FUTUREGEN 2.0 PROGRAM

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

TAYLORVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

TAYLORVILLE, ILLINOIS

JUNE 7, 2011

Representatives:

Mr. Cliff Whyte, Department of Energy
Mr. Jeff Hoffmann, Department of Energy
Mr. Michael Long, Ameren Energy Resources
Mr. Gordon Beeman, FutureGen Alliance

Court Reporter:
Rhonda K. O'Neal, CSR/RPR
Illinois CSR #084-004158
Midwest Litigation Services
15 South Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, Illinois 62701
(217) 522-2211
1-800-280-DEPO

I N D E X

(On the record at 7:01 p.m.)

MR. WHYTE: Welcome to the Department of Energy's public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. My name is Cliff Whyte. I am the NEPA compliance officer for the Department of Energy at the National Energy Technology Laboratory in Morgantown, West Virginia. Let the record show that the meeting began on June 7, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. at Taylorville High School in Taylorville, Illinois.

First, I want to thank the high school for the opportunity to be here this evening. It's a nice venue to have these meetings, someplace hopefully that was convenient for you all, and we appreciate everyone who's attending this meeting. As part of its compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, DOE has determined that an Environmental Impact Statement is required for this project.

The EIS, as we're going to call it from here on out this evening, will analyze and describe the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and the project alternatives. Take a moment here. Can everybody hear me okay in the back?

(No response.)

MR. WHYTE: This scoping meeting I want to

clarify is for FutureGen 2.0. FutureGen 2.0 project is not the same project that was considered under the original FutureGen, although it does share several of its common concepts such as carbon capture and storage.

In addition, although DOE has or is considering supporting other projects in the area such as the Taylorville Energy Center, these projects are not part of or related to the FutureGen 2.0 program. Before we continue with the FutureGen 2.0 program, I do want to recognize some folks from the Taylorville Energy Center project that were gracious enough to be here tonight in case there was any confusion and anyone wanted to discuss questions with that project.

I'd like to recognize Mr. Jim Prescott, Jack Brown, and Jeff Gonka. So if you came here tonight wanting to discuss any aspects of that project, please seek these gentlemen out. I appreciate them being here this evening with us to deal with that issue.

One of the first steps in the preparation of an EIS is to hold a public scoping meeting or a series of public scoping meetings. And a lot of times there's confusion about what a public scoping meeting

is. It's really an opportunity for the public to participate in the evaluation of the possible environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. More importantly, it's an opportunity for DOE to listen to your concerns about the proposed project, be they environmental issues, economic impacts, social matters, or health and safety concerns. The goal here tonight is to determine the major topics that need to be covered in the EIS.

For your convenience, there are comment sheets that were available back there on the table where you came in. On those comments sheets you can provide additional written comments. Those can be mailed or e-mailed to me. Also on those sheets you may indicate if you'd like to have a copy of the draft EIS, and we'll talk a little bit more about that later in the presentation. But you can request copies of that via electronic format or hard copy or a summary.

The informal session tonight saw a lot of people come through here, and I appreciate that. I appreciate the attendance. We were able to listen to your concerns, and it was a joy to meet some of you for the first time and to get reacquainted with some folks I hadn't seen in a while. So we thank you all

for being part of that. Those informal sessions are an important piece of this. That's the question-and-answer, the one-on-one time that is important for everyone to gain a better understanding of what the concerns are, so thank you for that.

During the formal session tonight, we will read items into the record. We will provide a little bit of history of the FutureGen project. We'll go over the relevant parts of the National Environmental Policy Act process. Also, Ameren Energy Resources and FutureGen Alliance will briefly present an overview of their respective pieces of the project. I'll provide a little discussion about the NEPA process and our anticipated schedule in preparing the EIS. At that point, we'll begin the formal comment period this evening.

We do have a few elected officials who are joining us this evening, and we appreciate their attendance. We'll give them the opportunity to say a few words, and then we'll begin to go down the list of folks who have signed up to speak. Written comments are given equal weight to oral comments. If you would choose not to speak but rather to take one of the comment forms and mail it or e-mail it to me, that

will be given the same weight as if you provided testimony this evening. Again, the comment sheets are available. If you didn't get one, they're available in the back. And remember that this comment period closes on June 22, 2011, which is a Wednesday.

