that pollute, coal cleaning fees, road repair which we're left with when a coal mine pulls out.

Has OSM considered the studies of the total cost of coal's impact on human health, plants, animals, environment, global warming, and the negative impacts on citizens in the community?

In regard to this public safety with these schools for the blind and deaf and the three colleges -- I had a relative go to one of your colleges in Jacksonville, and I was impressed with it. The people of Jacksonville as well as the farm families of Morgan County are going to be very much affected by this plant. What precautions will be

taken to evacuate Jacksonville and rural areas if there is a leakage of this CO2? Have we thought about that? Of course, if it -- because this gas -- CO2, you know, as it's been pointed out, if it escapes into a cloud, can do damage fast, and it's not like natural gas. So this would be more dangerous because you can smell natural gas. CO2 is odorless, colorless and -- so it too would be more dangerous than natural gas if it escaped.

And that four-foot-underground pipeline -- we know about pipelines, don't we? We've had accidents happen with those. And there's a big safety factor here is one of the reasons I decided to speak. What precautions will be taken to evacuate Jacksonville and rural areas if such a -- if they have the chance to escape with it from a pipeline leak four feet deep?

Will there be -- you mentioned something about compensation to landowners, if this pipeline goes through that they will be compensated. Is that a one-time payment or is it a lease payment? I guess no one has an answer for that maybe.

MR. CAREY: Ms. Edmiston, we're running up on time. We're running up on time if you could --

MS. EDMISTON: Yeah. I'm finished. Thank you. Those are all my comments.

MR. CAREY: Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Patty Rykhus? I got it? All right.

MS. RYKHUS: I'm Patty Rykhus. Last name is spelled R-y-k-h-u-s. You can say it; nobody can spell it.

And I come to you here today from Taylorville, Illinois. I want to give you a little background on myself. I spent my first career as a scientist, a histologist, and immunohistochemist. That means I studied the human body as a whole, all the organ systems, all the organs at the molecular and cellular level.

My second career in life I was a -- became a computer programmer, a system and business analyst. So I'm kind of a geek wearing two hats.

And I wish I could feel better about this project, FutureGen 2.0. I wish I could count on my government: my local, county, state, and federal elected officials. They all talk about the jobs this project would create and seem to gloss over the

financial, environmental, and fiscal costs and risks.

I wish I could feel better about the billions -- with a "B," billions -- of dollars involved of public monies, our money, taxpayer money. I don't think our government -- federal, state, or local -- could balance a budget regardless of the figure at the top of that spreadsheet. And I feel that this project is an example of that logic. What risks a private corporation wants to make with their money is their business; however, when it's taxpayer money, it involves all of us. When did supporting a project like this become my responsibility as a taxpayer?

With this project, the cost of the collateral damages are immense: from coal mining, all the way through to the energy outputs, ash pond storage, the carbon capture and sequestration, and byproduct chemicals created.

The Chinese refer to what we call the clean coal industry as the coal chemical industry, and don't you wonder why? I challenge the Department of Energy to respond to it in the same manner and with the same honor as the Chinese do.

I wish I could understand the economics of

this project and understand why, if coal mines and coal-fired power plants are the answer to Central Illinois's financial situation, why aren't eastern Kentucky and western -- and West Virginia prosperous areas? Have the depletion of the natural resources there led to the attempt of resurgence of the coal industry here?

I wish I could feel better about the carbon capture and sequestration. I'd like to understand why, when version 2.0 of the FutureGen came out, the first thing I noticed in the press was the profit-making corporations involved scrambling to limit their liability from the CO2 pipeline and sequestration.

Now, as I understand it, there are four layers of liability protection surrounding the nonprofit alliance for a process that is supposed to be safe. Safe, depending on who you talk to, whose study you read, and ultimately who financed that particular study.

Financially, just how many clean coal or coal chemical projects can we in Illinois afford? I have watched the legislative process. I have read the legislation written for or by the corporations

involved: Leucadia, Power Holdings, Tenaska, and, yes, those associated with FutureGen 2.0. To me, it appears they design their project to fit some mythical structure using company A's boiler or gasifier and matching it with some other proprietary equipment so they'd be just different enough to qualify as unique enough for the incentives. So my question to all would be just how many of these multibillion dollar projects can we really afford?

