

Mattoon, Illinois Table of Comments

M1.	Ashworth, Larry	13-111
M2.	Donnell, Tom	13-113
M3.	Mattoon Schools (Lilly, Larry D.)	13-115
M4.	Daily, Bruce	13-117
M5.	Upchurch Group (Dwiggins, Mark)	13-121
M6.	Gire, Jim	13-123
M7.	Freeland, D.	13-126
M8.	Roytek, Phyllis Rita.....	13-128
M9.	Mattoon Fire Department (Strader, Mitch)	13-130
M10.	Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (Thompson, Kyle).....	13-132
M11.	U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Bloomer, Phil)	13-134
M12.	Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)	13-136
M13.	Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)	13-141
M14.	City of Sullivan (Short, Ann)	13-143
M15.	Coles Together (Griffin, Angela)	13-145
M16.	Metzger, Kent.....	13-147
M17.	Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (McShane, Jim).....	13-153
M18.	Illinois Coal Association (Gonet, Phil)	13-155
M19.	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 146 (Taylor, John).....	13-157
M20.	Bell, Jim	13-159
M21.	FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering) (<i>The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8</i>)	13-161

Commentor (Alphabetical)	Commentor #
Ashworth, Larry	M1
Bell, Jim	M20
City of Sullivan (Short, Ann)	M14
Coles Together (Griffin, Angela)	M15
Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (McShane, Jim)	M17
Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (Thompson, Kyle)	M10
Daily, Bruce	M4
Donnell, Tom	M2
Freeland, D.	M7
FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)	M21
Gire, Jim	M6
Illinois Coal Association (Gonet, Phil)	M18
Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)	M12
Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)	M13

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 146 (Taylor, John)	M19
Mattoon Fire Department (Strader, Mitch)	M9
Mattoon Schools (Lilly, Larry D.)	M3
Metzger, Kent	M16
Roytek, Phyllis Rita	M8
U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Bloomer, Phil)	M11
Upchurch Group (Dwiggins, Mark)	M5

M1. Ashworth, Larry

From: Angela Griffin [mailto:angela@colestogether.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2007 12:40 AM
To: Swartz, Lucy L; Debra Walker
Subject: Names

You asked for the names of the people I've talked to who had questions.

#1 | Larry Ashworth – said his questions were coming from Bruce Daily
Tom Donnell – said his questions were coming from Bruce Daily. Tom is a huge advocate of the project and friend to Bruce Daily. Tom has tried to convince Bruce this project is in the public's best interest. He provide Bruce's questions to me in an effort to have them addressed to give Bruce a higher degree of comfort with th project. However, when I left a message for Bruce to offer one-on-one time with Gretchen, he didn't call back

Tom is a Director on the Coles County Farm Bureau and presented the Resolution to support the project to tl Farm Bureau (which was passed).

Angela Griffin
President
Coles Together
400 Airport Road
Mattoon, IL 61938
217-258-5627 -phone
217-254-1369 - cell
217-235-9492 - fax
angela@colestogether.com
www.colestogether.com

M1. Ashworth, Larry

Response to Comment #1:

Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

M2. Donnell, Tom

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

#1

2 TOM DONNELL: Thank you. I'll try to be brief.
3 I've had a long day. I buried my very best friend of 53
4 years today, but I feel so strongly about this project that
5 I came here tonight.

6 There are some other farmers in the audience that
7 will speak in event we have a lot of negative talkers.
8 Otherwise, I'll be the only farmer, I guess, that will be
9 speaking. They allowed me to speak, because I like to
10 talk.

11 Okay. The EIS states that 200 acres of farmland will
12 be converted for use for the power plant site. As a farmer
13 and a member of the Coles County Farm Bureau, I have no
14 objection to this, particularly in light of the fact that
15 the use is to construct and demonstrate that we could use
16 coal efficiently without contributing to greenhouse gas
17 emissions.

18 Keep in mind that a lot of this land can still be
19 used for farm services. Also, for anyone who is concerned
20 about loss of farmland, putting the project in Mattoon
21 ultimately converts less farmland because Mattoon is the
22 only proposed site that can accommodate the injection well
23 on-site for the CO-2.

0047

24 Almost everything has been covered here tonight

1 except one thing; and Mr. Oliver stated this or touched on
2 it when he spoke. Mr. Oliver stated that we, that we want
3 to use this technology around the globe in all types of
4 weather and all climates, South Africa, India, China, South
5 Korea, Japan. You name it.

6 300 days ago I spoke here and I brought up something
7 very important. Illinois has different types of weather.
8 We have extreme cold. We have extreme hot and humid. Our
9 competing state has the same type of weather all the time.
10 The same boring, long weather all the time.

11 (Laughter.)

12 So if we want to prove that this can be used around
13 the world, we need to locate it in Illinois.

14 I am really amazed at the folks that put together the
15 Environmental Impact Statement. In 21 simple page, they
16 put a lot of information in here. But looking at this
17 statement, I have to wonder why we have to bother to hold a
18 hearing here tonight; because, obviously, the two Texas
19 sites just don't qualify.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Read the statement and you'll see what I mean.

22 It has to be either Mattoon and or Tuscola; and
23 Mattoon is slightly ahead of Tuscola.

24 (Laughter.)

0048

1 Gentlemen, I do hope that you let Mr. Nolte get his
2 corn harvested before we start construction; but let's
3 start construction soon.
4 Thank you.

M2. Donnell, Tom

Response to Comment #1:

Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

M3. Mattoon Schools (Lilly, Larry D.)

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

5 LARRY LILLY: Good evening. My name is
6 Larry Lilly; and as Superintendent of the Mattoon schools,
7 I am pleased to publicly welcome representatives of
8 FutureGen and all of you to Riddle Elementary School.
9 As you can imagine, we are extremely proud of our
10 wonderful educational facilities here in Mattoon. In 2003,
11 we opened this beautiful elementary school along with
12 Williams Elementary School which is an identical building
13 on the other side of town.
14 Over the past 2 years, we've completed extensive
15 remodel of Mattoon High School and are now in the process
16 of our final building upgrades to our middle school.
17 Our facilities were built and renovated with
18 community growth in mind and we believe are among the
19 finest in the state. As a result, Mattoon schools are now
20 in the position to welcome an influx of FutureGen families
21 and their children to our 21st century classrooms.
22 We invite you to tour our facilities and meet our
23 staff and talk with our parents and students. In so doing,
24 we are confident that you will be impressed with the warm,

1 caring, learning atmosphere in Mattoon schools.
2 Please know that we are ready to partner with
3 FutureGen, your employees, and your, and their children.
4 We thank you for this opportunity and appreciate all

#1

0052

M3. Mattoon Schools (Lilly, Larry D.)

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

M4. Daily, Bruce

Bruce DAILY

Mattoon

#1

For 30 years my family has lived on a farm located near the intended site of the FutureGen plant. From the beginning, I have been concerned about the ramifications for our neighborhood if Mattoon is selected. Several hours spent studying the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) have confirmed that those concerns are indeed valid. I feel that these concerns may be shared not only by the residents of the 22 homes that are within 1 mile of the plant, but also by some Mattoon residents, particularly parents of children who attend Riddle School.

A closer look at the FutureGen Environmental Impact Study reveals the FutureGen plant to be a potentially unfriendly neighbor—loud, smelly, and dangerous.

I would like to share some pertinent sections of the Environmental Impact Study.

#2

Section 4.17-20 states, "Toxic impacts would be dominated by releases of H₂S and SO₂ from the Claus process unit. The resulting plumes could extend from .3 to 1.4 mi. from the point of release. There are 22 family residences or farm home sites and one elementary school within the plume release radius."

The EIS reveals that an explosion occurring at the FutureGen plant would cause 143 people to experience "irreversible adverse effects," from SO₂ with 4 life threatening, and 19 "irreversible adverse effects from H₂S, 10 life threatening," (Table 4.17-17-Effects to the public from explosion at the FG plant).

#3

Virtually every newspaper story about FutureGen uses the phrase "near zero emissions" to describe the plant. FG would pump 1.1 million tons of CO₂ in to the ground per year. Additionally the plant will produce air emissions that are described in table 4.2-1. On an annual basis FutureGen would emit 543 tons per year of sulfur oxides, that number decreasing as fewer start-ups are performed. All other air pollutant measurements stay relatively constant. These other air pollutants include: nitrogen oxides 750 tons/yr., particulate matter 111 tons/yr., carbon monoxide 611 tons/yr., volatile organic compounds 30 tons/yr., mercury .011 tons/yr..

#4

FutureGen will be burning five 100 car trainloads of coal per week—perhaps it's all perspective, but it seems these levels are a far cry from zero.

#5

The EIS states that "because emissions of some criteria pollutants are projected to exceed 100 tons per year, (even with less than 3 restarts per year) the FutureGen Project would be classified as a major source under Clean Air regulations."

#6

Page 4.2-14 indicates the area around the plant would be subject to acid rains.

