

From: "Tanner, Valda" <vtanner@aggeorgia.com>
To: <askepd@gaepd.org>
Date: 10/12/2009 4:36 PM
Subject: Plant Washington

I live within 2 ½ miles of the proposed coal fired power plant in Washington County, GA. I have a farm pond and have spent a lot of time and money turning it into a good fishery for my family and friends. There are several other local citizens in the area near the proposed plant site who have farm/family ponds also. There are lots of area citizens who fish the Ogeechee River which is only a few miles from the plant site. In light of the below article, how can EPD grant a permit for even more mercury pollution? There are times when controlled burns in the area near the plant site have inundated us with smoke, so it is evident pollution from the plant would do the same. Can you guarantee my fish will not have high mercury levels and if not, who will I have recourse against?

Thank You,

Valda Tanner

New gov't study shows mercury in fish widespread

<http://us.rd.yahoo.com/dailynews/ap/brand/SIG=br2v03/*http://www.ap.org>

<http://news.yahoo.com/nphotos/undated-handout-photo-US-Geological-Survey-shows-USGS-scientists-Lia/photo/090819/480/33d039ef6785493c8c1dc0f9d717ce2d/s:/ap/20090819/ap_on_go_ot/us_mercury_contamination>

By DINA CAPPIELLO, Associated Press Writer Dina Cappiello, Associated Press Writer - Wed Aug 19, 4:12 pm ET

WASHINGTON - No fish can escape mercury pollution. That's the take-home message from a federal study of mercury contamination released Wednesday that tested fish from nearly 300 streams across the country.

The toxic substance was found in every fish sampled, a finding that underscores how widespread mercury pollution has become.

But while all fish had traces of contamination, only about a quarter had mercury levels exceeding what the Environmental Protection Agency says is safe for people eating average amounts of fish.

The study by the U.S. Geological Survey is the most comprehensive look to date at mercury in the nation's

streams. From 1998 to 2005, scientists collected and tested more than a thousand fish, including bass, trout and catfish, from 291 streams nationwide.

"This science sends a clear message that our country must continue to confront pollution, restore our nation's waterways, and protect the public from potential health dangers," Interior Secretary Ken Salazar said in a statement.

Mercury consumed by eating fish can damage the nervous system and cause learning disabilities in developing fetuses and young children. The main source of mercury to most of the streams tested, according to the researchers, is emissions from coal-fired power plants. The mercury released from smokestacks here and abroad rains down into waterways, where natural processes convert it into methylmercury - a form that allows the toxin to wind its way up the food chain into fish.

Some of the highest levels in fish were detected in the remote blackwater streams along the coasts of the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida and Louisiana, where bacteria in surrounding forests and wetlands help in the conversion. The second-highest concentration of mercury was detected in largemouth bass from the North Fork of the Edisto River near Fairview Crossroads, S.C.

"Unfortunately, it's the case that almost any fish you test will have mercury now," said Andrew Rypel, a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Mississippi who has studied mercury contamination in fish throughout the Southeast. He said other research has shown mercury in fish from isolated areas of Alaska and Canada, and species that live in the deep ocean.

Mercury was also found in high concentrations in western streams that drain areas mined for mercury and gold. The most contaminated sample came from smallmouth bass collected from the Carson River at Dayton, Nev., an area tainted with mercury from gold mining. At 58 other streams, mostly in the West, the acidic conditions created by mining could also be contributing to the mercury levels, the researchers said.

"Some ecosystems are more sensitive than others," said Barbara Scudder, the lead USGS scientist on the study.

All but two states - Alaska and Wyoming - have issued fish-consumption advisories because of mercury contamination. Some of the streams studied already had warnings.

"This is showing that the problem is much more widespread," said Sonya Lunder, a senior analyst for the Environmental Working Group, which has pushed for stronger advisories on consumption of mercury-laden fish and controls on the sources of mercury pollution. "If you are living in an area that doesn't have a mercury advisory, you should use caution."

Earlier this year, the Obama administration said it would begin crafting a new regulations to control mercury emissions from power plants after a federal appeals court threw out plans drafted by the Bush administration and favored by industry. The Bush rule would have allowed power plants to buy and sell pollution credits, instead of requiring each plant to install equipment to reduce mercury pollution.

The EPA also has also proposed a new regulation to clamp down on emissions of mercury from cement plants.

AP

<

***** NOTICE *****

The information contained in this transmission is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, distribute or copy this communication. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and then delete it. Thank you for your compliance.

(3)

From: kbsingr@aol.com**To:** epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us**Cc:** ROYBON@aol.com; Kbsingr@aol.com**Subject:** Plant Washington Comments**Date:** Fri, Oct 16, 2009 6:25 pm

October 16, 2009

Dr. Carol A. Couch
Director, Georgia Environmental Protection Division
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Suite 1152 – East Tower
Atlanta, GA 30334
Email: epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us

Plant Washington Comments

Dear Dr. Couch,

My husband and I are writing this letter to go on record in strong opposition to the proposed coal-fired Plant Washington. The proposed site for the plant is about five miles from our family farm property, which has been in my husband's family for almost 60 years. His parents actively farmed the land and sold its produce at a small grocery store in Sandersville for many years and we have plans to continue that legacy. Our dream for this beautiful land is to create a showcase for sustainable living in a rural setting, one which encompasses organic agriculture, green building technology and renewable energy production for the farm and home—we're seeking to make a model that can be reproduced by other small family farms. We have been actively planning this for a number of years, so you can therefore understand our consternation to hear of the plans for a new coal-fired plant so close by. Obviously, we have closely followed the development of the plans for Plant Washington since they were made public, attending meetings offered by Power4Georgians, corresponding with Frank Askew, President of Washington EMC, tracking media sources, reading the specifications of the draft permits online at the EPD website and through research into the risks of coal plants, in general, and Plant Washington in particular. However, after much research and consideration, we have even more serious concerns about Plant Washington than we initially did.

Our research has highlighted the following issues and concerns:

First, and perhaps most importantly, we question the need for this plant to even be built. Based on the findings of the seminal Georgia Tech paper, "Meta-Review of Efficiency Potential Studies and their Implications for the South," which concludes "full deployment of energy-efficient technologies... would entirely offset the need to expand electric generation capacity in the South through the year 2020." In this compilation of numerous reports, the paper – co-authored by Dr. Marilyn Brown, a member of the intergovernmental climate change panel, who shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore—asserts that "with vigorous policies, it is possible to reduce energy consumption in the South by one percent per year, which would more than eliminate the projected growth in energy demand in the region." This information is borne out by the four Georgia EMCs that have withdrawn from the Plant Washington project, citing both uncertainty and financial risks from pending climate legislation, *and a decrease in power consumption* by their members. Jackson EMC in particular has experienced "negative growth" this year (as quoted from an October 14 article by Jason Crosby in The Flagpole, Athens, Georgia.) This is in direct contrast with Power4Georgians' graphs and projections showing consumer demand going steadily upwards. On what data do they base these projections? It has also not escaped our notice that of the 850 megawatts this plant is proposed to generate, only 2% of the power will be for use by

Washington EMC, whereas the remaining 98% will be exported to Atlanta and other areas. However, Washington and surrounding counties and the Oconee River will bear almost the entire burden of pollution and negative impacts from the plant. We submit that Washington EMC's power needs for the foreseeable future can be met with conservation measures, energy-efficient and renewable technologies which would offer no pollution and minimal water consumption compared to Plant Washington's 13-16 million gallons per day. It would also create jobs, and be much more cost effective than a \$2.1 billion coal plant.