And is there really a master plan for the energy needs of our country? The incentives change from project to project, all at taxpayer and rate payer expense, at the federal and/or the state level. The players change, but the game stays the same. As a taxpayer, a rate payer, and a citizen, I am tired of the game.

The sad part of it all is I feel we're taking a step back, not a step forward, and missing a great opportunity to develop new sources of energy. I feel we're back in the 1970s trying to revive an industry that was on life support. Coal and coal-based power plants are huge producers of toxic waste. Just because you change the location of where the waste is going doesn't mean you're still not producing

it. From the CO2, to the sulfur, mercury, lead, the list goes on and on. I think the Department of Energy owes it to us to show a flow of all of the waste streams and not just the politically correct or the public relation coined phrase for the CO2.

I'd also like to talk just shortly about the three sites that are involved in the sequestration and the hearings that are going on the scoping. I feel the current project structure kind of pits us against each other whether you are in support or in opposition. Is that the way this was intended with the three sites? If the political or environmental heat gets too hot in one place, would the site just move? And how would that decision be made? Is it going to be made on the economics of the price of the pipeline? Is it going to be made on the quality of the sequestration site? My question is how is that decision made?

And here's my basic closing opinion to the people: Not in my backyard, not in their backyard, and not in your backyard. I cannot and will not support a coal chemical power plant because they simply do not exist.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

The next speaker Alan Rider.

MR. RIDER: Alan Rider. A-l-a-n, Rider, R-i-d-e-r.

Thank you.

First of all, I'd like to thank Department of Energy personnel for answering my questions very straightforward. I'd also like to thank the Ameren people who have also answered my questions straightforward, and I do appreciate that, and I want to thank them for that, as I'm obviously doing.

I have condensed my comments, in the interest of time, and I will not speak fast so you can get this properly recorded, and I will also enter comments through other methods in the interest of time.

All the people in this room know that we need to do something with our energy policy, but we're not sure how we can influence the big picture, if, in fact, we can influence it at all. But we do what we can with new technologies and government programs. I could get -- I had a list of ten different things. I'm not going to go into those, but things like insulating your homes, buying hybrids, that sort of thing. And those are a result of a lot of

technological improvements and also government programs, specifically, but not exclusively, tax incentives, for example, that I have taken advantage of.

But a lot of us, myself included, see FutureGen as an attempt to save an old established industry. Please convince me otherwise. I'm not so sure you can. We wonder why more money is not directed to clean energy, including solar and wind. After all, we put people on the moon, we sneak into other countries and kill people. We have a hell -- excuse me -- we have a lot of technology that we can use if we devote our resources to it.

And I understand this project is an attempt to evaluate another source of energy that is potentially safe and clean for the environment. What scares me is when I hear what some parts of our government says, what some politicians say and do. We have climate deniers, we have big oil, we have big coal pouring millions of dollars into protecting what I see, as a private citizen, is an old dirty technology and holding back progress that makes me skeptical and concerned about the future for all of us tonight and our country both now and in the future.

The Alliance has got a lot of different players. If the Alliance could somehow sit with these big oil, big coal, and some parts of our political -- some of our political leaders and have an adult conversation about our energy policy that involves progress, they could do wonders for what they're attempting to do here.

And I ask -- I ask do we as a country, do we as a government, do we as a people have the courage to make decisions that future generations will thank us for or will they ask what were they thinking?

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

The next speaker that signed up and then the name was crossed off was Pat Boldt.

MS. RYKHUS: She left early.

MR. WHYTE: She left? Okay.

Next speaker is Reginald Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: Hi. Reginald, R-e-g-i-n-a-l-d, Jordan, J-o-r-d-a-n.

I didn't expect to speak tonight, but I thought I'd take the opportunity. I prepared some things, but I'm going to squash that and just speak from the heart.