M4. Daily, Bruce

#7

Page 4.2-14 also states, "Operation of the FutureGen Project may cause noticeable odors. The chemical components that cause odors are hydrogen sulfide and ammonia."

#8

This phrase is in section 4.17.4 regarding risk assessment of CO2 sequestration: "The approach to risk analysis for CO2 sequestration is still evolving."

#9

Page 3-22 is about noise from the plant. "Pneumatic or electric rail car shakers could generate noise levels of up to 118 dba. If the shaker is used on every rail car, the shaker would be used an estimated 253-428 times per week." 118 dba is about the same noise level as a jet takeoff. This would be in addition to the noise of the trains themselves.

#10

The agricultural property outside the city limits has been rezoned by the city of Mattoon. I believe this does not accomplish what zoning should. A good zoning plan promotes orderly development, with industries grouped. It does not hopscotch a prime agricultural/suburban area. Apparently at some point the State of Illinois would have agreed. Page 4.11-19 reads, "The proposed Mattoon Power Plant sites a LESA score of 255 points exceeds the 225 point threshold for lands that under the Illinois LESA system should be reevaluated so that the site could be returned for agricultural use."

I also believe a good zoning plan should protect the residents of a neighborhood from nuisances, danger, and the degradation of their enjoyment of their property and the lowering of their property value.

#11

The FutureGen Project is an experiment. I believe it is an experiment that should be conducted where the fewest people will be impacted by its possible negative consequences.

M4. Daily, Bruce

- Response to Comment #1:** Potential noise effects are discussed in the draft EIS for Mattoon in Section 4.14. Aesthetics and Human Health, Safety and Accidents are discussed in Sections 4.12 and 4.17, respectively. Although the FutureGen plant is an industrial facility with issues that may concern the nearby population, every effort will be made to minimize impacts as the site selection is made and final plant design work proceeds. Also, the Record of Decision may require the Alliance to make commitments for or complete specific actions (such as mitigation for specific impacts) as a condition to receive the government funding.
-
- Response to Comment #2:** The risk of an event is a combination of the event likelihood times the event consequences. The case referred to above is a rupture of the Claus unit, which was evaluated to show potential impacts of acts of terrorism or sabotage as required by recent court cases (see Section 4.17.5 of the EIS). This case does not represent normal operating conditions or small gas releases and is an unlikely event. The case resulting in potential effects to the largest number of people was for explosion of the Claus Unit at the plant, which would be a rare event, less likely to occur than other releases such as from the CO₂ pipeline or injection well. The number potentially experiencing irreversible effects by SO₂ was 143 out to a distance of 1.4 miles and life-threatening effects from SO₂ to a distance of 0.2 miles. The distance to which irreversible effects from H₂S could be experienced was estimated as 0.5 miles and 0.4 miles to life-threatening effects. **The Riddle Elementary School is outside the estimated area where irreversible adverse effects from SO₂ or H₂S were estimated to occur if such an explosion should occur.** The text in Section 4.17.3.2 has been revised as follows: "There are 22 family residences or farm home sites within the 1.4-mile (2.3-kilometer) plume release radius. The Riddle Elementary School would be outside this plume radius, situated approximately 1.75 miles (2.8 kilometers) from the assumed point of release."
-
- Response to Comment #3:** The term "near-zero emissions" is used only in connection with the underlying purpose and need for the project and DOE acknowledges that the FutureGen Project, while still emitting very low pollutants compared to other coal-powered electric plants, would still be a major air pollution source as defined by the Clean Air Act, as stated in the Air Quality Sections (4.2; 5.2; 6.2; and 7.2).
-
- Response to Comment #4:** The term "near-zero emissions" is used only in connection with the underlying purpose and need for the project and DOE acknowledges that the project, while still emitting very low pollutants compared to other coal-powered electric plants, would still be a major air pollution source as defined by the Clean Air Act, as stated in the Air Quality Sections (4.2; 5.2; 6.2; and 7.2).
-
- Response to Comment #5:** Although the FutureGen Project would be a major source of air emission according to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations under the Clean Air Act, it would emit less emissions than state of the art conventional coal-fired power plants or existing coal-fueled IGCC power plants. *See Response to Comment #4 above.* Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
-
- Response to Comment #6:** As stated in the EIS, because the FutureGen Project power plant would emit NO_x, SO₂, and CO₂, it would be subject to the Acid Rain regulations under the Clean Air Act. These regulations require continuous monitoring of these pollutants to ensure that regulatory allowances are not exceeded. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
-

M4. Daily, Bruce

- Response to Comment #7:** Hydrogen sulfide and ammonia are odorous chemicals; however, as is stated in the EIS, the odor would only be noticeable within a short distance of the proposed power plant site and would pose no health hazard to workers or the public. Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.
-
- Response to Comment #8:** This sentence in its entirety and the context in which it was meant is provided in the EIS Section 4.17.4. While the approach may change as more CO₂ sequestration and CO₂-EOR projects are implemented, there is adequate information on which to base the FutureGen Risk Assessment based on naturally occurring CO₂ releases and the substantial amount of information that exists on CO₂ enhanced oil recovery operations.
-
- Response to Comment #9:** This statement is correct in that the noise generated by rail car shakers would be about the same noise level as a jet takeoff. However, since the FutureGen Project is in its early stages of design, it is not known if rail car shakers would be used during coal unloading operations. Text in Section 3.1.14 relating to noise from rail car shakers was included in the DEIS only to acknowledge that equipment source noise levels as high as 118 dBA may be generated if rail car shakers are used to loosen coal material from the walls of the rail cars during unloading. The predicted maximum noise level resulting from the operation of rail car shakers are based on equipment manufacturers' specification data. It assumes the noise and vibration source (e.g., rail car shaker) is in an open-air environment with no acoustical enclosures, sound damping devices, or walls. DOE did not evaluate the impacts of intermittent noise and vibrations that may be generated by rail car shakers if they are used. However, the noise and vibration associated with rail car shakers would be considered if they are included in the final design. Such an analysis would also include the noise dampening effect of any enclosures or sound deadening devices included in the design.
-
- Response to Comment #10:** DOE cannot direct the City of Mattoon as to how to conduct their zoning practices. In Section 4.11.3.1, it is stated that prime farmland conversions are not prohibited and the Coles County Comprehensive Plan identifies the power plant site as suitable for potential economic (that is, non-agricultural) development.
-
- Response to Comment #11:** One or more of the site selection criteria used in the Request for Site Proposals focused on the preference for sequestration sites that were not under high population areas. All four sites under consideration have low population densities overlying the proposed sequestration reservoirs. The primary reason for wanting a sparsely populated area was to have opportunities for monitoring and investigation activities, like monitoring wells and seismic surveys.
- The EIS examined health and safety risks associated with catastrophic power plant accidents (such as fires or explosions) and the resulting impacts to local populations. For these analyses, population density statistics were used. While such events would be unlikely to occur, the EIS provides a side-by-side comparison of the public health and safety impacts for each site under these scenarios.
-

M5. Upchurch Group (Dwiggins, Mark)

FutureGen Project

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

#1

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY. IF MAILED, PLEASE HAVE THIS CARD POST-MARKED ON OR BEFORE JULY 16, 2008

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE MERCURY THAT IS REMOVED
THE COAL? PROCESSED AND SOLD?

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

NAME MARK DWIGGINS ORGANIZATION MATTOON THE UPCHURCH
ADDRESS 123 N-15TH ST. CITY CHATTANOOGA STATE IL ZIP 61938
E-MAIL ADDRESS mdwiggins@upchurchgroup.com

M5. Upchurch Group (Dwiggins, Mark)

Response to Comment #1:

The current conceptual design of the power plant includes activated carbon filters that should remove mercury with a high capture efficiency. The specific equipment and vendor of services have not yet been identified, so specific information is not available at this time on the handling of the spent carbon filter material and the ultimate fate of the mercury. It is expected that a service provider would periodically replace the spent carbon filter material with fresh filter material. The spent filter material would either be sent to a hazardous wastes landfill or would be processed to remove mercury and other captured materials. Mercury and other constituents captured by the carbon filters would not be stored, released, or disposed of on the FutureGen site nor sequestered with the CO₂.

M6. Gire, Jim

FutureGen Project

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

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

MATTOON

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

#1

Radioactive isotopes in coal - fly ash, slag, other
waste byproducts

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

NAME Jim Gire ORGANIZATION citizen
ADDRESS 1625 Reynolds Drive CITY Charleston STATE IL ZIP 61920
E-MAIL ADDRESS Girex4@consolidated.net

M6. Gire, Jim

Response to Comment #1:

Text has been revised in the Air Quality sections (4.2, 5.2, 6.2 and 7.2) as follows:

“Coal is largely composed of organic matter, but some trace elements in coal are naturally radioactive. These radioactive elements include uranium (U), thorium (Th), and their numerous decay products, including radium (Ra) and radon (Rn). During coal processing (e.g. gasification) most of the uranium, thorium and their decay products are released from the original coal matrix and are distributed between the gas phase and the ash product. Almost all radon gas present in feed coal is transferred to the gas phase. In contrast, less volatile elements such as thorium, uranium, and the majority of their decay products are almost entirely retained in the solid ash or slag.