I would like to recognize some of the folks that are here this evening before we get on with the program. First of all, Mayor Greg Brotherton, thank you for being here this evening. County Board Chair John Curtain, Mayor Steve Sipes, Mary Renner from Christian County Economic Development Office. Representing the Department of Energy this evening we have division director Tom Sarkus. At NETL we have Jeff Hoffmann who's a project manager with the Department of Energy.

We have Nelson Rekos who's a project manager with the Department of Energy. Representing Ameren Energy Resources we have Mike Long, the plant manager. We have Steve Whitworth, manager of environmental services; we have Mitch White, plant technical services supervisor; and Brian Martin, environmental scientist. With the FutureGen Alliance we have Mr. Gordon Beeman. Also like to recognize Gretchen Hunt who is the stakeholder involvement

manager; and Sally Greenberg with the State of Illinois Geological Survey.

We have a contractor who's working for the Department of Energy who's preparing the EIS, and that is Potomac-Hudson Engineering. We have president of the Potomac-Hudson, Mr. Fred Carey with us this evening -- he's in the back -- along with Cynthia Ong and Andrea Wilkes and Amanda Tyrrell. Again, I'm Cliff Whyte, and I appreciate everybody being her this evening.

Next on our agenda will be Mr. Jeff Hoffmann. He's going to talk a little bit about DOE's role and some background information.

MR. HOFFMANN: Thank you. Thanks. I'm Jeff Hoffmann with the Department of Energy, Office of Major Demonstrations. I'm the project manager on the FutureGen Alliance side which covers the pipeline and sequestration portion of the project. Nelson Rekos is, as Cliff had mentioned, he's a project manager with the Office of Major Demonstrations, and he's responsible for the Ameren side which covers the power plant within the fence line.

I'd like to start off and just kind of give a brief introduction to FutureGen 2.0. FutureGen 2.0

is a government/industry partnership to test oxy-combustion technology for safe and permanent carbon sequestration at meaningful commercial scale. I'm not going to go into details on either the technical details of the Ameren side or the FutureGen Alliance side. Representatives from both of those projects will be speaking immediately after me.

What I would like to say is that the U.S. Department of Energy has awarded approximately $1.05 billion, $1 billion of which is American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding, to execute the FutureGen 2.0 project. Combined with the industry cost share, the total project value is approximately $1.3 billion.

The objectives of the FutureGen project are to validate the technical feasibility and economic viability of near-zero emission energy from coal, validate the effectiveness, safety, and permanence of CO2 sequestration into the saline formation, establish a standardized technology and protocols for CO2 measurement, verification, and accounting, typically referred to as MVA, and gain domestic and global acceptance of the FutureGen 2.0 concept to facilitate broad deployment of oxy-combustible CCS.

I'd like to give a little bit of context of

where FutureGen 2.0 fits into the office of the Department of Energy Major Demonstrations Program. For the past 25 years, DOE NETL has been co-funding industry government cost-share projects to the large-scale demonstration of clean coal technologies. Over that time period, many of the large-scale demonstrations have resulted in moving pre-commercial technologies to widespread commercial deployment.

FutureGen 2.0 fits near the end of this arrow. It's intended to bring the, to develop and test technology options for both new power plants as well as repowering existing technologies with carbon capture sequestration. It's expected that the technology proven and lessons learned by FutureGen 2.0 will be useful in the deployment of the next generation of coal-based power plants.

This slide here represents the broad spectrum of major demonstration projects and test projects that are currently being funded by the Department of Energy's large-scale demonstration program. Included here are a variety of technologies including Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle coal plants, and it's the same technology that was intended for use in the original FutureGen. It also includes

post-combustion capture from conventional pulverized coal plants as well as carbon capture sequestration from industrial processes including the ADM project located nearby in Decatur, Illinois.

Note that FutureGen 2.0 is the only oxy-combustion project in this portfolio. Also mentioned, as many of you are familiar with the Taylorville Energy Center, that while it's not represented in here, it's among a number of other projects that are intended on moving carbon capture sequestration forward. This slide here represents those that are directly funded out of the Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory.

Another item I want to point out with this slide is that many of the projects, the lion's share of those that are being conducted are looking to sequester the CO2 in the EOR. Important to this project and one of the primary objectives is the demonstration of long-term permanent and safe sequestration in saline formations. Of the list of technologies or list of projects that I depicted before, only three of these, FutureGen 2.0 being one of them, are targeting the saline formations. It's worth mentioning that FutureGen 2.0 is planned to be

the largest scale in terms of tons-per-year storage of the three that are identified here.