Plant Washington has been promoted by its developers as the cleanest in Georgia, yet in an article by Dean Alford, the project developer, in today's Savannah Morning News he states, "The mercury emissions from Plant Washington will amount to less than one teaspoonful per day and, depending on wind and weather patterns, will be widely dispersed. Anyone truly concerned about mercury in waterways - including opponents of Plant Washington - know this is true." Our response is, yes we do know, and we are rightly concerned about mercury in the waterways, since, mercury **"...the highly toxic chemical is dangerous in even very small doses; one-seventieth of one teaspoon of mercury can contaminate a 20-acre lake and make the lake's fish unsafe to eat."** (quote is from a recent press release on the EarthJustice.org website) The release continues, "Mercury, a dangerous neurotoxin, interferes with the brain and nervous system. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, eight percent of American women of childbearing age have mercury in their bodies at levels high enough to put their babies at risk of birth defects, loss of IQ, learning disabilities and developmental problems." Therefore, a teaspoon a day of mercury pollution is totally unacceptable, whether it's in the water, the air, or the soil—it will find it's way into human bodies, to the great detriment of our health.

And recent comments by Senator Barbara Boxer, the California Democrat who is chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works brings into even sharper focus the shifting of the pollution burden by coal-fired power plants from air to water in this quote from an article appearing in the October 13th New York Times, Coal-fired Power Plants: Cleansing the Air at the Expense of Waterways by Charles DuHigg. "We know that coal waste is so dangerous that we don't want it in the air, and that's why we've told power plants they have to install scrubbers," said Senator Boxer. "So why are they dumping the same waste into people's water?" Why, indeed?

As for health risks, along with mercury, many other toxic wastes will end up in either the water used in the scrubbers or the coal ash--chemicals such as arsenic, aluminum, barium, boron, cadmium, chromium, manganese and nickel. Even though Plant Washington proposes to use state-of-the-art pollution controls, the fact is, there will be toxic dry coal ash stored on site in landfills with liners. These liners have proven to be less effective than hoped, and can leach these dangerous toxic chemicals into the soil and water. In fact, according to a recent article in the New York Times, **"Coal ash is becoming increasingly toxic. In fact, the cancer risk of people living near some coal ash sites is a staggering 1 in 50."**

The New York Times study is backed up by EPA's own data, which shows that coal plants discharge millions of pounds of toxic pollutants like arsenic, mercury, selenium and lead, each year. Yet the existing federal rules, which have not been revised since 1982, fail to set any limits on these metal discharges, which can leach into local water supplies, as well as contaminate local waterways."

This is a truly staggering figure! *One in 50 people living near a coal ash site is at risk for cancer.* That is also not an acceptable health risk.

Lastly, we submit that the financial risks of this project are huge. Given that four of the original 10 EMCs forming the Power4Georgians coalition have pulled out of the project due to financial risk and uncertainty over future environmental regulation, and one was absorbed by Cobb EMC, it leaves only 5 EMCs to handle the entire financial risk for the project. Though questions have been raised about this

issue, answers have not been forthcoming, other than to indicate a plan for municipal bonds to be sold by Washington County to support the project. Should the plant either not reach completion or fail, it could bankrupt the already strained Washington County economy. The evidence is clear: Plant Washington is not viable. It is too risky financially, too dangerous for human health and too potentially devastating for the environment, especially in light of the many clean, renewable energy alternatives that currently exist. Georgia has vast potential for clean, renewable, cheap energy. For example, several Georgia-based biofuel companies already produce power from locally grown resources. Biomass used to create syngas, is a much cleaner product than fossil fuels. If this type of plant were regionalized to take advantage of local sources of agricultural waste to produce power, it would create jobs, use a local resource (avoiding costs of transporting coal from Wyoming), and create healthier forests at the same time. Southface in Atlanta, has studies detailing renewable energy potential in the Southeast for biomass, solar PV, low-impact hydro, and wind, comparing power supply outputs, levelized costs, water usage, air quality impacts and climate change risks. The tide of public opinion has turned against coal, toward clean renewable energy. In a recent poll by Schott, 92% of Americans think it is important for the nation to develop and use solar energy. This was consistent across all political party affiliations.

I know from personal family history the dangers of coal – my grandfather, a coal miner in Pennsylvania, died of black lung. From start to finish, coal is dangerous to people and to our fragile environment. We respectfully appeal to you, for all these reasons, to deny Plant Washington. Allow us to be good stewards of the land and pass on a healthy, sustainable legacy to our children and grandchildren.
Sincerely,
Karen & Roy Bonnell, Sandersville, GA

4

From: "Chandra Brown" <cbrown@ocrk.org>
To: <james_capp@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/21/2009 3:58 PM
Subject: Plant Washington and DRI Process

Jac,

Sent this to the wrong email address for you. My apologies.

Chandra Brown

From: Chandra Brown [mailto:cbrown@ocrk.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2009 3:49 PM
To: 'carol.couch@dnr.state.ga.us'
Cc: 'linda.macgregor@dnr.state.ga.us'; 'jac.capp@dnr.state.ga.us';
'chris.clark@dnr.state.ga.us'; 'jennifer.kaduck@dnr.state.ga.us';
'acrosson@csrarc.ga.gov'; 'mike.beatty@dca.ga.gov'
Subject: Plant Washington and DRI Process
Importance: High

circle logo

PO Box 1925

Statesboro, GA 30459

Phone: 912-764-2017

Fax: 413-639-3757

www.ogeecheecanoocheeriverkeeper.org

WATERKEEPERR Alliance Member

Via Email and Facsimile

October 21, 2009

Dr. Carol Couch

Director

Georgia Environmental Protection Division

2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, Suite 1152 East Tower

Atlanta, Georgia 30334

RE: Proposed Plant Washington Development of Regional Impact Process

Dear Dr. Couch,

I learned this week of your resignation from the Georgia Environmental Protection Division. On behalf of Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper (OCRK), thank you for your service to the state and our natural resources. Your expertise and experience with southeast Georgia's river systems was of great benefit to our area of the state.

I am writing to you today regarding the proposed coal-fired power plant, Plant Washington. As I am sure you are well aware, OCRK is very concerned about the potential additional mercury load to the vulnerable blackwater river systems in our area. In speaking with leaders in surrounding communities about this concern, I became aware that many leaders in these communities were not aware of the proposal or had not been asked to comment on the proposal.

Clearly, there is a tremendous potential for Plant Washington to impact neighboring communities' air and water resources. According to the Department of Community Affairs,

Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs) are large-scale developments that are likely to have regional effects beyond the local government jurisdiction in which they are located. The Georgia Planning Act of 1989 authorized the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to establish procedures for review of these large-scale projects. These procedures are designed to improve communication between affected governments and to provide a means of revealing and assessing potential impacts of large-scale developments before conflicts relating to them arise. At the same time, local government autonomy is preserved since the host government maintains the authority to make the final decision on whether a proposed development will or will not

go forward.[1]

OCRK believes that this DRI process should have been triggered through several actions taken by Washington County, including the passing of a resolution in support of the coal plant. It is also our understanding that there is a proposal to close a county maintained road, Mayview Road, and potentially other actions that involved the local government, including the determination of whether the solid waste facility is consistent with the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP). Washington County's failure to solicit input from adjacent communities prior to the submission of the application materials by Power4Georgians to EPD is potentially a violation of the Georgia Planning Act of 1989.

On behalf of Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper, I hope that you will declare the current application process and draft permits null and void before your departure on October 27. For our part, we commit to helping communities that would be impacted by this proposed coal plant assess the impacts and fully participate in the DRI process.

Thank you for your time and commitment to Georgia's natural resources.