The concentration of uranium and thorium in coal is low. Analyses of Eastern and Western coals show that in the majority of samples, concentrations of uranium and thorium fall in the range from slightly below 1 to 4 parts per million (ppm). Similar uranium and thorium concentrations are found in a variety of common rocks and soils. For example, average thorium concentration in the earth’s crust is approximately 10 ppm. Based on standards for hazardous pollutants, EPA determined that current levels of radionuclide emissions (both parent elements and various decay products) from coal-fired boilers represent a level of risk that protects the public health with an ample margin of safety. Therefore, since the FutureGen plant objective is to achieve near-zero emissions and will have greater particulate control, the risk from air emissions for the FutureGen plant is projected to be less than the plants represented in the EPA study.

The fate and transport of radionuclides in a coal combustion power plant is reasonably well understood, and most radionuclides (with the exception of radon, see below) will partition to the slag or ash. However, limited research to date has been conducted on gasification facilities. DOE sponsored testing and measurement of a number of trace substances, including radionuclides, at the Louisiana Gasification Technology Inc (LGTI) facility located within the Dow Chemical complex in Plaquemine, Louisiana. The objective was to characterize such emissions from an integrated gasification combined cycle power plant. Sampling and chemical analyses included samples from inlet streams (e.g. coal, makeup water, ambient air conditions) and outlet streams leaving the plant (e.g. slag, water, exhaust streams). Limited data indicates that radionuclides behave in a similar manner to combustion facilities but the available data is insufficient to draw significant conclusions. As mentioned previously, FutureGen will have extremely high particulate control compared to conventional coal plants, a requirement for reliable operation of combustion turbines. In addition, FutureGen will have advanced highly efficient control equipment for removal of other syngas contaminants including mercury, sulfur and CO₂ beyond those that were included in the LGTI facility. These additional emission control devices provide added locations where radionuclides may be trapped, resulting in substantially lower emissions compared to existing facilities that use conventional technologies.

Radon is a naturally occurring, inert gas that is formed from normal radioactive decay processes. Radon in the atmosphere comes largely from the natural release of radon from rock and soil formations close to the surface. Radon in coal will be present in the gas phase (e.g. gas bubbles within the coal). The source of the radon is from the decay over time of uranium 235 and 238 or thorium 232 that would have occurred in the coal seam. Some of the radon gas in the coal would be released during mining and coal preparation prior to

M6. Gire, Jim

arriving at the FutureGen plant. The radon released during the gasification process would be present in the syngas product leaving the gasifier. Various syngas cleaning and conditioning processes will be included in the FutureGen plant, likely including water and solvent scrubbing processes as well as absorbent/adsorbent systems. Since radon is soluble in water it is possible that a significant portion of the radon will be transferred to the water stream. Some radon will likely pass through the various scrubbing operations and will be emitted through the stack gas. Technology is currently available and commercially used to remove radon from water (e.g. granular activated carbon, aeration processes) and waste water treatment facilities will be designed to provide suitable control of regulated pollutants.

DOE recognizes that radionuclides are present at detectable levels in coal throughout the U.S. While EPA has indicated that the risk of exposure from emissions from utilities is substantially lower than risks from background radiation, DOE acknowledges that there are research gaps related to the ultimate fate of radionuclides in advanced coal technologies. Characterization and monitoring of gaseous and solid effluents from the facility will be consistent with necessary requirements to ensure compliance with required permits. As a research facility aimed to provide the pathway of achieving coal-based energy generation with zero emissions, FutureGen is a likely candidate location for advancing the understanding of the ultimate fate of trace substances in coal including the ultimate fate of radionuclides.”

M7. Freeland, D.

FutureGen Project

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

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

MATTOON

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

#1

Since this is an experimental project, what guarantees do we have that it will not create difficult problems for the surrounding communities and citizens?

If problems do arise, can we be assured that Future-Gen will make every effort to correct the problems?

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

NAME: Diane Freeland ORGANIZATION: Private Citizen
ADDRESS: 109 Arbogate Dr. CITY: Mattoon STATE: IL ZIP: 61938
E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

M7. Freeland, D.

Response to Comment #1:

The project should be sufficiently funded to take care of problems that arise, so that the local communities do not have to pay the costs. Both DOE and the FutureGen Alliance are looking at the possible accident scenarios that could occur and intend to use this information in designing and operating the facility more safely. The Alliance (as an incorporated legal entity) will be liable for damages that occur in connection with the power plant construction and operation during the co-funded period. The Alliance will continue to have liability as long as they own the facility. Under the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), both the Alliance and DOE could have responsibilities to pay for certain types of environmental clean-up costs (for toxic substances) for long after the project is finished, even if the facilities have been sold to and used by other parties. Regarding the sequestration part of the project, the same degree of liability exists for the responsible parties, except as modified by any legislation by the host state.

The State of Illinois has recently enacted a new law (Clean Coal FutureGen for Illinois Act, Public Act 095-0018) that shifts some liability from the Alliance to the State for damages arising from leakage of CO₂ from the subsurface facility. CERCLA does not apply to CO₂ sequestration. However, Underground Injection Control Program regulations and enforcement would apply to CO₂ sequestration to protect the quality of underground sources of drinking water.

M8. Roytek, Phyllis Rita

FutureGen Project

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

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT CARD

MATTOON

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

#1

We have the land,
We have the MANPOWER,
We have the WATER,
We have the electric,
We have the coal,
We have the INTEREST,
We have the housing,
We have the schools,
We have the ENTHUSIASM,
We need FutureGen in MATTOON

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

NAME Phyllis Rita Roytek ORGANIZATION Homemaker
ADDRESS 4 Western Ave. Hgts CITY MATTOON STATE IL ZIP 61938
E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

M8. Roytek, Phyllis Rita

Response to Comment #1:

Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

M9. Mattoon Fire Department (Strader, Mitch)

To The Future Gen Committee

My name is Mitch Strader and I am a Captain on the Mattoon Fire Dept. I want to thank you for considering Mattoon as a finalist host site for Future Gen and to encourage you to select us as the host site. I will not put down any of the other finalist sites, but I will take the time to try to sell Mattoon to you.

The Mattoon Fire Dept. is here to help you in any way we can. We are one of the best Fire Depts. in downstate IL and are staffed with some of the best trained firemen around. We train in house weekly and also at the University of IL Fire Institute and National Fire Academy. Several of our firefighters also teach and work at the Institute. We are aware that there are many hazards involved with building and running a coal fired power plant, and want to offer our assistance and expertise in making this facility the safest it can possibly be. We want your workers, the plant and the people of Mattoon to be as safe as they can be. We have three aerial fire trucks fully staffed 24/7 along with rescue, confined space and haz-mat trained personnel on staff. Our Fire Dept. is one of the largest and best staffed depts., per capita, in the State with 38 firefighters on staff.

Illinois is one of the leaders in the country with complying with federal mandates since 9-11. We have several MABAS Team members here in Mattoon and quick access to more manpower and specialized equipment whenever needed.

The Coles County Memorial Airport is one of the finest facilities of its kind around. We can accept most planes except the jumbo jets. The Mattoon Fire Dept. protects the Airport with full time fire protection. So, all of this makes it a much safer landing site for your incoming flights.

We have utmost belief that we can answer any needs that you will have. Mattoon is the best site to host this project, on many different levels, and look forward to working with you. We are here to serve you and the people of Mattoon with whatever needs, cares or concerns arise.

Capt. Mitch Strader
Mattoon Fire Dept.

#1

M9. Mattoon Fire Department (Strader, Mitch)

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

M10. Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (Thompson, Kyle)



July 9, 2007

Mr. Mark L. McKoy
Environmental Manager
US Department of Energy
National Energy
Technology Laboratory
P.O. Box 880
Morgantown, WV 26507

Dear Mr. McKoy:

As a resident living in East Central Illinois, it is with strong conviction that I support construction of the FutureGen site in Mattoon. As an employee of Crossroads Workforce Investment Board, located in Mattoon, with interests in the development of a more skilled workforce I offer my interest and excitement about the potential growth and opportunity that a FutureGen site will bring to this area.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kyle Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Kyle Thompson
Mattoon, IL 61938

#1

M10. Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (Thompson, Kyle)

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

M11. U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Bloomer, Phil)
Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

18 PHIL BLOOMER: Good evening. Tim can't be here
19 tonight. He'd much rather be here than where he is, which
20 is in Washington, D.C. But this matters a great deal to
21 him, so he asked me to come instead.