Just a brief overview of what carbon sequestration is. Carbon sequestration can be described in a variety of manners one of which is terrestrial sequestration where CO2 is absorbed from the air and is sequestered and captured in trees, soils, and grasses. The other is point source capture, what we are looking to do here, where carbon dioxide from flue gas streams such as in the FutureGen 2.0 Meredosia facility or other options such as ethanol plants, cement, steel, and refineries, and natural gas processing plants where the carbon is captured, cleaned, and purified and compressed to be pipeline-ready.

The carbon is then sequestered in geologic storage formation such as saline formations, depleted oil/gas wells, unmineable coal seams, basalts, shales, and other types of suitable geologic formations. It's worth mentioning that, again, the FutureGen program is targeted to test and prove storage in deep saline formations.

Why this is important is if you look at this slide here, this captures information from a

National Storage Atlas that's developed by the National Energy Technology Laboratory and their partners. What this depicts here is what's been identified as a conservative or low-availability estimate of storage formations as well as a high-availability estimate of storage formations. What's important from the perspective of saline formations is that compared to oil and gas fields and unmineable coal seams, in the context of the available storage capacity, saline formations have at least an order of magnitude more storage capacity than oil and gas fields and unmineable gas coal seams.

Also important is the broad distribution of saline formations compared to some of the other options. Saline formations are of much greater distribution throughout the United States many of which are located in areas that are currently near existing coal-fire and other industrial CO2 sources.

In my last slide, I'll cover a little bit of background and speak a little bit to what, how Cliff had identified that FutureGen 2.0 is different than the original FutureGen program. FutureGen itself was conceived and initially announced in the last decade, formally kicked off in 2004 with a March 2004

report to Congress. In that report, FutureGen was identified as an integrated research initiative with the objective to establish feasibility and viability of producing electricity from coal with near-zero emissions.

Shortly after that report was published, FutureGen Industrial Alliance was formed, and the original FutureGen project that would have been located in Mattoon was designed as an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle, or IGCC plant with hydrogen production and carbon capture sequestration in the Mt. Simon saline formation.

In August 2010, Secretary Chu announced that FutureGen 2.0 was another alternative to achieving near-zero emissions, near-zero-emission electric power from coal, the primary drivers of which were the fact that rising costs for IGCC concepts as well as a number of other IGCC concepts had been announced. And FutureGen 2.0 represents oxy-combustion which is an amenable and potentially cost-effective option for repowering the existing plants or the existing fleets of new power plant construction.

With that, I'd like to introduce Mike Long,

he's the plant manager, to go into additional detail of the Meredosia side, the Ameren side of FutureGen 2.0.

MR. LONG: Thank you, Jeff. As Jeff said, I'm Mike Long, plant manager of the Meredosia power station. What I'd like to talk to you about this evening is a little bit about Ameren Energy Resources, who we are, a project overview of the Meredosia project, and a description of oxy-combustion technology.

Most of you are aware of Ameren, and under the umbrella of the Ameren corporation are three companies: Ameren Illinois, Ameren Missouri, and Ameren Energy Resources. Ameren Energy Resources is the owner and operator of power stations in Illinois, and they're an independent power producer. By that I mean that we're not a rate-regulated utility, that we sell our energy to the open market.

Last year our total generating capacity of the AER was 6,250 megawatts, and last year it produced just under 30 terawatt hours of energy. Ameren Energy Marketing is a company within AER that sells the power from the Meredosia power station and the other plants in the AER system. We sell to wholesale and retail

customers, municipals, cooperatives, common marketers and the like as listed on the slide.

The project team for the Meredosia FG2 project is, of course, Ameren Energy Resources. They're the owner and operator of Meredosia plant. Babcock and Wilcox; they're responsible for the boiler island and gas quality control system. Air Liquide, responsible for the air separation unit and the compression and purification unit.

URS was hired by Ameren as a project manager; they're responsible for balance of plant and interconnecting that to the existing plant facilities. And by balance of plant, I'll explain. On this project, Unit 4, which is the unit that is being repowered, the turbine and all of the systems that support that turbine and generator will remain in place. And that's what we refer to as the balance of plant.

As we look at this picture, on your left, left of the slide, there's a tall chimney, and that is plant south. And as you look to the right would be plant north. That chimney is connected to Units 1 and 2, which are fueled by coal. And those units currently have their operation suspended. Unit 3 has

a stack on top of it. It is the next stack to your right. Unit 3 also is powered by coal, and that unit is in operation.