Yours Truly,

Chandra Brown

Riverkeeper/Executive Director

cc: Michael A. Beatty, Commissioner, Department of Community
Affairs

Jac Capp, Branch Chief, EPD Air Protection Branch

Chris Clark, Commissioner, Georgia Department of Natural
Resources

Andy Crosson, Executive Director, CSRA RDC

Horace M. Daniel, Chairman, Washington County Commissioners

Jennifer Kaduck, Branch Chief, EPD Land Protection Branch

Linda MacGregor, Branch Chief, EPD Watershed Protection
Branch

[1]
<http://www.dca.ga.gov/development/PlanningQualityGrowth/programs/regionalimpact.asp>

(73)

From: "Bill Garner" <Bill.Garner@thielekaolin.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/20/2009 1:42 PM
Subject: Plant Washington comments

To Georgia EPD,

I am a citizen of Washington County and have lived here all my life except when I lived in Athens where I received my BS from the School of Agriculture at UGA. I live in the northern part of Washington County in the house that my great grandfather built in 1870. I am currently employed at Thiele Kaolin Company and have been so for 24 years. I will keep my comments brief and to the point.

1. Air quality has always been an issue in this county. We were on restricted burning for a few months this past summer. Why permit a plant that would add more CO2 to the air we breathe.
2. I understand that coal ash containment ponds have the potential to be a problem. I know of one that overflowed containing certain contaminants.
3. Mercury has been found in fish and some ground water near or downwind of coal plants.
4. Our supply of ground water could be affected by the massive amount needed to run this plant.
5. Bringing in the raw coal by rail and offloading for storage could add pollutants to the ground and air.

I have listened to both sides and I believe that the permitting of Plant Washington would not be in the best interest of the ones of us who reside and work in this county, therefore I oppose this coal plant being built in Washington county or any county in the state of Georgia.

Thank you for your consideration on this important issue.

Bill Garner

bill.garner@thielekaolin.com

83

From: Caleb Lord <caleblord@hotmail.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/16/2009 2:18 PM
Subject: Plant Washington Comments

I have a few questions concerning the effect Plant Washington will have on Washington County and surrounding counties. They are as follows:

Have there been any considerations about using some of the waste-water ponds from the kaolin companies as a source of water? With a life expectancy of 30 years for the proposed landfill, what will happen to the 450 acres after those 30 years have expired? And what proposals are given to store the material after the first 30 years? Will it be safe to consume fish and other wildlife out of the William Swamp Creek stream and area or will there be limits on the consumed amount per month as it is for the Oconee River? Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing a response to my above mentioned questions at the meeting held on October 20 at the Ridge Road Primary School.

Caleb G. Lord

Hotmail: Powerful Free email with security by Microsoft.
<http://clk.atdmt.com/GBL/go/171222986/direct/01/>

4-22
141

From: David Cummings <doscarc3204@yahoo.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/26/2009 2:25 PM
Subject: Comments on Plant Washington

My name is David Cummings. I live at 3204 Hamburg State Park Rd, Warthen, Georgia and am a native of Washington County. This comment is written to state my opposition to the permitting of Plant Washington. I am concerned about the mercury emissions from Plant Washington. The site for Plant Washington is within the water shed for the Ogeechee River. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) has found that mercury levels in fish living in black water rivers of the Southeastern United States are high. In fact the levels are two to three times the recommended level. The Georgia EPD has issued recommended limits of the consumption of fish caught in these rivers. The Ogeechee River is a black water river with high mercury levels.

The USGS identified emissions from coal fired power plants as being a source of the mercury found in the Southeastern black water rivers. In addition the mercury levels are found to be higher in Southeastern Rivers than those in the Midwest or West. A possible explanation is that the prevailing wind pattern has concentrated the mercury deposits in the Eastern United States. This coupled with the location of the black water rivers has concentrated the mercury in this geographic region.

At a public meeting on October 6, 2009 the EPD complimented the Power4Georgians on the water and air quality modeling done for Plant Washington. The EPD also pointed out that the mercury emissions from Plant Washington were set at a level lower than requested by Power4Georgians. However, no one has stated the expected ground level concentration of mercury based on these models. It seems reasonable that such values exist in the models created to examine the impact on air quality from Plant Washington.

The bottom line is that because of our neighbors to the west and the chemistry of the Ogeechee and other black water rivers, the mercury levels found are at an alarming level. In a study published in Environmental Science Technology in 2006 by Hammerschmit and Fitzgerald found that the accumulation of methylmercury in wild fish populations is linked to the atmospheric mercury loadings. In other words, the higher the mercury level in the atmosphere the higher the level in wild fish. The Ogeechee River is in a precarious position with regards to mercury contamination. Plant Washington is going to increase the mercury loading of the atmosphere in the Ogeechee watershed. We are trading jobs that may last 30 years for the health of a river which may never recover. For the future of the Ogeechee River and the health of the aquatic life found in the river, I ask that you not permit Plant Washington.

5 - (22)
(163)

From: "Don McAdam" <dmcadam@comcast.net>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/24/2009 2:19 PM
Subject: Comment regarding the proposed coal-fired power plant in Sandersville

To the EPD,

In a study by the US Geological Survey, every stream in US that they tested since 1998 is contaminated by an intense neurotoxin, mercury. Consequently, 48 out of 50 states have advisories warning of the dangers of consuming fish from these waters. The US Environmental Protection Agency warns us that the single biggest man-made source of mercury pollution comes from coal-fired power plants. Despite this, and in contradiction to our state's EPD's mission to protect and restore Georgia's environment, the state of Georgia is set to approve permits for more coal-fired power plants.

The USGS also found that some of the highest levels of mercury in fish were in Georgia's waterways. As it turns out certain types of wetlands and forest streams, of which are abundant in Georgia are more efficient in converting precipitated mercury into the form which ends up contaminating fish.

This past week the Georgia Environmental Protection Division offered a disingenuous defense of the proposed coal plants at public hearing in Sandersville. The EPD claimed that these new plants would pollute less than existing ones. They made this argument even though no environmentalist ever claimed otherwise. The problem is that despite design improvements, these plants will still emit large amounts of toxic waste.

It is unethical for the EPD to support the construction of new power generating facilities that burn coal. Yet, that's exactly what they are doing. It's up to us to demand that no more coal plants be allowed in our state. Please call and write your state legislators, Governor Perdue and the state EPD.

Kind regards,

Don McAdam

6422 Vernon Woods Dr.

Atlanta, GA 30328

770-335-9587

5-(22)

174

From: "Ed and Lori Boyen" <eaboyen@mindspring.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/21/2009 10:41 AM
Subject: Plant Washington
Attachments: PlantWashington.pdf

Please see attached file for comments.

Thank you,

Lori Boyen

Glascok County, Georgia

Lori Boyen

October 21, 2009

Plant Washington Comments
Environmental Protection Division
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Suite 1152 – East Tower
Atlanta, Ga. 30334

RE: Plant Washington Comments

Name: Lori Boyen
Address: 3587 Beall Springs Rd, Gibson, GA 30810
Occupation: Industrial Engineer/Management Consultant
Number of years in area: 28

Dear Dr. Carol Couch,

I am writing to register my opposition to the construction of a coal-fired plant in Washington County, Georgia.

My primary concern is the detriment of our environment and the impact it will have on our water supply. Georgia is no stranger to water woes, but this area does not receive the precipitation that it did in my childhood days. The creeks, family ponds and even rivers do not flow with the water volume I remember as I child. This has occurred in a short span of time. Yes, we do receive periods with ample rain, but with the heat and drought that the summers have been producing in the past few years, the recharge time to our water supply is taking longer.

I am very concerned that the backers of this plant have realized that the Oconee River is not going to supply their massive need of 16 million gallons of water per day. The proposal on the table now to drill wells into the aquifer tells me that this is going to be the main source of cooling water for the plant. I find this an unacceptable compromise. Living in an agricultural area, I have already seen in the past year several farm wells going dry. The farmers have to drill deeper in search of water. Most rural residences operate off of well water, are we going to wake up one morning and not have water. I think this likelihood is high.