22 I was looking through the file on this project
23 today. And I noticed that he'd been writing letters
24 advocating for this since 2002. So it's been close to his

0027

1 heart for a long time. And it's good for Mattoon. It's
2 good for this district. It's good for the nation and the
3 environment for a lot of reasons. And the state folks here
4 and the people from Mattoon have put all of those reasons
5 down in voluminous and arcane and esoteric detail.

6 But one of the things Tim talks about a lot is that
7 there are less quantifiable reasons for bringing a project
8 such as this here. And that has to do with the nature of
9 the people who live and work here. There is a level of
10 integrity and a work ethic that is part of our culture of
11 the Midwest in Central Illinois. We're pretty proud of
12 it. And we need to underscore that and tell these people
13 that we're the best place for it to be.

14 So know that Tim Johnson is working on your behalf
15 and let's put our best foot forward. I won't take any more
16 of your time. This meeting this evening is for you to
17 express your opinions not for public officials like me.
18 They've all heard from people like me.

19 Thank you.

#1

M11. U.S. Representative Timothy Johnson (Bloomer, Phil)

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

M12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)
Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

0028 24

JACK LAVIN: Thank you, Mark.

1 My name is Jack Lavin. I'm the Director of the
2 Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity.
3 I am Governor Rod Blagojevich's point person on the
4 FutureGen Project. And on behalf of Governor Rod
5 Blagojevich, it's my pleasure to welcome, back to Illinois,
6 the US Department of Energy officials, Mark McKoy and
7 Tom Sarkus and the FutureGen Industrial Alliance, Mike Mudd
8 and Jerry Oliver, to Illinois for another round of public
9 hearing which are critical next step for this important
10 selection process.

11 We have been actively engaged in this process for
12 more than 4 years. And, as you can see, there is a high
13 level of energy, buzz, and excitement surrounding FutureGen
14 and its impact on our state, the country, and the world.

15 My many thanks to Mayor Charlie White and
16 Angela Griffin, President of Coles Together, as well as all
17 of today's attendees for their continued participation and
18 enthusiasm throughout the process.

19 This has truly been a partnership, from the
20 beginning, with local, state, and federal government.
21 You've heard representatives from Senator Durbin and Obama,
22 Congressman Shimkus, Phil Bloomer with Congressman
23 Johnson's office, Congressman Costello and all of the
24 delegation in Washington, D.C. are very engaged in this

0029 1

project.

2 I also want to recognize our state legislators, State
3 Senator Dale Righter, State Representative Chapin Rose,
4 have been very active in Springfield advocating for this
5 project. And I want to thank them.

6 I also want to recognize Bill Hoback, the Director of
7 the Illinois Office of Coal Development at DCO and his team
8 who have been the resident experts and advocates for
9 FutureGen.

10 And as a former coal miner, Bill Hoback, no one
11 better understands the importance of clean coal technology
12 and the significance of FutureGen. And everything I've
13 learned about coal is from Bill Hoback. So, Bill, thank
14 you and your team for all the hard work that you've done in
15 putting our application together and getting Mattoon and
16 Tuscola into the final four.

17 I also want to recognize our partners in labor that
18 are here. Alan Wentz, with the Lincoln Land Building and
19 Trades. Evan Sink with the United Mine Workers. The
20 AFL-CIO has been very supportive in working with us in
21 Springfield. Phil Vanette of the Illinois Coal
22 Association. University of Illinois. Southern Illinois
23 University. Eastern Illinois University. It's really been
24 a great partnership.

M12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)

0030

1 And I say this. FutureGen is, indeed, the future of
2 energy. And I'm here today to tell you that Illinois is
3 ready for FutureGen.

4 I say this to the Department of Energy, the FutureGen
5 Industrial Alliance, the people of the State of Illinois
6 and the folks at Mattoon and Tuscola, the foundation is
7 poured. The house is built. And the table is set. We
8 reached this point with quiet confidence and high
9 anticipation. And we have benefited from the input of
10 people from throughout Illinois, including planners,
11 elected officials, business leaders, farmers, laborers and
12 some of the top scientific and engineering talent from
13 anywhere in the world.

14 There may be no economic development project in the
15 history of this state that approaches the scope of
16 FutureGen. And the local communities here at East Central
17 Illinois and the hard-working people who live in Coles and
18 Douglas counties have met every challenge along the way.
19 This region wants to show the world how to use coal
20 cleanly, to capture and store CO-2.

21 We have worked creatively, cooperatively on solutions
22 to complex problems and nurtured each other as valued
23 partners in this endeavor which will pay dividends for
24 decades to come.

0031

1 We have said all along that Illinois is the place for
2 FutureGen, based on the merit of the these two sites,
3 alone. And I feel more confident of that today than of any
4 time in the past. Some of the best minds in the state have
5 helped us in reaching this stage. We have had top to
6 bottom cooperation from government and private sector; and
7 we wouldn't be here today if we didn't have absolutely the
8 best local partners possible in Angela Griffin and
9 Brian Moody and their respective FutureGen teams.

10 As we head down the home stretch, I'd like to
11 reiterate all the distinct advantages Illinois offers
12 FutureGen, starting with our geology. Illinois is blessed
13 with the geology to demonstrate this breakthrough
14 technology as well and probably better than anywhere in the
15 United States, including our competitors in Texas.

16 We have deep, thick, porous sandstone reservoirs and
17 the safety margin of at least two cap rock seals, never
18 before penetrated. Illinois, in addition, offers a
19 platform from a geology standpoint that will maximize the
20 transferability and the FutureGen technology to cites
21 throughout the United States and the world.

22 We have been examining and documenting this potential
23 with the help of top scientists in this region for more
24 than 3 years.

#1

M12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)

0032

1 From a water standpoint, both sites offer more than
2 the ample water for FutureGen's needs and do so at a
3 reasonable cost without negatively impacting current or
4 future water supply in the region.

5 Our location. Among other advantages, our sites our
6 almost ideally situated in relation to the nation's major
7 coal fields, saving the Alliance millions of dollars every
8 year in rail costs as well as further minimizing the carbon
9 profile of the project.

10 Leadership. The project has garnered bipartizan
11 support from elected Illinois leaders in Congress and in
12 Springfield. And we, as a state, particularly under
13 Governor Rod Blagojevich, have never lost faith in a long
14 term potential for Illinois coal.

15 We have the research capacity. We have leading coal
16 research institutions supporting Illinois' bid for
17 FutureGen, including Southern Illinois University in
18 Carbondale and our partner state, Indiana's Purdue
19 University. Two of the top coal research centers in the
20 nation.

21 And by the way, we do have the governor of Indiana's
22 support. And we're working on and I think we have
23 Kentucky's support. And we'll soon have other states'
24 support.

#1 0033

1 And we have the University of Illinois, premier
2 research university with the Number 4 Engineering Program
3 in the country; and right in our own, right in our backyard
4 here, a top state university at Eastern Illinois
5 University.

6 Illinois' investment package includes an unmatched
7 \$17 million grant to the FutureGen Alliance. In addition,
8 we have committed the Illinois State Geological Survey and
9 some of the nation's top scientists in their field to
10 oversee the long-term monitoring of CO-2 once it is
11 captured and stored. In addition, we have low-interest
12 loans through our Illinois Finance Authority and various
13 tax credits through our Enterprise Zones.

14 As I have emphasized, as I emphasized at the last
15 round of FutureGen hearings, Illinois is a coal state, not
16 an oil and gas state. We have demonstrated our belief in
17 coal through investments of millions of dollars in the
18 development and deployment of clean coal technology. We
19 have, in the past several weeks, permitted the first two
20 coal gasification projects to be advanced anywhere in
21 America in the past 20 years. And we are very close to
22 permitting and breaking ground on the gasification project
23 in far northwestern Illinois that will make nitrogen
24 fertilizer from coal and quite significantly begin

M12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)

0034

#1

1 producing for US consumption the first low-sulfur, diesel
2 motor fuel made from Illinois coal.
3 The fundamentals for FutureGen are in place. Water,
4 geology, location, economics, research, political
5 leadership and community support with all of you here
6 tonight.
7 With science on our side and all of these strategic
8 assets, we are confident that the world's cleanest coal
9 plant will be built in our state and be successful.
10 It is a marriage made in heaven. We're all here
11 today because we share in this vision and we believe in the
12 possibilities of this facility to change the way we look at
13 energy production.
14 And as I have said many times, FutureGen needs
15 Illinois; and Illinois needs FutureGen.
16 Thank you very much for all of you being here
17 tonight.