The unit that we're concerned with here on this project is Unit 4. It has the, in the yellow rectangular box, that is Unit 4. What you're looking at in that box in this particular picture is Boiler 6. Boiler 6 will be replaced with a new oxy-combustion boiler. It will be referred to as Boiler 7, and the plant itself will extend to the property in the foreground of this picture.

Unit 4 was selected as an ideal candidate for oxy-combustion simply for, well, for a couple of reasons actually. Its main fuel is oil, and because of that, it does not compete as efficiently as coal does in an open market; and as a result, it sits idle quite a bit. So a new power source to a turbine generator is very desirable to, for Unit 4. It's also a logical next step as far as scale for the oxy-combustion technology.

200 megawatts is the size of this unit, and it's a logical step from a 30-megawatt test unit that we have already proven to the first commercial scale size. The turbine generator also has very low

operating hours in the neighborhood of 20,000 hours, which by power plant standards is very low. And that is as a result of the fuel that is used in that unit, as I just described.

Okay. So what is oxy-combustion? If you think about the air that you breathe, approximately 80 percent of it is nitrogen, 20 percent being oxygen. In a combustion process, be it coal or gasoline or wood or whatever, the end result is CO2 and nitrogen. Basically what the oxy-combustion process is doing is simply stripping the nitrogen away from the air and using that in a combustion process.

Now, in order to make certain that the volume is the same throughout that process, CO2 is recirculated back into the combustion process, and as a result, as you can see on the graphs behind me, that approximately 20 percent of that process is all that is going to the compression purification unit. The rest is being utilized in the combustion process.

Okay. The plant will basically be made up into three sections. There's a typical boiler island or power block that's in the middle, and that's where the electricity is generated, but it's added a couple processes on the front end and the back end. The air

separation unit is obviously on the front; that's where oxygen is utilized to strip the nitrogen from the air, the air goes to the boiler for combustion purposes, and the flue gas from that process goes through environmental cleanup equipment. And that equipment is basically equipment that is currently used on existing power plants today. It's a bag house and scrubber system.

Flue gas from that system is recirculated back to the O2 stream; as we mentioned in the previous slide, that would be part of the combustion process. At the end, we're left with a very concentrated stream of CO2 which is compressed at the compression and purification stage. From there it enters into the sequestration pipeline.

And with that, we're ready for Gordon Beeman from FutureGen Alliance, and Gordon can take it from there.

MR. BEEMAN: Good evening. My name's Gordon Beeman. I'm the manager for design engineering for the FutureGen Alliance. I'd like to send regrets from Ken Humphreys our CEO. He would have liked to have been here tonight. Unfortunately, he's currently out of the country trying to attract other members to

the Alliance. What I'm going to talk about tonight is essentially the FutureGen Alliance's part of the project, which is essentially the CO2 pipeline that comes from the Meredosia plant, and then the CO2 storage site.

FutureGen Alliance was formed shortly after the report to Congress. It's essentially a consortium of coal producers and equipment suppliers and electrical-generation utilities who generate electricity from coal. They've come together with the main purpose of trying to find a way to produce clean coal and capture CO2. So if you look at our project concept, essentially what we have is the power plant that Mike referred to earlier.

We have currently a CO2 pipeline that runs to the sequestration site, and then there'll be an injection well. We actually think we will wind up with two injection wells. They will inject the CO2 deep underground, more than a mile underground, into the Mt. Simon saline formation. The nice thing about the geology in central Illinois is essentially we have a primary caprock of shale which serves as a primary means of sequestering the CO2, and then there are also our secondary shale layers higher up in the formation

that would also serve as additional barriers.

So the project goals, I think Jeff talked a little bit about them earlier. We want to demonstrate the siting, permitting, insuring, operating activities necessary to put together a CO2 storage plant that's fully integrated with the power plant. It's our goal to store ultimately 39 million metric tons of CO2 that would otherwise be emitted to the atmosphere. We expect to store about 1.3 million metric tons on an annual basis.

We want to demonstrate the comprehensive monitoring technologies that are required to ensure that the CO2 is going into the formation as we expected it to go into the formation and it's behaving in the formation as we expect it to and that we know the extent of the formation. We also intend to establish a visitor and research and training facilities that would be dedicated to looking at carbon capture and storage technologies, and we want to provide a pathway for future activities in the same area. FutureGen 2.0 essentially is a first-of-a-kind project. We hope to make it easier for those that come down the road.