I am also concerned about the pollution that the plant will put into our environment. Coal is not clean burning. There are poisonous chemical characteristics of coal that must go somewhere when the coal is broken down for fuel. No magic wand will make these compounds go away. So, where does it go - our air and our water? I do not want my children to have to grow up worrying about their health and if the water they drink is contaminated. I do not want to worry if the fish we eat and the deer we hunt are harming my family when we sit down to a meal.

I have heard the economic arguments for this plant. The economic impact will benefit **only** Washington County. There will not be many jobs for locals during construction – out of town specialty contractors will do the bulk of the work. There will be a few jobs created when the plant is operational that will be filled by locals, but this benefit is far outweighed by the risks.

I cannot support a plant that is being built to benefit a few people to the detriment of many. I also cannot support this plant because it is not being built to fill the needs of this region. The power generated at this plant is to benefit Atlanta and other points that will pay for this power.

I urge you to not issue a permit for this plant. America is the land of innovation and should be moving forward not limping along on the crutches of outdated technology. Coal is dangerous, noxious and detrimental to our health and the health of the environment; we should be exploring other avenues for the power that will fuel the future of Georgia.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lori Boyen

Lori Boyen

5-(22)
(175)

From: Ed Boyen <ed@cfsarchitects.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/26/2009 11:01 AM
Subject: Plant Washington
Attachments: EPD_coalPlant.pdf

Dear EPD:

I am writing to let my opinion be known about the proposed plant in Washington county, Georgia.

Please take into consideration the greater public welfare when the plans are under consideration.

Thank you,

Ed Boyen

Edward Boyen, A.I.A.
LEED AP
CHEATHAM FLETCHER SCOTT ARCHITECTS
420 1/2 Eighth Street
Augusta, GA 30901
Ph: (706) 724-2668
Fax: (706) 849-9919
www.cfsarchitects.com

Please consider the environment before you print this e-mail.

NOTICE: This e-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error, then delete it.

October 26, 2009

Edward Boyen
3587 Beall Springs Road
Gibson, GA 30810

Environmental Protection Division
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Suite 1152 DEast Tower
Atlanta, Ga. 30334

Attention: Jim Ussery - Acting Director

Dear Mr. Ussery:

I am writing today to register my opposition to the proposed coal fired plant in Washington County, Georgia. I have been a resident of the area for the last six years and have chosen to raise my family here. I am primarily concerned with the health and welfare of my family. The air quality and mercury released into the environment regionally (Georgia and South Carolina) are not worth the small service area of this one plant. There is another tower presently going in at Vogtle. I would imagine that the output at this facility trumps this smaller proposed plant without the air quality and mercury concerns.

I work in Augusta and drive in to the area early in the morning. The air is stale and toxic from a combination of the Olin plant and the meat processor in town as the cool morning air settles in the river basin. These are only the smells that can be identified. The items that cannot be detected by the nose are bigger concern. There are many chemical and heavy production industrial plants in the area that are pumping tons of contaminants into the air & this can be seen just by the steam generated at the stacks. Other agencies have picked up on this also:
http://chronicle.augusta.com/stories/2009/10/22/met_552793.shtml
http://chronicle.augusta.com/stories/2009/10/24/edi_553051.shtml

Now add a coal plant. The air quality is already bad in the region. Now it will be worse. This does not take into consideration that THERE ARE NO COAL MINES IN THE AREA. Coal will have to be brought in by train. How much more energy will this consume and pollutants will be released just in transportation?

As a resident dependent on well water, I have watched the levels in one well drop over time. I am really concerned over how much water will be consumed by the plant in an area already losing its water supply.

Please consider the bigger picture as you work on the permitting process of the plant. I am sure that you have had to put family first in situations you have encountered. Now take a moment and put our families first.

Thank you,



Edward Boyen, AIA

8 - (22)

(230)

From: "Hart" <hartramm@comcast.net>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 12:03 AM
Subject: Draft Plant Washington Comments

To All Concerned:

I wish to lodge my strong objection to the construction of Plant Washington. I have looked over the documents on your website that concern the draft permits and could find no mention of either carbon dioxide or the potentially catastrophic climate change that it threatens to bring about. The EPD has legalistic excuses for ignoring carbon dioxide, probably the most far-reaching and dangerous pollutant, but by ignoring global warming and its consequences the EPD is choosing to leave out an indispensable parameter. A strong case can be made that the EPD's astounding failure to take carbon dioxide and global warming into account invalidates its entire review process.

An example of the inadequacy of the existing permit process is provided by existing mercury regulation: carbon dioxide impacts the mercury danger. Mercury deposited in lakes and rivers undergoes a chemical reaction that converts it into methyl mercury, a compound that is readily taken up by marine animals and accumulates in higher order predators, like humans. Furthermore, it is well known that carbon dioxide becomes carbonic acid when it is dissolved in water, which lowers the pH of bodies of water. Finally, we know that mercury is converted into methyl mercury more abundantly at lower pH values. If we assume that carbon dioxide levels will continue to climb as it did in the last decade, ie., by an average of around 5% per year, rivers and streams will be significantly more acidic than they are now, and mercury levels which are deemed safe now will become woefully inadequate.

Recent reviews of the climate data since the 2007 IPCC Report (see, for example, <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=487>) project the distinct possibility that by the time the coal plant reaches old age in 2060 the average temperature of the earth may well be 40C (7.20F) hotter than it is today. That number must be viewed in the light of the already unmistakable, damaging impact that just .740C increase in average world temperature over the entire 20th Century has had on the atmosphere and hydrosphere. The climate into which the coal plant emits its last few decades of pollution will be a very different climate than the one that underlies the regulations that the EPD deems appropriate today. The IPCC Report projects a climate that is increasingly unstable. Lying, as it does, between the tropical and temperate climate zones, Georgia will bounce back and forth between drought and torrential rains, between drought and flood. These are trends that we are already beginning to experience and that climate models have established to a high (often 95%) statistical certainty. We have already experienced droughts that threatened the wells and surface waters of middle Georgia. The IPCC Report warns of worsening drought in a hotter world. Is the EPD protecting the environment and the populace when it places an additional, sizeable burden on the water table of the region? What will a period of heretofore unknown torrential rains do to Plant Washington's growing ash heap? At higher temperatures the nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrous oxide, carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide that the coal plant emits will be more effectively converted into ozone. Asthma and allergy sufferers will already be plagued by significantly higher pollen levels.

All of these effects are in large part due to 50 years of emissions by existing coal plants and all will be exacerbated further by the proposed coal plant. A regulatory body that takes the protection of the environment and the public seriously would not permit the construction of a coal plant that struggles to meet, and in the case of particulate matter fails to meet, even today's pollution limits -- not when very good science is screaming that instability, uncertainty and disruption of major physical and biological systems threaten.

13 - (22)

(342)

From: <kbsingr@aol.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
CC: <ROYBON@aol.com>, <Kbsingr@aol.com>
Date: 10/16/2009 6:26 PM
Subject: Plant Washington Comments

October 16, 2009

Dr. Carol A. Couch

Director, Georgia Environmental Protection Division

2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive

Suite 1152 – East Tower

Atlanta, GA 30334

Email: epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us

Plant Washington Comments

Dear Dr. Couch,

My husband and I are writing this letter to go on record in strong opposition to the proposed coal-fired Plant Washington. The proposed site for the plant is about five miles from our family farm property, which has been in my husband's family for almost 60 years. His parents actively farmed the land and sold its produce at a small grocery store in Sandersville for many years and we have plans to continue that legacy. Our dream for this beautiful land is to create a showcase for sustainable living in a rural setting, one which encompasses organic agriculture, green building technology and renewable energy production for the farm and home—we're seeking to make a model that can be reproduced by other small family farms. We have been actively planning this for a number of years, so you can therefore understand our consternation to hear of the plans for a new coal-fired plant so close by. Obviously, we have closely followed the development of the plans for Plant Washington since they were made public, attending meetings offered by Power4Georgians, corresponding with Frank Askew, President of Washington EMC, tracking media sources, reading the specifications of the draft permits online at the EPD website and through research into the risks of coal plants, in general, and Plant Washington in particular. However, after much research and consideration, we have even more serious concerns about Plant Washington than we initially did.