We've had some very compelling data. Frankly, I haven't done my research. I don't know all the statistics, the specifics. So I'm going to deal in what we do know. We do know that every new technology is unknown. Everything has inherent risks. So we weigh those risks against a cost benefit analysis. We do know this: The U.S. is awash in natural resources -- coal, natural gas, oil. It takes effort to get to those things. We know that we rely on the Middle East and other areas of the world for our oil and other resources because of environmental efforts and other things that cause our efforts to be delayed to be more self-reliant.

So, again, I don't have all the statistics that the other speakers have had. They've had very compelling testimony which frankly caused me to reevaluate things. I do support FutureGen 2.0. I see the potential long-term benefits could be tremendous. Again, there are always risks involved. You weigh those risks. When you weigh those risks against the reality of our situation, you need to consider that moving forward.

At this time I support FutureGen 2.0. It could provide a way to tap these vast coal reserves,

do it in a clean, efficient manner. I would also say people have mentioned solar power and wind. I hate to use the cliche of "Drill, baby, drill," but I support any -- any and all forms of getting energy. The fact is that wind and solar are highly inefficient, very expensive sources of energy. I know, if you go by Peoria, you see all these wind farms and stuff. That's fine. I've heard that on the East Coast all the, let's say, more far left people who would you think support wind, I've heard and read that they don't like the wind turbines, whatever you want to call them, because they're not aesthetically pleasing. Okay?

So we need to weigh these things when we make our decision. At this point I think that the benefits to this outweigh the risk and could be a tremendous long-term boom economically and otherwise, environmentally, to the region.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Joyce Blumenshine.

Ms. BLUMENSHINE: My name is Joyce, J-o-y-c-e, Blumenshine, B-l-u-m-e-n-s-h-i-n-e.

I am a volunteer with Illinois Sierra

Club, and I have some questions and comments. And I do want to thank the DOE and their staff for the opportunity of this hearing.

It is my understanding that the environmental impact statement (EIS) must provide a full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision-makers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment, and these include direct effects from the proposed project as well as indirect effects from the proposed project.

So I specifically ask the DOE in their study to consider alternatives and that's been mentioned earlier, but there does really appear to be a glaring omission here in the lack of consideration for alternatives involving energy efficiency and renewable energy projects.

I'd like to speak particularly to a couple of the listings under the EIS that must be considered. And, number one, under Solid Wastes, when we talk about zero emission, there's a huge entity that hasn't been really brought forward. I specifically request the DOE to assess and analyze the amount of coal ash

waste from this type of project, where this waste will go, what are the potentials for human habitat and other detrimental effects from coal ash, what are the cumulative toxic liabilities of the coal ash, and the cost to the public versus the companies of coal ash management. Currently in the United States, coal ash is not treated as a hazard toxic waste, which it is. It has heavy metals, mercury, hexavalent chromium, and many other toxins, and we need this ash to be considered in the complete analysis of this plant.

Another issue is the biological resources. I specifically request the DOE to assess the potential impacts on not only the local streams and water resources but the streams and water resources, as Ms. Edmiston mentioned, of areas in Illinois currently under coal mining production and coal mining being developed because we have in Illinois, for example, in Montgomery County just east of here, a 4,000-acre longwall coal mine which will subside acres of our prime national resource heritage and resource-essential productive farmland.

This farmland will be dropped an average of 5.7 feet through longwall mining, and that's not even -- longwall mining, for those who are not aware,

takes out all the coal seam, but to get to the coal seam, the coal companies have to have room and pillar avenues. So you have room and pillar avenues supporting the surface, and then between the surface for three miles long and up to 12,000 feet wide is a trough which is sunk. So for farm families who have spent centuries and generations of hard labor to make high quality, productive, efficient farmlands, longwall mining will forever change the topography of our national resource rich essential heritage of highly productive farmlands, and this is happening now in Illinois. Currently in Montgomery County, 4,000 acres are permitted for this mining. 120,000 acres potentially could be harmed in one county.

Southern Illinois: Another longwall mine is permitted for 10,000 acres of subsidence. This will have detrimental impacts on the IDNR, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, listed biologically significant streams, and no one is telling the cost of this particular project and its takings of the resources of this state and also other areas which show potential for this site.