This briefly kind of shows the injection well. What you see here is a well head, the piping

that leads up to the well head for the injection of the CO2. The CO2 will come into the site in a 12-inch-diameter pipeline. Comes in as supercritical CO2, which means it's a liquid. It'll be, reach the site at somewhere over 1500 PSI probably at around 90 degrees Fahrenheit. We will then inject it down into the ground.

As we put the pipeline together, the pipeline will be at least four feet underground in all areas. Where it comes through agricultural land, we will be down at least five feet. And we made a commitment to stay 150 feet away from residences even though requirements say 50 feet is sufficient. As I mentioned earlier, we probably will have two injection wells, and then there will be several monitoring wells that would be placed on site to monitor the CO2 plume.

As you may know, FutureGen Alliance has selected Morgan County site near Jacksonville as a permanent preferred site for the CO2 storage facility; however, there are two alternate sites, here in Christian County and in Douglas County. All three sites are being carried forward through the EIS, and we will be evaluating all three sites.

If we look specifically at the Morgan

County formation, we will be storing CO2 about a mile underground. It's far away from the groundwater which only goes down to a depth of about 200 feet. As I indicated before, at that site we have three primary seals, and we believe that the, as we've seen in other demonstration projects, that the Mt. Simon formation would be very high-quality storage reservoir for CO2.

As I mentioned earlier, there are a significant amount of monitoring activities that take place. Not only are there wells that go down to monitor the pressure in the formation. There are wells that go down above the caprock to check for any potential CO2 leakage that comes up. There are seismic arrays in place to help understand how the plume is moving.

Significant amount of monitoring pieces are required by the class 6 injection permit that we will receive from the U.S. EPA, and if you have any particular questions about these monitoring activities, please contact one of us later.

In summary, FutureGen 2.0 is the world's first near-zero emission power plant. A high rate of carbon capture. We expect carbon capture to be in excess of 90 percent. We expect near-zero levels of

other traditional emissions. There will be full integration between the CO2 pipeline and the geologic storage.

We will essentially enable the use of Illinois basin coal as a clean coal piece, and we will create and create construction and permanent jobs. We'll provide additional revenue for those landowners whose deep underground storage space is used for the CO2 storage. And that will increase county tax revenue, and it should contribute somewhere between, construct somewhere between the 25 and $50 million in the visitor research and training facilities.

MR. WHYTE: Thanks, Gordon. I'm going to give just a short talk about the National Environmental Policy Act. It's going to be short because I'm nearly blind from the sun coming in on me here. But anyway, it is a federal law that's been in effect for quite some time, since 1970. It applies to all federal agencies. When there's federal monies involved, when there's federal projects that are being undertaken, they must comply with NEPA. It is a national charter for the protection of the environment, and it promotes environmental considerations in a decision-making process.

One of the central tenets of an EIS is to make the information available to the public. This information needs to be high-quality, it needs to be in the hands of the public and also in the hands of the expert agencies in the various resource areas. One of the things I failed to say earlier today was that I appreciated the fact that there were a number of state agencies represented here this evening, and we appreciate all those folks coming out to be part of this. And finally, public involvement is one of the most important aspects.

For this particular EIS, we made the determination in November that an EIS was necessary. Notice of intent was filed in the Federal Register on May 23. There've been a number of mailings and scoping letters that have been sent out to various agencies. And it's basically a 30-day window for the scoping period, although as I've said earlier, we'll accept comments that are a little late to the extent that it's practicable. Public comments should be submitted to DOE by Wednesday, June 22.

A typical environmental impact statement, which can be voluminous, is, consists of various pieces, and these general pieces of the document

remain the same. There's a purpose and need for agency action. There's a proposed agency action and the reasonable alternatives, a discussion of the proposed project and project alternatives, a description of the affected environment, an analysis of the potential environmental consequences, and there's also a list of agencies, organizations, and persons who are contacted. Also public participation and responses to public input are included in these documents.

As I'm sure many of you saw in one of the posters back here this evening, we're early on in this process for the FutureGen 2.0 project. The notice of intent was filed in May, and right now we're at the first comment period, the first public scoping. A draft EIS will come next followed by a comment period on that draft document so that we can solicit additional input.