Our research has highlighted the following issues and concerns:

First, and perhaps most importantly, we question the need for this plant to even be built. Based on the findings of the seminal Georgia Tech paper, "Meta-Review of Efficiency Potential Studies and their Implications for the South," which concludes "full deployment of energy-efficient technologies...would entirely offset the need to expand electric generation capacity in the South through the year 2020." In this

compilation of numerous reports, the paper – co-authored by Dr. Marilyn Brown, a member of the intergovernmental climate change panel, who shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore—asserts that “with vigorous policies, it is possible to reduce energy consumption in the South by one percent per year, which would more than eliminate the projected growth in energy demand in the region.” This information is borne out by the four Georgia EMCs that have withdrawn from the Plant Washington project, citing both uncertainty and financial risks from pending climate legislation, and a decrease in power consumption by their members. Jackson EMC in particular has experienced “negative growth” this year (as quoted from an October 14 article by Jason Crosby in *The Flagpole*, Athens, Georgia.) This is in direct contrast with Power4Georgians’ graphs and projections showing consumer demand going steadily upwards. On what data do they base these projections? It has also not escaped our notice that of the 850 megawatts this plant is proposed to generate, only 2% of the power will be for use by Washington EMC, whereas the remaining 98% will be exported to Atlanta and other areas. However, Washington and surrounding counties and the Oconee River will bear almost the entire burden of pollution and negative impacts from the plant. We submit that Washington EMC’s power needs for the foreseeable future can be met with conservation measures, energy-efficient and renewable technologies which would offer no pollution and minimal water consumption compared to Plant Washington’s 13-16 million gallons per day. It would also create jobs, and be much more cost effective than a \$2.1 billion coal plant.

Plant Washington has been promoted by its developers as the cleanest in Georgia, yet in an article by Dean Alford, the project developer, in today’s *Savannah Morning News* he states, “The mercury emissions from Plant Washington will amount to less than one teaspoonful per day and, depending on wind and weather patterns, will be widely dispersed. Anyone truly concerned about mercury in waterways - including opponents of Plant Washington - know this is true.” Our response is, yes we do know, and we are rightly concerned about mercury in the waterways, since, mercury “...the highly toxic chemical is dangerous in even very small doses; one-seventieth of one teaspoon of mercury can contaminate a 20-acre lake and make the lake’s fish unsafe to eat.” (quote is from a recent press release on the EarthJustice.org website) The release continues, “Mercury, a dangerous neurotoxin, interferes with the brain and nervous system. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, eight percent of American women of childbearing age have mercury in their bodies at levels high enough to put their babies at risk of birth defects, loss of IQ, learning disabilities and developmental problems.” Therefore, a teaspoon a day of mercury pollution is totally unacceptable, whether it’s in the water, the air, or the soil—it will find it’s way into human bodies, to the great detriment of our health.

And recent comments by Senator Barbara Boxer, the California Democrat who is chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works brings into even sharper focus the shifting of the pollution burden by coal-fired power plants from air to water in this quote from an article appearing in the October 13th *New York Times*, *Coal-fired Power Plants: Cleansing the Air at the Expense of Waterways* by Charles Duhigg. “We know that coal waste is so dangerous that we don’t want it in the air, and that’s why we’ve told power plants they have to install scrubbers,” said Senator Boxer. “So why are they dumping the same waste into people’s water?” Why, indeed?

As for health risks, along with mercury, many other toxic wastes will end up in either the water used in the scrubbers or the coal ash—chemicals such as arsenic, aluminum, barium, boron, cadmium, chromium, manganese and nickel. Even though Plant Washington proposes to use state-of-the-art pollution controls, the fact is, there will be toxic dry coal ash stored on site in landfills with liners. These liners have proven to be less effective than hoped, and can leach these dangerous toxic chemicals into the soil and water. In fact, according to a recent article in the *New York Times*, “Coal ash is becoming increasingly toxic. In fact, the cancer risk of people living near some coal ash sites is a staggering 1 in 50.

The *New York Times* study is backed up by EPA’s own data, which shows that coal plants discharge millions of pounds of toxic pollutants like arsenic, mercury, selenium and lead, each year. Yet the existing federal rules, which have not been revised since 1982, fail to set any limits on these metal discharges, which can leach into local water supplies, as well as contaminate local waterways.”

This is a truly staggering figure! One in 50 people living near a coal ash site is at risk for cancer. That is also not an acceptable health risk.

Lastly, we submit that the financial risks of this project are huge. Given that four of the original 10 EMCs forming the Power4Georgians coalition have pulled out of the project due to financial risk and uncertainty over future environmental regulation, and one was absorbed by Cobb EMC, it leaves only 5 EMCs to handle the entire financial risk for the project. Though questions have been raised about this issue, answers have not been forthcoming, other than to indicate a plan for municipal bonds to be sold by Washington County to support the project. Should the plant either not reach completion or fail, it could bankrupt the already strained Washington County economy. The evidence is clear: Plant Washington is not viable. It is too risky financially, too dangerous for human health and too potentially devastating for the environment, especially in light of the many clean, renewable energy alternatives that currently exist. Georgia has vast potential for clean, renewable, cheap energy. For example, several Georgia-based biofuel companies already produce power from locally grown resources. Biomass used to create syngas, is a much cleaner product than fossil fuels. If this type of plant were regionalized to take advantage of local sources of agricultural waste to produce power, it would create jobs, use a local resource (avoiding costs of transporting coal from Wyoming), and create healthier forests at the same time. Southface in Atlanta, has studies detailing renewable energy potential in the Southeast for biomass, solar PV, low-impact hydro, and wind, comparing power supply outputs, levelized costs, water usage, air quality impacts and climate change risks. The tide of public opinion has turned against coal, toward clean renewable energy. In a recent poll by Schott, 92% of Americans think it is important for the nation to develop and use solar energy. This was consistent across all political party affiliations.

I know from personal family history the dangers of coal – my grandfather, a coal miner in Pennsylvania, died of black lung. From start to finish, coal is dangerous to people and to our fragile environment. We respectfully appeal to you, for all these reasons, to deny Plant Washington. Allow us to be good stewards of the land and pass on a healthy, sustainable legacy to our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,

Karen & Roy Bonnell, Sandersville, GA

15 - (22)
(378)

From: "Linda Helton" <lbh@pineland.net>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/26/2009 1:04 PM
Subject: Plant Washington Comments

EPD,

I am very concerned about the proposed coal fired power plant in Washington county. I have attended all of your meetings and still do not believe that this plant is what Georgians need. We have too many coal fired power plants in Georgia now. Supposedly this one is clean technology! I'm sure that's what was said about the others when they were built, look at them now. Twenty years out (in my lifetime) I'm sure we will be saying the same things about this one. With all the technology we have as Americans we are still willing to sacrifice OUR HEALTH for the ALMIGHTY DOLLAR AND THE GREED AND POWER OF A FEW WHO STAND TO PROFIT GREATLY FROM THIS PLANT!! This plant as you know will be the first to be located so far from a body of water using 16 wells to fulfill its needs when the Oconee River is low. As you well know if it had been in existence for the last couple of years, it would have used those wells daily. That could not be good for those people who depend on their wells for their water. The dry storage of the coal ash is another great concern! I am unaware of any regulations you have in place or the manpower you would need to monitor this. I know that the stormwater runoff from this site will run into WILLIAMSON SWAMP CREEK and from there to the OGEECHEE RIVER. THAT'S NOT GOOD!!! The mercury and the CO2 levels that would be emitted from this plant are very questionable and therefore unacceptable.