Many excellent comments have been made about the lack of efficiency of the utilization of

coal to produce energy here, how wasteful this project is. I specifically request the DOE include in its analysis the complete costs, not only of the coal to be burned in this plant but the cost of the complete energy used for sequestration, the cost of the complete energy used for building this pipeline, and the cost for complete energy used of the potential of the other processes, including hauling the coal or whatever other necessary products are required for this.

Just a few other points toward closing here. There is a huge environmental justice problem with this project. Environmental justice means the protection of the environmental rights of people and animals and all of us to a clean and healthy environment for now and for future generations.

And I question if the building of pipelines takes into account the tragic impacts on the farm families or other families and homes whose historical properties are impacted by either having to move or being disrupted. No one in this state or I think in this country is taking into consideration the full environmental impacts of coal mining on the families whose homes are going to be subsided or

families who are being moved off the land.

And, again, I ask the DOE to do specific analyses in Illinois on the rural impacts of coal mining that is decimating the rural populations of Montgomery County, Macoupin County, and other counties where coal companies go in, buy up the farms, move the families out, and, gentlemen and ladies, we are depopulating large sections of our vital Illinois farm heritage and families due to coal mining. This is a tragedy.

I thank you for your time and attention. This plant has many, many deficits that have been well spoken to tonight, and I'll end with this.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Terry Denison.

Mr. DENISON: Terry, T-e-r-r-y, Denison, D-e-n-i-s-o-n.

Good evening, everyone. Thank you, Mr. Whyte.

My name is Terry Denison. I am president of the Jacksonville Regional Economic Development Corporation. I'm also a Vietnam-era veteran, and, wow, what an evening. This has been quite an evening, and I guess only in America can this kind of dialogue

take place, and so I'm proud to be an American for being able to do this.

I also think that I realize that it's really amazing what can be found on the Internet nowadays. I don't know what we would have done without -- without the World Wide Web that we now have.

I also want the DOE to be aware of and to know that there are a lot more citizens in this community who are for this project than what you're hearing this evening. That can be proven quite easily, and I just want you to know that it's not all doom and gloom, that there is a lot of folks that's very much in favor and very supportive of this project.

We were the lead agency that led the Morgan County effort to submit the application to FutureGen. We did do our due diligence, and we felt very comfortable with the project as we pursued it, and we still feel very comfortable. We think Mr. Humphreys and the FutureGen Alliance have been open, and they've been honest, and they've been up front with us in every step of the way, and I think they will continue to be that way.

A question that I have for all of you and particularly for DOE that I would like for them to answer is what will be the cost environmentally and dollar-wise if we don't do this project? We still have CO2. It still contributes to gas -- or warm -- greenhouse gas. Something's got to be done. So I'd like an answer to what do we do if we don't do this project?

Jobs have been talked about. The jobs that -- they talked about 2,000 construction jobs. That's not true. It's a thousand construction jobs and a thousand -- what they refer to as indirect jobs. Someone mentioned hotels, restaurants, new businesses. That's where the thousand indirect jobs will come. Those are not exact figures. There's no way -- in any economic development project that I've ever worked on, it's always been a range of jobs. This is a range of jobs. This is not something in writing that Ken Humphrey's has signed and said I guarantee you 1,000 construction jobs, 1,000 this, so on and so forth. But this community needs new jobs. It needs a new niche. It needs something that -- we've had some maturing industries that have closed, and we need to keep moving forward and looking at things. So we're

doing the best we can. Jobs will be created.

It will attract more industries and more jobs. Just think that if we become -- and I know someone said about the visitors. I'm not sure again either whether it will be 300 visitors a year or not, but I'm sure there will be some visitors coming in to look at this. I do know that the geology of China is very similar to what we have here, and China is building more power plants than any other country in the world right now. I expect there will be a few folks from China come to look at this plant or this project.

And I also -- I just want you to know that, if there was ever a project that's going to be put under a microscope and watched, it's going to be this one. Every step of the way we're going to be seeing exactly what's going on. Ken mentioned a while ago that there's going to be monitoring processes. Someone mentioned it needs to be bigger. They will do whatever is necessary, and they'll be following that CO2 as it starts to spread out in the formation and adjustments will be made -- safe adjustments to take care of the environment and take care of the people.