The schedule that we envision for this is that a draft environmental impact statement will likely be out in the spring of 2012. At that point, obviously we'd have another public hearing and be back here to present that document and collect public information or public input on that document. The

final EIS we're projecting to be published in the fall of 2012 with the record of decision to follow after.

The purpose of the public scoping meeting is to collect your input. We want to know what the local folks believe should be in the scope of the EIS. What are the issues, what are the concerns, what data do you believe needs to be generated or used, what analysis needs to be performed, and in general what the stakeholder concerns are.

After the meeting tonight, you're welcome to continue to submit comments. My address is on here as well as on the comment forms that are available in the back as well as my e-mail address and a toll-free number. And again, I can't emphasize enough comments are due by Wednesday, June 22.

At this point, we're going to begin the formal collection of comments. Again, please note this is not a question-and-answer session. This is your opportunity to read your comments, your thoughts into the record such that they can be recorded. After the public, each speaker's had an opportunity, we'll open this back up to anyone who hasn't preregistered to speak or anybody who has anything additional to add, and after we close the formal public comment

portion, we will be available after the meeting to have additional questions and answers similar to what we did before the meeting. Please limit your speeches to five minutes. Again, we'll give opportunities to speak as time allows at the end.

There will be an official transcript made. It's likely that that will be available in a couple of weeks online. Speakers, please when you come up to the microphone, please state your name clearly and your affiliation. If you're with an organization or speaking on behalf of a group or club, please make that known. That said, let's start with the comments, and let me get the list here. First commenter this evening will be Mayor Greg Brotherton.

MAYOR BROTHERTON: Thank you. My name is Greg Brotherton, and I'm currently serving as mayor of the city of Taylorville. I've lived in the city of Taylorville for most of my life. I grew up here, I met and married my wife here, and I've raised my children here. Taylorville is my home, and I want only the best for it and its citizens.

The city of Taylorville has demonstrated time and time again that it wants to embrace clean energy technologies. This has been evidenced by the

numerous local meetings and rallies held in support of both the proposed Taylorville Energy Center, and FutureGen 2.0. This project means more than just new jobs for our citizens. It represents hope for the city and the surrounding county, hope for a new industry and the revival of our local economy, hope for a brighter future for our sons and daughters.

We offer to be associated with FutureGen 2.0 because we believe that it represents an investment that will be a catalyst for growth not only within the city but in the rest of the state as well. Taylorville has a long, rich history that evolved around the mining of coal. Christian County was once home to the world's largest coal mine, and it is still rare to find a resident who is not related to someone who once worked in those mines.

After suffering through decades of a local economic downturn, the result in large part from the area coal mine shutting down, the idea that a new technology may once again allow this relatively abundant resource to be utilized is definitely exciting for us and the country as a whole. We believe in the viability of the coal gasification process and understand the science behind the CO2

sequestration.

With that said, our citizens also recognize the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing this country's energy needs, one that includes not only clean coal but also includes renewable energy sources like wind, solar, biomass, hydropower, nuclear power, and efficient natural gas. We want our leaders to eagerly embrace those opportunities that will allow us to gain a greater degree of energy self-sufficiency. A FutureGen 2.0 project offers us that type of opportunity.

The federal government has shown support for this type of project by including loan guarantees in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This type of funding assistance helps make the implementation of the new technologies possible and in turn benefits all of us. We certainly welcome this as evidence that our federal government sees the need for the development of clean energy technologies like FutureGen 2.0.

I cannot overemphasize the positive impact that a project like FutureGen would have in our city. Workers involved in construction would eat at our restaurants, shop at our stores, stay in our motels, and rent available residential property. I truly

believe that the much-needed economic stimulus that this project would provide would also trigger additional new investment into the area.

The concept plans for FutureGen 2.0 have received the approval and support of not only the city of Taylorville but of numerous other area entities as well. The Taylorville Chamber of Commerce, Christian County Board, and the Christian County Economic Development Corporation have all voiced their support for the project. The citizens of Taylorville are confident that the proposed facility will be built and operated well within all of the health-based federal, state, and environmental standards.

No one is more concerned about those issues than our own citizens. After all, it is their community, their environment that's being impacted, and their quality of life that would be bettered. As the Department of Energy proceeds through the National Environmental Policy Act environmental impact study, I hope that they will weigh the needs and desires of the local community above those of the outside interests.