M12. Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (Lavin, Jack)

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

M13. Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)
Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

0035

22 CHAPIN ROSE: Welcome. Welcome to Illinois.
23 Welcome to chairmen and advisors. It was nice to talk to
24 you earlier. Welcome to this wonderful school here in
1 Mattoon.
2 We are very excited to have you here this evening,
3 and I know that Director Lavin is going to talk a lot about
4 really the team effort that's gone into FutureGen
5 Illinois.
6 I represent both sites in both locations; and
7 unfortunately, this may be my only opportunity to address
8 the crowd. Because we're due back at Springfield tomorrow
9 through Saturday; so I may not be in Tuscola.
10 I want to take just this quick opportunity to
11 highlight a few of the items that Jack talked about. The
12 geology is here. The technology is here. And the coal is
13 here. And I know Jack just did it much more eloquently
14 than I can, but let's just take a look around East Central
15 Illinois and look at what we have to offer.
16 We've got wonderful schools. We have wonderful
17 health care opportunities. You have diversity. Lakeland
18 College. Our new interim president from Lakeland is
19 sitting back here, Scott Lensink is here tonight. You've
20 got the University of Illinois to the north; and, of
21 course, you've got Southern Illinois and their coal
22 research center. All of these resources are at your
23 disposal. And I will do everything I can to help make the
24 state resources be at your disposal.

#1

0036

1 This, truly, has been a team effort. In my 5 years
2 in Springfield, I've never quite seen anything like it.
3 Having grown up a short ways from here in Charleston, a
4 little over ten miles to the east, we've even got
5 Charleston and Mattoon working together in a team
6 partnership to bring FutureGen to East Central Illinois.
7 We are very excited to have you. I want to close,
8 just briefly, by saying some quick thank yous, primarily,
9 to Angela and Brian from Tuscola and Mattoon and
10 Phil Hoback, Director Lavin, and Governor Rod Blagojevich.
11 We are very excited to have you here.
12 The geology is here. The technology is here. The
13 coal is here. We want FutureGen to be here in Illinois.
14 Thank you very much.

M13. Illinois State House of Representatives (Rose, Chapin)

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

M14. City of Sullivan (Short, Ann)

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

18 ANN SHORT: Good evening. I want to welcome you
19 all to Central Illinois, again. I am Ann Short. I'm the
20 Mayor of Sullivan; and that's located just 15 miles down
21 Illinois Route 121, right on the proposed site in Mattoon.
22 And as mayor, I want to express to you support of the City
23 Council and the citizens of Sullivan for the construction
24 of FutureGen at that site.

0037

1 I'm also a member of the Sullivan Chamber and
2 Economic Development Board, which also supports the
3 construction of FutureGen here. Both these organizations
4 feel that locating the site in Illinois would be a
5 tremendous plus for Central Illinois.

6 However, locating it in Mattoon would be a great
7 benefit for the Sullivan community. The Sullivan community
8 can offer the employees of FutureGen, both in construction
9 and long term, the opportunity for first-class recreation
10 at our Lake Shelbyville. We can also offer cultural
11 entertainment through our Little Theater on the Square,
12 which is a professional equity theater who offers
13 performances year-round. And we also have available
14 housing opportunities in Sullivan and have a first-rate
15 school system that can accommodate many new students.

16 The Sullivan community believes that there will be an
17 economic opportunity for current businesses to expand and
18 for the development of new businesses to serve the needs of
19 the FutureGen operation. The Sullivan Chamber and Economic
20 Development Board is working with our local businesses to
21 determine what products and services we can provide for
22 FutureGen and encouraging those businesses to be ready to
23 step forward when the site is selected.

24 Again, we're thrilled that you have chosen these

0038

1 sites in Illinois; and we hope to see you return soon with
2 a positive decision.

3 Thank you.

M14. City of Sullivan (Short, Ann)

Response to Comment #1:

Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

M15. Coles Together (Griffin, Angela)

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

7 ANGELA GRIFFIN: On behalf of Coles Together,
8 the City of Mattoon, again, welcome to everyone tonight.
9 Of course, it's always good to see the Mayor, the
10 Honorable Charlie White. Mayor, thank you for your
11 leadership on this important project. And it's important
12 to remember that John Inyart, the Mayor of Charleston and
13 Charleston City Council has provided important leadership
14 on the project, as well.

15 As Mr. McKoy, explained, we're here tonight to take
16 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that's
17 been published. The Mattoon team has had an opportunity to
18 review the Environmental Impact Statement, and we have
19 found it to be extremely thorough in its analyses.

20 The conclusions and the impacts reported appear to be
21 based on adequate documentation and supporting data. We
22 also found it to be consistent with the data that we
23 generated when we were doing our own research and testing
24 and providing information for the environmental impact

1 volumes which were used in producing the Environmental
2 Impact Statement.

3 But we're here tonight to hear your opinions of the
4 environmental impact statement. We encourage you to use
5 this opportunity to express your views and ask questions.
6 We're committed not only to the integrity of this project
7 but also to the integrity of this process, and your
8 participation tonight will help maintain both.

9 Thank you for coming out, and thank you for your
10 support.

#1

0039

M15. Coles Together (Griffin, Angela)

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

M16. Metzger, Kent

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

14 KENT METZGER: Good evening. Thank you. My
15 name is Kent Metzger, and I am a neighbor to FutureGen and
16 also a supporter of FutureGen. So I want to, first, thank
17 you for the opportunity to speak and give me an opportunity
18 to review the report.

19 I have one comment on the report, and then I want to
20 go into some other things and my thoughts on the, on
21 FutureGen.

22 In the report, under the climate section, it said
23 that all four sites subject to permanent drought and severe
24 drought. I think there's an issue of magnitude of scale

#1 0040

1 there. What's a drought in Illinois is a wet season in
2 Texas. And, when it comes to water and availability, I
3 think Illinois has Texas hands down on water.

4 As you can see, we're kind of in a drought right now;
5 and the corn is 6, 7 feet tall and starting to tassel. And
6 if there was a drought in Texas right now, the sagebrush
7 would be dead, so.

8 Also, I believe that Odessa, Texas, the evaporation
9 rate is about three times what it is in Mattoon and
10 Tuscola. And Jewett, Texas is about twice that. So, even
11 when we get the rain, at least we can hang on to it here in
12 Illinois.

13 I want to give you a couple perspectives as a
14 neighbor. And not only am I a neighbor, but I'm also an
15 engineer, have a couple of businesses here in town, one
16 engineering firm, one contracting firm. My background is
17 in mining and engineering. I've worked in the coal
18 industry and been in the consulting business for 19 years
19 now. So I've got a little bit of technical experience when
20 it comes to these issues.

#2

21 But some of the issues that came up and I think are
22 concerns as, as neighbors and as people in the community
23 is, 1. What's this place going to look like? Esthetically,
24 is it going to be a pleasing site?

M16. Metzger, Kent

0041

1 And I would hope -- and I throw this out there to
2 everyone involved -- that since this is going to be a show
3 place for technology, that it also be a show place that is
4 esthetically pleasing to the community. If we're going to
5 be bringing world travellers in to check this facility out,
6 we want them to be impressed with your facility and our
7 community, as well. We're going to do our best to make you
8 proud of our town.

9 In reviewing the report, I noticed that there was
10 going to be a 250-foot high stack. You know, in corn
11 country that sounds like a pretty tall, tall stack. So I
12 went around, and I tried to figure out what in the area is
13 250 feet high.

14 A mile-and-a-half northwest of the site there's a
15 grain elevator at Coles Station. And that elevator is
16 about a hundred and eighty feet tall. I don't think a
17 250-foot stack, a mile-and-a-half from a hundred eighty
18 foot high grain elevator is really going to stand out, so.

19 And then as I drove around the area and if you go out
20 in the parking lot here tonight on the way out and you look
21 to the northwest, you can't even see that grain elevator.
22 Because, even though we think we live in flat corn country,
23 there is topography here and there are trees here. So,
24 esthetically, I don't think that's going to be an issue. I

#2

0042

1 think people will become, it's going to become so common
2 place seeing a stack that they'll be oblivious to it. I
3 think probably most of the people that came in on 121
4 didn't notice that grain elevator that is a hundred eighty
5 feet tall. So I think that's the one issue that, that
6 we'll just come to grips with and will get common place to
7 see it.

8 Another issue is, I know people are going to be
9 upset, we're taking crop production out and we're going to
10 build a plant there. You know, one of the things we're
11 going to replace that field with is a lake. And most
12 people don't really mind looking at lakes. And it's going
13 to be a good-sized lake. So, you know, probably 40 or 50
14 acre region.

15 Another issue, esthetically, is high-tension
16 transmission lines. I also challenge everybody in this
17 room to name the number of high-tension transmission lines
18 they saw on the way to the school tonight. And there are
19 some within eyesight. If I looked out the window right
20 now, I could see them. People don't notice these things.
21 Esthetically, they're common place.

22 Another issue, noise. You know from the new journey
23 point, there are a lot of ways to handle noise. And I'm
24 sure that those will come into consideration with this

#3

M16. Metzger, Kent

0043

1 plant. If we're going to dig a 450 acre lake, we're going
2 to have plenty of dirt to build berms to attenuate that
3 noise.

4 And where I live, a-mile-and-a-quarter west of the
5 property, I live in a wooded area. And I can say, without
6 a doubt, that in the winter it's louder in my yard than it
7 is in the summer. It's because there are trees there, and
8 those trees block the noise. So we throw up a berm -- I
9 think that sounds easy -- we put a berm in with the plants
10 and trees. We're in control of the noise with natural
11 features.