If this is so good for our community would it not be in the best interest of everyone to wait and see what the EPA's ruling is on coal ash as a hazardous waste in December of this year and the new regulations on CO2 emissions? What is the hurry of Allied Energy and Power for Georgians? I know you have heard a lot about the jobs that this plant would bring, that remains to be seen. I'm sure there will be some boost to the local economy but at what price? Although I know this really does not concern your division, I would like to share this. There has been some question as of late that our county may be part owner in this plant. If this is true this is another example of the untruth and the deception that has surrounded this plant from the beginning. All that has been talked about is the jobs and the tax base that it will bring to the county. Too bad the taxpayers don't know that it may be coming out of their pockets in higher taxes and higher electrical rates. I hope that your division is what it says it is, a PROTECTION DIVISION and not just about issuing another permit.

In closing I would like to say, the many people I talk to don't even know that another dirty coal fired power plant is proposed to be built in Georgia and others say don't take it personal, we need the jobs. I'm sorry it is personal because you see I was born and raised in Washington county the 10th of 11 children. We didn't have much but we had the most important thing, faith in GOD and the love of family. My husband and I have lived at our current residence for 36 years. We have about 85 acres of timberland which backs up to WILLIAMSON SWAMP CREEK. This land has been in his family for many years. We live here because of its beauty and the peacefulness of being in the country. We love spending time outdoors with our children and grandchildren. Our son does food plots, hunts and fishes in the area. His 3 year old son loves the outdoors as I'm sure his soon to be son will love it. We have a garden and fruit trees that meet our needs, so the thought of a dirty coal fired power plant being within a mile of our home is hard to swallow.

I very much oppose this coal fired power plant and ask that you not issue this permit!

Sincerely
Linda B. Helton

22 - (22)

(545)

From: Seth Gunning <srgunnin@gmail.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/19/2009 5:16 PM
Subject: Plant Washington: Hidden Costs

To whom it may concern,

The National Academy of Sciences has just released a report, titled "The hidden costs of energy", finding that coal-fired power plants in the United States are responsible for more then \$62 billion dollars of environmental damage every year.

The report can be found here:http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12794#toc

I would like to know if the Georgia Environmental Protection Division has/will read this report and weight its contents into the decision of issuing further Coal Plant permits without either a) defined measures for Carbon Dioxide emissions or b) measurable expected monetary damages done yearly by the plant.

I believe that Power4Georgians should be responsible for using similar modeling to estimate in monetary value the environmental damages caused by the yearly operation of the proposed Plant Washington, will the Environmental Protection Division require this type of study? If not, why not?

Further, Carbon Dioxide has been ruled, under the supreme court, to be a hazardous pollutant. Why, even in the absence of regulation, does the EPD not AT THE VERY LEAST require projected carbon dioxide emissions be in applications for significant source permits? I encourage the EPD to do so, and further, to regulate these emissions. Failing to do so costs tax-payer dollars as EPD defends their irresponsible decisions in court.

Seth R. Gunning
Srgunnin@gmail.com
404-434-9745

www.climateaction.net
www.itsgettinghotinhere.org

(620)

From: <abbot.jim@gmail.com>
To: <cbrown@ocrk.org>, <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 1:12 PM
Subject: Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper - Plant Washington Feedback Form

The following comments were submitted through the feed back form on the Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper Website - Plant Washington Page. Below is a copy of the information submitted.

FIRST NAME:

Jim LAST NAME: Abbot STREET ADDRESS 1: 946 Waverly Way NE STREET ADDRESS 2: CITY: Atlanta STATE/CANADIAN PROVINCE: GA ZIP CODE: 30307 OFFICE PHONE: 404-471-6873 HOME PHONE: 404-523-5298 CELL PHONE: 404-281-0638 EMAIL ADDRESS: abbot.jim@gmail.com ADD YOUR OWN COMMENTS: I oppose the permitting of Plant Washington.

(1) The demand for the energy produced by this plant is based on dubious assumptions about population growth and energy use.

(2) You know for a fact and should act on the knowledge that there is insufficient water for this purpose in the Oconee River and in the aquifer system underlying the plant. By permitting this plant, you will "lock in" a low priority use of water and put at risk for the future local drinking water supplies.

(3) The nearby Ogeechee River is polluted with methylmercury. Plant Washington's BEST estimate is that it will put well over 100 pounds of mercury into the air each year. You have a statutory duty to regulate pollutants and to protect human health. The EMCs submitting this proposal have one dubious argument in favor of this plant: if the plant is not built, energy costs for consumers will rise. Your job is not to supply cheap energy to Atlanta. Your duty is to submit this proposal to rigorous scrutiny for the impact it will have on our natural resources and human health.

By that measure, the plant should not be permitted.

Thank you.

This e-mail was generated automatically by Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper

641

From: "Dianna Wedincamp" <dwedincamp@ocrk.org>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
CC: <slayton@ocrk.org>, <sweetmidge@aol.com>, "Brian Gist" <bgist@selcga.o...
Date: 10/27/2009 4:58 PM
Subject: RE: Plant Washington Comments
Attachments: ogeechee riverkeepr comments.xls

Please accept the attached comments on behalf of Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper..

Thank you,

Dianna Wedincamp

Program Director

We are located at 124 Savannah Avenue, Suite 2-B, Statesboro, GA 30458 next to the Daily Grind. Come visit us!

Ogeechee-Canoochee Riverkeeper®

PO Box 1925

Statesboro, GA 30459

Phone: 912-764-2017

Fax: 866-942-1115

Toll free Pollution Reporting: 866-942-1115

<<http://www.ogeecheecanoocheeriverkeeper.org/>> www.ogeecheecanoocheeriverkeeper.org

Join over 800 households in supporting clean water in the Ogeechee (
<<http://www.ogeecheecanoocheeriverkeeper.org/membership.html>>
www.ogeecheecanoocheeriverkeeper.org/membership.html).

P Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Date Submitted	First Name	Last Name	Street Address 1	Street Address 2	City	State/Canadian Province	Zip Code	Office Phone	Home Phone	Cell Phone	Email Address	Add Your Own Comments
04/10/09 05:47 PM	lynda	english	715 west church		swainsboro	GA	30401				lenglish64@yahoo.com	A meeting needs to be held in Dublin and Swainsboro also.
04/10/09 05:52 PM	Mary	Stanley	1055 Turner Road		Statesboro	GA	30458		912-865-5314		stanvog@bulloch.net	I'd be in favor of a hearing in the Statesboro area.
04/10/09 06:02 PM	richard	nash	107 bedford street		statesboro	GA	30458		912-489-8233		richardnash@gmail.com	I was at the Sandersville meeting but arrived late and was only able to get information provided to the public. I noticed that there was no scientist on the panel representing public health concerns or the bigger picture of non-clean coal and carbon dioxide emissions as well as mercury and the residual waste left over from furnt or used coal. I did notice the police cars out front, that and an unscientific approach and a less that democratic decision making process leads me to believe that this process is in the wrong hands.
04/10/09 09:59 PM	Martha	Black	8910 Hwy 17 South		Louisville	GA	30434		478-586-7814	478-494-8758	oldownplantation@gmail.com	I am shocked that the State of Georgia would even consider another coal fired plant. The CEO of Dominion Resources says that they are reducing their use of coal because of the many inherent dangers to the public health and to the miners and the natural resources. They have built two huge wind fields and have changed coal plants to natural gas which produces one half the carbon of coal without the harm to the mountians and workers. The only people who will benefit from this proposed plant are the people who will transport the coal, the people who are selling the land where the plant will be built and the people in Cobb County who want this plant no matter what the cost to our public health. It is shameful and all a lot of dirty politics and I hope you will take a stand against this plant and I hope you will hold hearings in every county with 100 miles of the proposed plant as they will all be adversely affected by it. Sincerely, Martha C. Black
04/11/09 12:51 AM	Leon	Tomlinson	pobox1433		Savannah	GA	31420		9129278656		leont1@bellsouth.net	Dr Couch, This Washington coal power plant will effect people all over Georgia and neighboring states. Please hold some public hearings near where I live so I can attend.
04/11/09 03:35 PM	Roy	Hubbard	155 Bent Tree Way		Richmond Hill	GA	31324		912 727-3177	912 857-3929	2skipperhub5@comcast.net	Please schedule ameeting in Statesboro as well.
04/13/09 03:20 PM	William	Dallas	132 Hunters way		Statesboro	GA	30461		912-587-3715		mdallas@ega.edu	This IS the 21st century. We must START now to think in a more conscious way about our ONE world. A coal-fired power plant near our river is 19th century thinking. We can do so much better than that.
04/17/09 09:38 AM	Gayle	Cousar	175 Parker Road		Sylvania	GA	30467		9128637474		gcousar@gmail.com	
04/26/09 03:48 PM	Elizabeth	Cluett	13 Magnolia Crossing		Savannah	GA	31411		912-598-7043		lhc1u@earthlink.net	Mr. Couch, I am very concerned about the backward approach to energy that GA is considering. In this day and age we need to seriously look at more sustainable means of power that are not harmful to our environment. I read about other states utilizing wind, sun, and other forward thinking means. I find it hard to believe that this is our best option. Please help keep our beautiful state just that! Ann Ramee
05/20/09 12:09 PM	Ann	Ramee	414 East 46th St.		Savannah	GA	31405		912 233-5847	912 233-6647	aramee474@bellsouth.net	Savannah, GA
05/24/09 03:11 PM	Hugh	Radford	148 Combatee RD	P.O. Box 223	Maldrim	GA	31318		912-308-9582	912-308-9582	hradford5@gmail.com	