The Taylorville City Council has demonstrated its support of the project. We have worked with and will continue to work hand in hand

with developers to ensure that FutureGen 2.0 project has what it needs from our city. Thank you very much for allowing this opportunity to address you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. Our next speaker this evening will be County Board Chair Mr. John Curtain.

MR. CURTAIN: Thank you, Mr. Whyte. My name is John Curtain. I'm the chairman of the Christian County Board. On behalf of the members of the Christian County Board and the residents of Christian County that we represent, I want to express our support of the DOE's federal mission here tonight to help to understand the full impact of FutureGen 2.0's CO2 storage field.

We're more than pleased to host you here and appreciate the opportunity to let you know what we perceive will be the most important impact this project will have here locally and all across the entire region of the state. I was around here during the boom years when coal was king and working in the mines was a way of life for most of our residents here in Christian County.

My father-in-law moved here from Ohio back in the 30s to work in the mine where he made a good

salary and provided for his family. Coal moved out of this county by the trainloads, and the miners had secure jobs. I also have seen that boom end and eventually nearly die off when demand for Illinois coal waned due to more stringent standards in the Clean Air Act.

Coal-fired power plants that are now going off line must be replaced by using coal in a clean and more environmentally responsible way. We have a huge abundance of coal reserves here, and we desperately need these jobs. Please heavily consider the positive impact of this project on our region in your environmental impact studies. Thank you very much.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. The next speaker will be Mayor Steve Sipes.

MAYOR SIPES: Thank you. I'm Steve Sipes, mayor of the city of Pana. The city of Pana is very excited about the opportunity to help host the CO2 deep underground storage site for FutureGen 2.0 in Christian County. If Christian County is selected, this project would not only put central Illinois on the map in terms of environmentally responsible electric generation, but it opens the door to cleaner uses of Illinois coal. That's why we appreciate the

Department of Energy's mission to help bring these projects to a reality. The number of jobs and the amount of local spending this project will bring to our area especially during this national job downturn and would, I would hope would make a strong consideration in your impact study.

In Christian County we have had plenty of time to learn about the environmental benefits and impacts of CO2 storage because of our familiarity with other projects. We have had presentations from the Illinois State Geological Survey, and we've had time to ask questions about the process until we are relatively comfortable. We understand that the FutureGen 2.0 storage project will result in millions of tons of avoided carbon dioxide emissions. In addition, we look forward to the economic boost projects such as the FutureGen CO2 storage project can provide for our area. Creating jobs in central Illinois leads to overall economic growth in all sectors including our community of Pana. Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. The next speaker that signed up in advance was Mr. Jadon Evans.

(No response.)

Okay. Mr. Marsh? Would you like to make

any comments on the record. You're signed up in advance. Okay. No problem.

That brings us to those who signed up this evening, and the first speaker off that list is Mr. Alan Rider.

MR. RIDER: Good evening. My name is Alan Rider, R-i-d-e-r. I represent me, the private citizen. I live in the Mt. Auburn area of Christian County. I would like to make a few comments for the record, and one is pertaining to clean coal technology. Coal burning for energy production has not changed at all.

We burn coal, it has the same waste byproducts today as it had 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and 30 years ago. Some of it, of course, can be captured and properly disposed, as the Ameren officials pointed out, and they're absolutely correct. Scrubbers have been in place for several, several years. There're still some areas that need to be worked on in terms of capturing. Perhaps mercury might be one of them.

Another one though is what this whole project and this whole discussion is about, and that is CO2. It's a big concern. Every time you look in

the newspaper, I would suggest almost weekly if not daily, you're seeing something about weather, you're seeing something about climate change, you're seeing something about things changing in our world and including Illinois.

Including Illinois in terms of last year, last summer, for example, the Great Lakes reached its highest temperature of the year a month ahead of its normal average time that it reaches its maximum temperature. The farmers in northern Indiana today are still attempting to plant their corn crops. This is today, not last year, not 10 years ago. This is today. They've had the rainiest season in northern Indiana ever in recorded history. 2010 was the recorded warmest year in recorded history worldwide.

So I'm asking the question why are we investing tax dollars in an established industry? Why do we not use our tax dollars to catch up to other countries who are ahead of the United States of America in terms of leading-edge energy technology production, namely China and Germany. Other people have made comments, yes, China still produces a lot of dirty energy. You're correct, they do. But they are also on the leading edge of clean energy technology

because they know, they have seen the handwriting on the wall, and their government has taken the position to do something about it aggressively.