#3

12 In my experience working in the coal mines, I know
13 there are different ways to handle coal, some are noisier
14 than others. I hope that the methodology we use are the
15 quietest methods possible. We don't have to clang cars
16 together to dump them. They can be placed on a, and
17 pivoted while they're all connected. You don't have that
18 loud banging and this and that.

19 And we have a coal, we have a train track right
20 there. And I feel my house rumble every once in a while.
21 And that's going to continue. But you know it's going to
22 continue whether this plant is there or not. So the
23 benefits outweigh the problems with having more trains.

24 Another issue is site lighting and light pollution.

0044

1 We live in the country. We like living in the country.
2 But there are ways, engineering ways, to control that light
3 to avoid as much light pollution as possible to where it's
4 minimum.

#4

5 Another issue is roads and traffic. You know, I
6 touched on the train issue. We have trains. We'll have a
7 few more trains, probably three trains a week. I think
8 three trains a week is a good trade off for what we're
9 going to get out of this plant.

10 And we're going to have trucks. And, during
11 construction, we're going to have a lot of trucks. But, as
12 I was looking around the area, the 200 East Road, which is
13 the east property line of the property, it's an asphalt
14 road. It's going to handle a lot of traffic. We're going
15 to have a lot of dirt and dust from the road traffic.
16 Obviously, we're going to have some dirt and dust during
17 construction. That what water trucks are for. And that's
18 the way construction sites work. So we can come to grips
19 with that.

#5

20 And another issue is community safety. And they're
21 going to be generating some chemicals there and some
22 materials on-site which are potentially hazardous. But,
23 again, we're used to being around those things. We take
24 them for granted.

#6

M16. Metzger, Kent

0045

1 This school is within 3/4 of a mile of at least three
2 manufacturing facilities where they handle materials that
3 could be harmful to us as citizens.

4 There is also an anhydrous ammonia plant within a
5 very short distance of that. One of the most dangerous
6 chemicals in our area is anhydrous ammonia. And we're so
7 used to it that we don't even take it into consideration a
8 lot of times. If you speak with the fire fighters and they
9 talk about dealing with chemical control in an accident,
10 ammonia, ammonia is one of the biggest things they have to
11 be concerned with.

12 And, also, explosion. Everybody says it's going to
13 blow it up. It's going to take out the school and this and
14 that.

15 The other, one of the most common explosion hazards
16 in our area or in the world is grain dust explosion.
17 Again, we're used to that. There are risks in everything
18 we do, but I believe that FutureGen beyond payment and
19 technology is also going to be faded as taking care of our
20 area and the safety of our people.

21 So, with that, thank you.

#6

M16. Metzger, Kent

4 KENT METZGER: My name is Ken Metzger, again.
5 And I didn't want to make any comments. But one thing
6 that's come up, you know, to get this is, I think, if some
7 of you could speak with Angela if they have any ideas. But
8 part of this process is to come up with a way to get rid of
9 some of these by-products. Because they're actually useful
10 in other chemical processes and whatnot.

11 So, if any, this is a big group and a lot of minds
12 out there, a lot of good minds out there, if you can think
13 of something, a use for the CO-2 or the hydrogen or what
14 not, I think that would be very helpful for them to put
15 together a package to make a bigger presentation as to
16 another thing we can provide for the team.

17 So, thank you.

#7

M16. Metzger, Kent

Response to Comment #1: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to evaluate the environmental impacts of proposed actions, so that they can make informed decisions. Public involvement is a key component of the NEPA process, so that agencies can solicit and address concerns from the public. The EIS addresses impacts to nearby residents (in terms of aesthetics, noise, and health and safety). DOE outlines those impacts which are considered unavoidable (such as the visual impacts of the power plant) and describes methods that can be taken during the design and operational phases of the project to minimize these impacts (see Tables S-16 and 3-13).

Response to Comment #2: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

Response to Comment #3: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

Response to Comment #4: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

Response to Comment #5: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

Response to Comment #6: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

Response to Comment #7: Comment noted and will be included in the Administrative Record of the EIS.

M17. Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (McShane, Jim)
Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

#1

7 MARK MC SHANE: Thank you for this opportunity
8 to comment. The Crossroads Workforce Investment Board
9 happens to cover 14 counties which includes both
10 locations. And the board is very excited about the
11 opportunity that's here that we can see develop in our
12 area. We're concerned about having enough folks that are
13 trained in order to build this project. And, working with
14 the trades, we've supported some of what they're doing to
15 recruit. We're looking at the job potential and also the
16 income generation that this will help in our region.
17 And I really appreciate the leadership Jack Lavin has
18 had on the state end and the local team that has really put
19 a lot of work into this. And we want to be big supporters
20 of this. Our board supports this a hundred percent.
21 Thank you.

M17. Crossroads Workforce Investment Board (McShane, Jim)

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

M18. Illinois Coal Association (Gonet, Phil)

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

1 PHIL GONET: Good evening. My name is
2 Phil Gonet. I'm the President of the Illinois Coal
3 Association.

4 On behalf of our industry, I enthusiastically welcome
5 you to our state. We, in the coal industry, are very
6 excited about this project. As you may know, you may not
7 know, and I wanted to bring in a few facts that may not be
8 covered in your Environmental Impact Statement, about
9 coal.

10 We have a long history of safe and successful coal
11 mining here in Illinois. The first commercial coal mining
12 actually started in 1810 in Jackson County. And by the
13 1880's, coal mining was well established and fueling the
14 power needs of both Chicago and St. Louis.

15 The Illinois Coal Association, by the way, started in
16 1878; so we have a long history here. But even more
17 impressive than our history is the abundance of coal. And
18 I'm sure you know that. But I'm not sure everyone in the
19 audience knows that's here tonight.

20 We are known as the Saudi Arabia of coal. In fact,
21 the energy content of our coal is greater than the energy
22 content of the oil in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait combined. As
23 you probably know from the Illinois State Geological
24 Survey, our coal reserves, recoverable reserves are over

0050

#1

1 100 billion tons of coal.

2 And to put that in a perspective, one of the earliest
3 speakers talked about how much capacity we have in the
4 United States to store CO-2. To give you an example of how
5 much coal we have in Illinois, our country used 1.1 billion
6 tons of coal last year. So we, in Illinois have enough
7 coal to power this country for the next 100 years. So this
8 is an abundance of coal here in Illinois you find nowhere
9 else in the country. One other state, Montana, which is
10 not in the running for this project, actually does have
11 more coal than us in Illinois.

12 So this project is important to Illinois. It's
13 important to the economy of the United States. That's one
14 thing that hasn't come up tonight, the economic value of
15 energy to this country. 52 percent of our energy in the
16 United States, right now, comes from coal. And we need to
17 find a way to burn that coal more cleanly and more
18 environmentally friendly. And this project will do this.

19 So, to mirror the slogan that the Department of
20 Commerce and Economic Opportunity has come up with:

21 The state needs FutureGen. The country needs
22 FutureGen. In fact, the world needs FutureGen. But
23 FutureGen needs Illinois.

0051

24 So we welcome you here, and we hope to have you

1 back. Thank you.

M18. Illinois Coal Association (Gonet, Phil)

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

M19. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 146 (Taylor, John)
Public Hearing Oral Comment (see full transcript in Appendix K)

15 JOHN TAYLOR: My name is John Taylor. I'm a
16 lifelong resident of Mattoon. As a matter of fact, I just
17 live 7 blocks straight down Western Avenue. I've been
18 there for 35 years.

19 I represent the International Brotherhood of
20 Electrical Workers Local 146 out of Decatur. I would like
21 to assure the FutureGen Alliance gentlemen and the
22 Department of Energy that, if you so elect to use the
23 Mattoon site, which we hope that you do, we have a highly
24 qualified, skilled labor source for electrical workers.

0053

1 Our local union has built a 2-unit power plant in Coffeen,
2 Illinois, for Ameren CIPS approximately 40 years ago.

3 We also built a 2-unit fossil plant at Kincaid,
4 Illinois, for Commonwealth Edison. That was done in the
5 60's and 70's. And then, low and behold, the new
6 technology caught up with us too. We built a single-unit
7 nuclear plant at Clinton, Illinois. And we have 650
8 electricians just champing at the bit to come in and do
9 this work for you.

10 And I kept waiting for someone from the building and
11 trades to stand up here and speak representing organized
12 labor. And, if there's anyone in the crowd, they've waited
13 me out. So, I guess I ended up with the duty.

14 But we would welcome you. We're looking forward to
15 working with you. And anything we can do, at all, to
16 assist, we will do that. Give you a good job, efficient
17 job and a quick job.