07/07/09 11:59 AM	Jennifer	Baker	206 N Main St.	Apr. 4	Swainsboro	GA	30401					freebaker2002@yahoo.com	Dr. Couch, I grew up fishing with my father and eating each catch my mother cooked. I implore the EPD to hear the opinions of the communities of Atlanta, Dublin, and Savannah. These communities and those between them rely on the affected water resources and will be affected by the workings of Plant Washington. Our health is one of our greatest sources of wealth. Please take these issues into consideration. Thank you!
07/08/09 12:13 PM	JD	Polk	po box 747		Walthourville	GA	31333	9129662771				SolarmanJD@DCemail.com	Wow whats the cost? 2.5 Billion. Just think with 2.5B what I could do with PV.....ITS SHOCKING
10/22/09 10:11 AM	Thomas	Black	8810 Hwy 17 South		Louisville	GA	30434					black9@yahoo.com	EPD is so dumb to be permitting another coal-fired power plant that will be putting additional mercury in our waterways for years when we already have fish advisories from EPD for health reasons limiting the amount of fish one should eat from our waterways. With this additional mercury the fish in our black-water rivers can be too toxic to eat in any amount since the mercury accumulation is greater in these rivers. It seems to me that EPD is more concerned with protecting the coal power plants and supplying electricity to Atlanta than protecting the health of Georgia's citizens.
10/22/09 11:48 PM	William	Nichols	8 Tillman St		Statesboro	GA	30468					wnichol2@email.georgiasouthern.edu	Plant Washington would consume far too much water for drought stricken Georgia. No coal is clean. Does anyone want mercury in their fish and water?
10/27/09 09:19 AM	Sandy	Layton	310 W. Charlton St.		Savannah	GA	31401	404-374-1618	404-374-1618			sandydayton@yahoo.com	Please deny permit for plant Washington.
10/27/09 09:25 AM	Kathleen	Pitt	5 Sleggy Terrapin Lane		Savannah	GA	31411	912-588-9968				krpitt1@bellsouth.net	Please, let's move forward and develop new ways of producing energy. As an asthma sufferer, I do not need more pollution in the air.
10/27/09 09:46 AM	Lisa	Knighon	1190 Barnett Ridge		Americus	GA	30605	706 5491051	706 5491051			lisa.knighon@me.com	To Gov. Perdue and EPD dept heads, and interim director (decision makers) Lets look at the real picture here: -most of all the utility companies that originally wanted this DONT NOW. mainly the local, our hands are tied coop> wash emc. -coal fired plants are being/have been shut down all over the country (including ga) . what makes this one viable, oh yeah RAIL! -most of the created power will be "to the grid" and sold even out of state, emcs were not originally built as profit centers. -EPD> be an env protection group for once!!! not a permitting group that has to do what you are told. -can't we leave one river and some ground water for the future....we will need it. -BONE UP and stand up to those who really gain in this, oh yeah... please call my cell number listed above. I would love to discuss the deep wells that have been recently permitted and drilled for ag irrigation, who pays for all rural folks to have residential wells lowered to get water. It has happened all over jefferson county and am sure washington, people divided do nothing for they are afraid to ask!
10/27/09 10:44 AM	geary	davis	pobox 613		louisville	GA	30434					zackmandavis@jeffersonenergy.com	

10/27/09 10:48 AM	Alan	Bailey	419 Houston Oaks Drive		Savannah	GA	31419	912-925-3159	ab Bailey46@comcast.net	<p>Dear EPD: Thank you for taking comments on the proposed Plant Washington. I hope that all of the comments received about the environmental consequences of permitting this plant are seriously considered. It seems as though in the past, EPD has allowed public comments, but then has not actually considered these comments in making their permitting decisions. As you well know, coal fired power plants are one of the largest sources of mercury to the atmosphere. This mercury finds it way into the State's waters, resulting in serious pollution and contaminating fish. This contamination is significant. For example, over 2/3 of the St. Marys River is posted with fish consumption advisories from contamination by mercury. Not only that, the CO2 emitted from the burning of coal is a significant greenhouse gas, contributing to global warming, something Georgia should be exquisitely cognizant of, given it is a coastal state. Finally, permitting a coal-fired plant will enable mountaintop removal to obtain coal. Even though this heinous practice does not occur in our state, its use obliterates</p>
10/27/09 11:19 AM	glenn	newsome	736 forsyth st		monticello	GA	31064	7064682197	gnewsome@bellsouth.net	<p>Dear EPD: Please DO NOT APPROVE the application for Plant Washington. My family has lived in Wash Co for 6 generations. Mostly farmers. The use of millions of gallons of water will deplete the aquifer. Water levels in ponds on property I own are down this year even with all the rain. We must think about the future for our children. Wash Co already has one of the highest rates of cancer in GA. The air is bad now - a coal plant will make it much worse. Increased mercury in the water will hurt young children. We must take care of God's creation. Please DO NOT approve Plant Wash. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Glenn Newsome</p>
10/27/09 11:37 AM	nancy	newsome	736 forsyth st		monticello	GA	31064	7064682197	rheneyfarm6@bellsouth.net	<p>Please DO NOT approve Plant Washington. I was raised on a dairy farm in Wash Co. This plant would deplete the water in our aquifer. Water levels on our farm are down now. Mercury in the air and water will harm everyone especially young children. The air in Wash Co already has high pollution due to existing coal plants and kaolin plants. Plant Wash will make the pollution even greater. Nancy Rheney Newsome</p>