The other thing I want to close with is

that all of the things that have been mentioned tonight -- that's been mentioned tonight has been, is, and will be addressed as this project moves forward. It appears that there is still a lot of misinformation that needs to be addressed and corrected, and I know it will be.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

Next speaker is Ginny Fanning.

Ms. FANNING: G-i-n-n-y F-a-n-n-i-n-g.

I'm Ginny Fanning, and I'm here representing the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce. Here to let you know that FutureGen 2.0 has the chamber's endorsement. Reasons being are many. We definitely are cognizant of the job aspect that this is going to bring. We realize that that number is not a definite number that we know of right now, but we talk about the construction people that will be coming here, that will be buying things, that will be staying here, and the long-term jobs that there is the potential for.

We have two private colleges and a community college here in our community. They have the opportunity to have our students learn new skill

sets, to learn new occupations, and hopefully keep those young people right here in our community.

And so we're very excited about the economic opportunity that it has, not only for Jacksonville but for Meredosia to be able to keep that plant open and to have the economic support that this will bring to our entire county.

The tourism aspect will be huge. If we have people coming in from all over, Jacksonville -- they won't even be looking at just FutureGen, but we have a lot to offer here as far as our own sites for people to see and to be able to promote what we have here as far as Looking for Lincoln, our historical society that is so important with Governor Duncan and Grierson. So we have a lot to offer the entire world.

And then part of that too will be the development of this clean energy technology. This is huge for our entire world, and we have the opportunity to be a part of what all of this is going to be about.

I appreciate FutureGen's website. I hope you go to that. I especially enjoy the Community Corner where we can ask our questions and they will respond to those. And there's some very good information. So I hope you'll go to that and be a

participant in that so that we can hear the pro and the con and be able to look at what's being said on both sides.

Tomorrow they're meeting with our agro-industry division. They're very open, and they want to meet with you and have coffee get-togethers. I want you to know that the chamber is here to help with educational aspects any way we can and support this project.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you.

That concludes the list of folks who registered to speak this evening. Before we go back to the speakers that we cut off a little earlier, is there anyone who didn't register tonight to speak who would like to say a few words?

I'll remind you all again that you can utilize the comment forms in the back to submit written comments, e-mails, what have you.

At this point I'll specifically ask, I believe, Mr. and Mrs. Niemann. I think you were the two that we had to cut a little short. Would you like to come back up and finish your remarks?

MR. NIEMANN: No, I think I pretty well summarized what I felt.

MR. WHYTE: Ms. Niemann?

MS. NIEMANN: I'm fine.

MR. WHYTE: Okay.

Anybody else who spoke previously who would like to say a few more words this evening? Okay. We have a few. Yeah, there are three of them.

Mr. Davenport, I believe your hand was up. Work our way left to right. Again, sir, we'll ask you to keep your testimony under five minutes, please.

MR. A. DAVENPORT: I just have a comment on selecting the sequestration site. There's only a very few people in our neighborhood that were willing to sign off on this. By far the majority of the landowners and farmers out in our area oppose this project. I don't know if that's been brought up enough. We tried to make the media aware of that, and it's not been brought to the public's attention very well through that, those sources.

One of my biggest concerns is, as farmers, we do a lot by raising our crops to solve the carbon dioxide problem. Our crops absorb a lot of CO2, and we don't get any credit for that, and we are the people that have to put up with the waste site, not the people in Jacksonville.

I am proud to be a Morgan County resident, and I realize the amount of money that's involved in this and how it could benefit the community. But we're the people taking the risks, not you people here in town. This is going to be under our farm homes.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Mr. Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: This will be quick. First of all, I'm not a farmer. I've had family who have been farmers. So I honestly cannot relate to the emotions that you all have. That's why I was so impressed with your testimony. It appeared to be very, as I said, compelling. I don't know the truth of it, but for what it is, I thank you for incredibly hard work that you do for our county and community and for the country because it's -- I can't imagine how tough of a job it must be. So no matter how this pans out, thank you for all the hard work that all the farmers do.