18 And thank you for your comments.

#1

M19. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 146 (Taylor, John)

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

M20. Bell, Jim

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

#1

0058

13 JIM BELL: My name is Jim Bell. I am a neighbor
14 to the proposed FutureGen site. And my views are contrary
15 to most all that have been stated here this evening. You
16 know, I'm one of these guys, it's not in my backyard, you
17 know. Mr. Metzger, back here, is a neighbor of mine. And,
18 you know, he makes a lot of points that possibly could kind
19 of gloss over some of the problems with a facility like
20 this, if that be done. And I have no assurance that those
21 things will be done at this point.

22 Nearly everyone that commented up here had something
23 to gain this evening. I have a lot of neighbors that, you
24 know, they don't really want to speak out against the

1 community. And I don't really want to either, but we do
2 have concerns out there as neighbors, for health and
3 esthetics and just our daily living, you know. And I guess
4 that's about all I have to say. So, thank you.

5 (Applause.)

M20. Bell, Jim

Response to Comment #1:

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to evaluate the environmental impacts of proposed actions, so that they can make informed decisions. Public involvement is a key component of the NEPA process, so that agencies can solicit and address concerns from the public. The EIS addresses impacts to nearby residents (in terms of aesthetics, noise, and health and safety). DOE outlines those impacts which are considered unavoidable (such as the visual impacts of the power plant) and describes methods that can be taken during the design and operational phases of the project to minimize these impacts (see Tables S-16 and 3-13).

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

Description of reservoir in process water section.

#1

“If a larger reservoir were constructed (approximately 40 acres [16.2 hectares] in size) with a capacity of 200 million gallons (757 million liters), the Mattoon WWTP effluent would be sufficient by itself to supply the proposed plant’s process water.”

This calculation was based on a minimum process water supply requirement of 3.6MGD. With the increased process water requirement of 4.3MGD, this calculation was redone and resulted in a reservoir size of 310 million gallons and approximately 44 acres. If Charleston WWTP effluent is added, the reservoir may be reduced to 25.5 Acres and 114 million gallons.

Surface water impacts

#2

Cassell and Kickapoo creek flows reduced by process water withdrawals (3,000 gallons per minute [gpm] [11,356 liters per minute (lpm)]) from Mattoon and possibly Charleston wastewater treatment plants.

This statement may imply that process water is being withdrawn from these streams. Reword as follows to avoid this misconception: "Cassell and Kickapoo creek flows reduced by diversion of effluent discharge water from Mattoon and possibly Charleston wastewater treatment plants to provide process water (3000 gallons per minute [gpm][11,356 liters per minute (lpm)]).

Impacted Wetlands

#3

“Up to 29.2 acres (11.8 hectares) of wetlands could be impacted along the transmission line and process water corridors.”

Since the number of impacted wetlands at Mattoon varies significantly with the choice of transmission corridors and water supply options, we suggest appending, “,depending on the options chosen.” to this statement.

Wetlands

#4

“The appropriate type and ratio of wetland mitigation would be determined through the Section 404 permitting process.”

The following paragraph from Volume II, Page 4.8-1:

“IDNR has the authority to regulate wetlands under the Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 (IWPA) for projects that receive funding or technical assistance from the state. The IWPA defines federal money that passes through a state agency as state funding. Isolated, farmed, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional wetlands are state jurisdictional wetlands under the IWPA. IDNR accepts the procedures outlined in the 1987 USACE Wetland Delineation Manual for delineating wetlands. The IWPA requires mitigation for all adverse impacts regardless of the size of the impacted area or the wetland quality.”

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

#4 | Should be also be inserted after the first full paragraph on Page 3-11 in Volume 1.

Biological Resources

#5 | "The proposed Mattoon Power Plant and Sequestration Site has potential habitat for the federally-listed Eastern sand darter and the Indiana bat. Habitats for the state-listed Kirtland's snake and the federally-listed Eastern sand darter have been found in the vicinity of the process water supply line corridor.

The list reference for the Eastern Sand Darter is incorrect. It is state-listed not federally-listed. Please correct as follows: "The proposed Mattoon Power Plant and Sequestration Site has potential habitat for the state-listed Eastern Sand Darter and the federally-listed Indiana Bat. Habitats for the state-listed Kirtland's Snake and Eastern Sand Darter have been found in the vicinity of the process water supply line corridor."

Mattoon process water pipeline length

#6 | "The Mattoon process water pipelines would traverse up to 14.3 miles (23 kilometers)."
The pipeline from the Mattoon WWTP would traverse only 7.5 miles. Adding the optional pipeline to deliver water from the Charleston WWTP would increase this to 14.3 miles. We suggest changing this statement to read, "The Mattoon process water pipelines would traverse 7.5 miles (12 kilometers) or 14.3 miles (23 kilometers) depending on the option chosen."

Description of surface water crossings by utility corridors

#7 | "Construction of the proposed water supply pipeline at the Mattoon Site would cross five surface waters,"
Only two streams or drainage ditches will be crossed by the Mattoon-only water supply line and 138 kV connection options for the Mattoon project. An additional three crossings would be encountered if the Charleston supplemental water supply pipeline was utilized. We suggest changing this statement to read, "Construction of the proposed water supply pipeline at the Mattoon Site would cross two to five surface waters depending on the options chosen."

Mattoon surface water impacts

#8 | **Operations:**
Streams affected: Cassell and Kickapoo creek flows reduced by process water withdrawals (3,000 gallons per minute [gpm] [11,356 liters per minute (lpm)]) from Mattoon and possibly Charleston wastewater treatment plants.

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

#8 For the Mattoon site, the proposed FutureGen plant will use wastewater that Mattoon discharges to Kickapoo Creek and that Charleston discharges to Cassell Creek. Cassell Creek flows into the Kickapoo Creek, which flows into the Embarras River downstream of Lake Charleston. The FutureGen plant requires 3,000 gpm of wastewater, which represents 62% of the average effluent discharged from both wastewater treatment plants. This water will be impounded in a reservoir to be built at the Mattoon site. This reservoir should provide flexibility to mitigate any problems associated with low flows in Cassell and Kickapoo Creeks. In addition, the IDNR has provided its opinion that diverting these effluents would positively impact these streams, allowing them to return to a more natural state.

Existing Air Quality

#9 “The nearest non-attainment and maintenance areas are located in Indianapolis, Indiana (146 miles [235.0 kilometers] away) and Vigo County, Indiana (46 miles [74.0 kilometers] away).”

Information originally provided by IEPA for Section 4.2 indicates that the closest NAA to Mattoon, IL is St. Louis, MO-IL which is approximately 72.3 miles from the proposed site. The closest maintenance area (MA) and distance indicated in the EIS is correct for Vigo County, IN.

Nearby residences

#10 “There are two residences located adjacent to, two residences located within 0.25 mile (0.5 kilometer) of, and 20 additional residences located within 1 mile.”

The local economic development authority, Coles Together, has options on several of the residential properties that are closest to the power plant site and is negotiating others. If FutureGen is located in Mattoon these properties will be purchased and vacated thus reducing the population with the greatest impacts and/or exposure risks.

Stream quality

#11 “Cassell Creek is not listed as impaired (IEPA, 2006).”

This is wrong. While Cassell Creek is not included on the 303(d) list, it is listed as not supporting its Aquatic Life Use due to a recent fish kill.

Zoning

#12 “Because the proposed Mattoon Power Plant Site lies 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) west of the Mattoon city limits, it lies within the extra-territorial area where the City of Mattoon Zoning Ordinance may be applied, but the area is currently not zoned.”

Please replace the above sentence with the following:

“On May 15, 2007 the City rezoned the portion of FutureGen proposed site that lies within the 1.5 mile extra-territorial area from the existing rural-suburban use to industrial use.”

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8)

Right-of-ways

“North of the Mattoon city limits, the corridor lies on private property for 2 miles (3.2 kilometers). Three property owners own the 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) of ROW, which would require new easements in an area that appears to be primarily farm land. Option contracts have been secured to purchase the three necessary easements. For the last 3.5 miles (5.6 kilometers) of the corridor, the pipeline would be placed on the public ROW of CR 900N. The road ROW is 60 feet (18 meters) wide, with the roadway surface averaging 20 feet (6 meters) wide.”

#13 Please replace the above sentences with the following:

“North and west of the Mattoon city limits, the corridor lies on private property for 5.5 (8.9 kilometers) miles. Three property owners own the first 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) of ROW, which would require new easements in an area that appears to be primarily farm land. For the last 3.5 miles (5.6 kilometers) of the corridor, the pipeline would be placed on the ROW of CR 900N. The ROW is proscribed rather than dedicated, and therefore new easements will be required from the current land owner. Option contracts have been secured to purchase two of the three necessary easements from the property owners in the first two miles. Negotiations continue for the remaining easements.”

Transportation Corridors

“Assuming the existing road ROWs are of sufficient size to accommodate any new construction, there would be no change to the land use of the transportation corridors.”

#14 Please replace the above sentence with the following:

“The only change to the existing road ROW would be at County Highway 13 and the intersection of State Route 121. The intersection would be rebuilt so that CH13 would approach SR 121 at right angles. A turn lane would be constructed on SR 121.”