It's also important to note that this particular project is almost 80 percent funded by the federal government. Now, if this were a project that private industry thought was profitable, I don't think -- I think they would invest in it by themselves, and I understand the whole federal government subsidy program; I get that.

Carbon capture, of course, on this scale has not been done, and I understand that this project is a test for that; I get that. There are very few carbon capture operations presently operational, and yes, we did see a slide a few minutes ago that showed the ones that were.

But I would like to point out that, for example, the information that I found on the Morgan County site is made up of sandstone, sits at a slight angle, and that makes carbon capture or gas being injected into the earth a little bit more mobile and potentially problematic. So I would like to include that in the record that I am challenging the location for the gas capture.

I would also like to point out that Illinois is impacted by the New Madrid Fault. And there are many here who are thinking we haven't had any problem with earthquakes around here lately, so what is your concern? I would suggest to you that perhaps that comment would also have been made in Japan one year ago. If you're not sure, what I meant was they had an earthquake that did a lot of damage to their nuclear industry there.

I'm also concerned about the lack of regulations that are in place for carbon capture. Who's liable if there is a breakdown and a release of carbon that is injected into the earth? Is it going to be the Alliance? There are no, there are no regulations in place right now or they're perhaps being formed and generated and debated, but to my knowledge, there are no regulations in place right now.

Of course, we're talking about carbon capture and the resulting electricity that will be produced from it. I asked a question earlier to one of the Ameren officials, well, how will this electricity be priced? The answer was, we don't know. I asked the question, well, will it be subsidized

perhaps by the government? The answer was, I don't know. It has not yet been decided. Now, if it is being subsidized by the government, whether it's a federal or the state subsidy, guess who's paying for that? You and I, the taxpayers.

I would suggest that is not a viable alternative. I'm sure all of you read in the paper probably daily about the concern on the federal level and our own state level about debt, federal debt. If this project is being subsidized to produce electricity -- excuse me. If this project is being pursued to have subsidized electricity by the government, I would suggest that's not in our best interest.

The electricity that will be produced is also said to be increasing -- let me rephrase that. It came out awkward. The official, Ameren officials suggest that more electricity will be produced if this operation and this project goes forward. I am asking the question, is this electricity needed. I know our gentleman from the Department of Energy did some explanation of this FutureGen 2.0 and differentiated it from the prior FutureGen project. But to me as a citizen, I do not understand the difference, and if

the project, if the earlier project was cancelled or at least postponed or suspended because of cost overruns, I don't understand why this one would not have the same problem. Thank you very much.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you, Alan. The last speaker that signed up is Jack Norman.

MR. NORMAN: Thank you. My apologies. My name is Jack Norman. I'm here as a citizen of the state of Illinois. All of us, wherever we live and work and whatever our other concerns may be, are entitled to hope for proof of this project's workability and for its complete success.

On the way there, it is critical to identify potential hazards arising from projects, construction, and operation, to thoroughly characterize and evaluate them, and as needed, to construct ways to avoid or sufficiently minimize those hazards. Decisions must not be based on mere hope or on personal affiliations. Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you, sir. That concludes our list of registered speakers. Is there anyone here this evening who hasn't had an opportunity to speak that would like to enter comments into the record?

(No response.)

MR. WHYTE: Hearing none, are there any who have spoken who would wish to provide additional comments at this time? Mr. Rider?

MR. RIDER: Yes, sir. My name is Alan Rider. I'm a private citizen from the Mt. Auburn area of Christian County. I overlooked this comment, and I apologize for that. My, one of my comments was investing tax dollars in a leading- or cutting-edge technology. I would also like to point out that if you're investing those dollars in those types of projects, those would also create jobs. Thank you very much.

MR. WHYTE: Anyone else who'd like to enter comments into the record this evening?

(No response.)

MR. WHYTE: Well, thank you for your comments, participation this evening. Please remember that the scoping period ends on June 22, 2011. We're going to hang around here for a little while. If anyone would like to have additional discussion, please welcome to do that. This concludes the formal session of the public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. Let the record show that this meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m. Thank you all.

(Off the record at 8:02 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANGAMON)

I, Rhonda K. O'Neal, a Certified Shorthand Reporter (IL), Registered Professional Reporter, and a Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the meeting aforementioned was held on the time and in the place previously described.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal.

_____

Notary Public within and for
the State of Illinois