Kind of a rhetorical question. How many of us took a solar powered car here? Or how many of us have our homes powered by wind power? I'm going to guess none of us do. So we can talk about how idealistic and how wonderful it would be to have these perhaps cleaner sources of energy, but, again, solar

and wind are highly, highly inefficient. I don't have statistics, but I just -- that is just how it is.

So coal can be made clean. Oil can be drilled more safely. Apparently up in Alaska, ANWR -- I believe this to be true -- I think they've said that if ANWR were to be drilled, it has the environmental effect of a postage stamp on a football field.

As technology improves, your means to access this energy source improves. 10, 15 -- you know, 50, a hundred years ago we couldn't have done that, couldn't have this clean coal technology. So, again, there is risk involved in everything that is new technology. Cost benefit analysis. And at this time I favor this risk because of the long-term benefits could be unbelievable for the community and for the world at large.

MR. WHYTE: Before we get to our last speaker this evening, I want to echo some sentiments that were expressed earlier, and that is the respect with which we've treated each other this evening. I appreciate the fact that everyone's had an opportunity to speak and that everyone's been respectful during those -- for each speaker. So with that, our last speaker of the evening will be Ms. Rykhus, I believe.

MS. RYKHUS: Earlier this evening I had the pleasure of talking to John Rentz, the mayor of Meredosia. He had been called away on business. And there are several questions he wanted to ask, and I kind of explained the process to him. So he'll be submitting a written statement.

One of the questions he wanted me to ask here was what will the ultimate cost of a megawatt of electricity from the FutureGen 2.0 plant be? He's wanting to kind of understand, you know, the costs and the benefits there. He had other questions, but he'll submit those.

Going back to my history as a business analyst and as a scientist, I looked at the flows of the business of the coal and the oxygen from the air separation unit. One pathway they didn't talk about was air is 80 percent nitrogen, 20 percent oxygen. What is happening to the nitrogen? The trend in the industry is any valuable byproduct often is enhanced and a profit made off of it. It is sold.

I know my concerns in Taylorville with the Taylorville Energy Center was that the nitrogen from our air separation unit being taken across the fence line into an anhydrous ammonia processing plant. Is

that the case here? I don't know.

When you look at the amount of sulfur that will be captured that would normally have gone up the smokestack before, I have some statistical analyses, but I wasn't real sure what the volumes at this plant would be. So I have the volumes at the Taylorville -- proposed Taylorville Energy Center which will be using 2 million tons of coal per year, and it came out to 80,000 tons of sulfur. While I'm glad it's not going up a smokestack, in our case it also looks like the proposal will be that that sulfur will either be sold as an element -- sulfur packed into tanker trucks and carted off in special tankers that have to be under high pressure and heated. So I didn't think that was a very viable disposal route.

And as I was looking through the ICC paperwork that Tenaska filed in our case, they're already in talks of bringing a sulfuric acid processing plant across the fence, and while I don't want to live downwind of an anhydrous plant and I don't feel like living downwind of a sulfuric acid processing plant, you know, that could be your choice, but it wasn't one of mine.

Financially, what I've seen in the

industry is some of the coal -- clean coal plants use that money to offset the cost of the power produced while others do not. So this is your time to speak out to say what is happening with these other possible revenue streams? Where are these products going? How are they going to be used? And is it going to offset the high cost of the power being produced?

If anybody here wants to see, I've got an analysis of the Illinois Herrin No. 6 coal, and we can run some quick figures if you want to see what's in these other byproducts or contaminates and the volumes that you can expect to see here.

Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: It's been quite an evening.

Thank you, everyone, for being here. I appreciate those who spoke. Appreciate the way that everybody handled themselves this evening.

Final reminder: There are written comment sheets still available back there that have the information. You can still submit comments through June 22nd to me.

And this concludes the formal session of the public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. Let the record show that this meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.,

and we will be around to try to answer any additional questions one on one for a short while.

Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANGAMON)

I, ROBIN A. ENSTROM, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand Reporter, and Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing public scoping meeting was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

_____

Notary Public in and for
the State of Illinois