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

Sales Tax Collections

“Coles County collected \$45 million in property taxes in 2003 and \$9.2 million in sales taxes in 2004 (FG Alliance, 2006a). The counties located within the ROI each collected an average of \$38.9 million in sales taxes (FG Alliance, 2006a).”

The figure for average sales tax collections is incorrect - \$38.9M is far too high. Our analysis of sales tax data for this region gives approximately \$3.6M. See the spreadsheet below:

Sales Tax Liability for Calendar year 2004- collected 02/04 through 01/05

(source- Illinois Department of Revenue report to Tuscola City government)

#15

	State Sales Tax	Municipal Tax	Home Rule Tax	Non-Home Rule Tax	County Tax	Countywide sales tax	County ROT for Sublic	Total Sales Tax	Sales tax less State portion
	<i>(5% of State's 6.25 sales tax rate)</i>	<i>(1% of State's 6.25 sales tax rate)</i>	<i>(locally imposed tax rate)</i>	<i>(locally imposed tax rate)</i>	<i>(1% of State's 6.25 sales tax rate)</i>	<i>(.25% of State's 6.25 sales tax rate)</i>	<i>(locally imposed tax rate)</i>		
Douglas	\$9,058,419	\$1,787,760	\$224,558	\$87,125	\$283,216	\$454,763		\$1,895,841	\$2,837,422
Coles	\$25,174,371	\$5,772,686	\$0	\$1,875,570	\$272,997	\$1,258,449		\$34,354,073	\$9,179,702
Cumberland	\$1,595,858	\$350,739	\$0	\$0	\$23,998	\$79,745		\$2,050,340	\$454,482
Moultrie	\$4,523,272	\$782,826	\$0	\$0	\$286,699	\$226,040		\$5,818,837	\$1,295,565
Champaign	\$90,256,640	\$20,837,964	\$12,330,091	\$0	\$946,226	\$4,511,204	\$3,879,529	\$132,761,654	\$42,505,014
Edgar	\$5,778,968	\$1,326,920	\$0	\$352,006	\$135,823	\$288,927		\$7,882,644	\$2,103,676
Macon	\$55,307,269	\$13,017,177	\$9,635,081	\$937,188	\$303,655	\$2,764,646	\$2,231,963	\$84,196,979	\$28,889,710
Piatt	\$3,987,042	\$847,603	\$0	\$0	\$76,096	\$199,185		\$5,109,926	\$1,122,884
Clark	\$4,677,610	\$959,397	\$0	\$0	\$153,890	\$233,705	\$693,614	\$6,718,216	\$2,040,606
Effingham	\$28,798,083	\$6,352,176	\$0	\$0	\$297,389	\$1,439,581		\$36,887,229	\$8,089,146
Shelby	\$4,658,393	\$953,803	\$0	\$0	\$156,812	\$232,897		\$6,001,905	\$1,343,512

Tuscola ROI	\$195,681,839	\$44,723,675	\$22,189,730	\$3,251,889	\$2,328,710	\$9,782,959	\$6,111,492	\$284,070,294	\$88,388,455
Mattoon ROI	\$78,486,006	\$16,959,387	\$224,558	\$1,962,695	\$1,475,001	\$3,925,180	\$693,614	\$103,726,441	\$25,240,435

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

Response to Comment #1: The 40 acres is described as “approximate”. With a planned capacity of 200 million gallons, this still provides 46 days of supply at 4.3 mgd. Because there is more than adequate land area to accommodate a larger reservoir within the planned 200 acre disturbance footprint at the power plant site a larger reservoir could be accommodated. This information will be taken into account as the planning process progresses, therefore and the final site design may dictate a reservoir of a different size that would be analyzed in a Supplement Analysis; therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.

Response to Comment #2: Tables S-12 and 3-3 have been revised as follows: “Streams affected: Cassell and Kickapoo creek flows reduced by diversion of effluent discharge water from Mattoon and possibly Charleston wastewater treatment plants to provide process water (3,000 gallons per minute [gpm] [11,356 liter per minute [lpm)].”

Response to Comment #3: In Section 3.8.1; Table S-12; and Table 3-13; Summary Comparisons of Impacts, Wetlands and Floodplains, it states that "up to 29.2 acres" could be impacted. DOE decided to show the upper bound for all impacts for all four sites because at this stage of the project it has not been decided what corridors or options would be selected, therefore, the text will remain as presented in the EIS.

Response to Comment #4: The following paragraph has been added to Section 3.1.8: “IDNR has the authority to regulate wetlands under the Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 (IWPA) for projects that receive funding or technical assistance from the state. The IWPA defines federal money that passes through a state agency as state funding. Isolated, farmed, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional wetlands are state jurisdictional wetlands under the IWPA. IDNR accepts the procedures outlined in the 1987 USACE Wetland Delineation Manual for delineating wetlands. The IWPA requires mitigation for all adverse impacts regardless of the size of the impacted area or the wetland quality.”

Response to Comment #5: The text has been revised as requested. In addition, Section 3.1.9 was revised as follows: "If listed species were discovered to occur..."

Response to Comment #6: DOE decided to show the upper bound for all impacts for all four sites because at this stage of the project it has not been decided what corridors or options would be selected, thus the text remains as presented in the EIS.

Response to Comment #7: Section 3.1.7 was revised to state that the pipeline would cross "up to five surface waters". It was decided to show upper bounds for all impacts for all four sites because at this stage of the project it has not been decided what corridors or options would be selected. This is consistent with the upper bound analysis used elsewhere in the EIS where different options were proposed for the same alternative.

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)

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

- Response to Comment #8:** Text in Tables S-12 and 3-3 was revised as follows: “Streams affected: Cassell and Kickapoo creek flows reduced by diversion of effluent discharge water from Mattoon and possibly Charleston wastewater treatment plants to provide process water (3,000 gallons per minute [gpm] [11,356 liters per minute [lpm]). Proposed reservoir would provide flexibility to mitigate downstream flow impacts.” Although it is possible the storage of process water at the power plant may allow more effluent to be diverted to the streams during low flow conditions, there would be no regulatory or other impetus to do so. While the IDNR has provided a biological opinion on the future lower flow rates in the streams, in terms of surface water alone, it is accurate to simply state the flow would be reduced.
-
- Response to Comment #9:** The text in Section 4.2.2.1 has been revised as follows: “The nearest non-attainment and maintenance areas are located in St. Louis, MO-IL (72.3 miles [116.3 kilometers] away)....”
-
- Response to Comment #10:** This information will be taken into account as the planning process progresses and more specific residential property information is available. However, without information on which properties are optioned and which are currently in negotiations, DOE believes that it is appropriate to retain the numbers in the EIS in order to show the maximum effect that the FutureGen facility could have on the site.
-
- Response to Comment #11:** The text in Section 4.7.2 has been revised to match Table 4.7-1 “Cassell Creek is listed as impaired due to fish kills” (IEPA, 2006). Section 4.7.2 and Section 4.7.3 were also revised accordingly.
-
- Response to Comment #12:** Paragraph regarding extra-territorial area has been deleted in Section 4.11.3.1 and the following sentence was added at end of previous paragraph: “In addition, the May 15, 2007, rezoning of the 1.5-mile (2.4-kilometer) extra-territorial area to industrial use allows the proposed Power Plant site to be compatible with the zoning ordinance.”
-
- Response to Comment #13:** The text in Section 4.15.3.1 has been revised as follows: “North and west of the Mattoon city limits, the corridor lies on private property for 5.5 (8.9 kilometers) miles. Three property owners own the first 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) of ROW, which would require new easements in an area that appears to be primarily farm land. For the last 3.5 miles (5.6 kilometers) of the corridor, the pipeline would be placed on the ROW of CR 900N. The ROW is proscribed rather than dedicated, and therefore new easements will be required from the current land owner. Option contracts have been secured to purchase two of the three necessary easements from the property owners in the first two miles. Negotiations continue for the remaining easements.”
-
- Response to Comment #14:** The text in Section 4.11.3.2 has been revised as follows: “The only change to the existing ROW would be at CH 13 and the intersection of SR 121. The intersection would be rebuilt so that CH 13 would approach SR 121 at right angles. A turn lane would be constructed on SR 121. The Illinois Department of Transportation would be responsible for the proposed construction and related cost.”
-

M21. FutureGen Illinois Team (Swager, Ronald – Patrick Engineering)
(The complete comment document submitted to DOE is shown in G8)

Response to Comment #15:

DOE agrees the average county sales tax cited in the EIS for the Mattoon and Tuscola socioeconomics ROIs were high. The figures have been corrected. However, DOE believes the figures suggested in the comment were low. The revised figures reflect the average ROI county data as derived from the Mattoon and Tuscola EIVs.

The text has been revised in Section 4.19.2.2 from \$38.9 million to approximately \$10 million and Section 5.19.2.2 from \$11.3 million to approximately \$9 million.