10/27/09 12:11 PM	Jim	Abbot	946 Waverly Way NE		Atlanta	GA	30307		404-523-5298	404-281-0638	abbotjim@gmail.com	I oppose the permitting of Plant Washington. (1) The demand for the energy produced by this plant is based on dubious assumptions about population growth and energy use. (2) You know for a fact and should act on the knowledge that there is insufficient water for this purpose in the Oconee River and in the aquifer system underlying the plant. By permitting this plant, you will "lock in" a low priority use of water and put at risk for the future local drinking water supplies. (3) The nearby Ogeechee River is polluted with methylmercury. Plant Washington's BEST estimate is that it will put well over 100 pounds of mercury into the air each year. You have a statutory duty to regulate pollutants and to protect human health. The EMCs submitting this proposal have one dubious argument in favor of this plant: if the plant is not built, energy costs for consumers will rise. Your job is not to supply cheap energy to Atlanta. Your duty is to submit this proposal to rigorous scrutiny for the impact it will have on our natural
10/27/09 12:15 PM	Valda	Tanner	2525 Mayview RD		Sandersville	GA	31082		478-552-1437	478-232-9456	vianers@bellsouth.net	I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF PLANT WASHINGTON BEING BUILT. WE NEED TO PROTECT OUR AIR AND CONSERVE OUR WATER!
10/27/09 12:18 PM	neill	herring	257 S Elm St		Jesup	GA	31546		912 427 0657		neilherring@earthlink.net	During initial promotion of the coal power plant in Washington Co. mention was made of using wastewater from the kaolin mining and processing industry for cooling water for the plant. What happened to that proposal? This plant's cooling water requirements are excessive for the water resource in the area. The Oconee and Ogeechee Rivers both need all the flow they can capture, and the groundwater systems in the area are at the upper ends of their gradients, meaning that recharge will come slowly, and areas immediately downgradient will experience areal shortages during periods when the power plant's wells are recharging.
10/27/09 12:55 PM	Phil	Waldrop	Georgia Southern Univ	Box 8047	Statesboro	GA	30460-3047				pwaldrop@georgiasouthern.edu	Please ensure that the permits for the new coal-fired plant at Sandersville require the best available technology for pollution control. Thank you.

10/27/09 01:40 PM	Roy	Hubbard	1155 Bent Tree Way		Richmond Hill	GA		31324		912 727-3177	912 657-3929	2skippertub5@comcast.net	With current levels of mercury poisoning already over the EPA limits, it is unacceptable to consider permitting any source of additional contamination such as the Washington County coal fired power plant. We must stop making Georgia a dumping ground for other people's garbage, i.e. Plastic from North Carolina and we must stop polluting the air and water of the State to satisfy the insatiable appetite of the uncontrolled growth in the Atlanta area. The concept being promoted that such a plant is going to bring prosperity to that depressed area of the state is simply not true. The labor force there is not equipped to work in a highly technical, automated facility. Plants of that size normally employ a handful of skilled workers and management. Tell the truth to the people of Washington County. They are going to get the pollution, not the jobs.
10/27/09 03:15 PM	Paula	Jacobs	2664 White Hall Rd.		Green Pond	SC		29446		843-844-8433		rlj@lowcountry.com	I live in Colliston Co., SC but intend to retire in a few years and move back to Jefferson Co., Ga. where our 470 acre family farm is located. South Carolina residents have been fighting this ticking time bomb of arsenic, mercury, lead, etc. and now it has moved its proposal to Ga. But SC is left with the old coal fired power plants and the damage they have done. Please go on line and look under " utility toxins or Canadys coal ash" and read from our Charleston news paper: www.postandcourier.com
10/27/09 03:15 PM	Charles	Lewis	1186 Duffers Lane		Louisville	GA		30434		478 625-1030	478 625-1030	cslewis1@bellsouth.net	I am adamantly opposed to the coal plant proposed for Washington County, GA due to negative environmental impact. Please do not allow greed to destroy the environment we leave to our grandchildren. Charles Lewis

(645)

From: earle taylor <dretishome@yahoo.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
CC: <etishome88@hotmail.com>, kat <ellymay521@yahoo.com>, <nitenita@gmail.co...
Date: 10/27/2009 4:47 PM
Subject: new coal powered plant in Washington county

To all concerned, especially state regulators of Georgia and concerned citizens,

This is a letter from a conservative who supports conserving the environment.

This is a letter from a concerned physician and college chemistry major who actually read the permits and to my alarm the allow much , much pollution and ground contamination in a relatively close local area.....

For example, per Ground water permit #Ga 0039035 part 1 page 10/ of 22

A Management Request

1 b "dischargers shall notify the Division.... or any toxic pollutant if that discharge will exceed

(i) 100 pica grams/l (ii) 5

times the max concentration rported .. (iii) and " (or??)

" 200 pica grams /l " (of specific pollutants, such as) acrolein, acrylnitrile, 500pica g/l dinitrophenol "
 (and other probably deadly chemicals,,)

then on to page 17/22 ... "500 pg/l (ii) ten times the maximum concentration for" said pollutants.....
 still page 17/22 B." Special Request

#4. " quantity of pollutants discharged effluent

characteristics..

Total solids equal 30mg/l up to max per 24 h of 100 mg/l "

Now lets do the math.... which I do not see done by any one in the permits nor in the

Green peoples complaints..... At the prodigious amount of 13 to 16 million gallons of water per day/24 h that would be 2.4 million pounds of silt and solids up to a MAX of 80 million pounds of solids/silt, etc. (ya think a few pounds of toxins could hide in the solid effluent,,,,, I do.....) (as a chemistry major, it is not hard to make certain compounds, but to make them pure, ie clean them out of the water to a clean non-toxic standard is costly and difficult.) (therefore , pick the perfect storm, bad economy, need for jobs, plant closings, very powerful and wealthy business people, and the "need for more power") (oops, the permit does not address the

sale of 50% of Macon coal power electricity to Florida)

Let us continue, if we only take the second of several more pollutants; still page 17

"Total grease and oil allowed 15 to 30 mg/l "

Now let us do the math ;;; $15 \times 4 = 60$ to 120 mg per imperial gallon (slight larger gallon,)now multiply times 13 to 16 MILLION. gallons (of heck lets round out to only 10 million.....) equal $60 \times 10,000,000$ mg to twice that of grease.....

(maybe , the people that pollute don't want us to convert to metric for a reason?)

No problem,,, we move the decimal point by three and viola... 600,000 kg of grease and oil DAILY which

is a lot of grease > 1.2 million pounds up to 2.4 MILLION Pounds of grease and OIL DAILY//////// No way this county can handle that without catatropic results..... (Notice , i did not waste my time on green house gases as that is shared globally and i do not share all the typical Green dogmas.....) Let us focus on the proven poisons admittedly being dispensed..... and deny this permit

Also, i saw now procedure in place for penalties.....only the ambiguous comment that "civil and criminal penalties " could be levied..... sounds like big money and power to me..... Earl Taylor,MD

647

From: earle taylor <dretishome@yahoo.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
CC: <etishome88@hotmail.com>, <nitenita@gmail.com>, <info@ocrk.org>, <steve....>
Date: 10/27/2009 5:33 PM
Subject: correction of math

i just reviewed the math in my note to youi should have moved the decimal point 6 places for mg to grams then kg..... i am out of practice (long time since college problems)

anyway the figure are correct for the time period of between 2 to 3 years which is still unacceptable to me as a health promoter in this locale.....et, earl taylor, md

correct daily figures would be in thousands of pounds ie

2400 pound to 8000 pound daily "solids"

1200 to 2500 pounds of grease and oil DAILY (still a lot) (will forward note)

653

From: "Golden, Paula" <Paula.Golden@house.ga.gov>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/28/2009 9:24 AM
Subject: Comments from Rep. Stephanie Stuckey Benfield
Attachments: COMMENTS1.doc

Please see the attached comments from Rep. Benfield.

Paula Golden

Administrative Assistant

to Representatives Stephanie Benfield,

Elly Dobbs, Carl Epps, Bob Hanner,

Michele Henson, Sistie Hudson,

Barbara Reese, Jay Shaw, & Don Wix

(404) 656-7859



House of Representatives

STEPHANIE STUCKEY BENFIELD
REPRESENTATIVE, DISTRICT 85
940 ARTWOOD ROAD
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30307
(404) 377-7014
E-MAIL: stuckey@mindspring.com
ENVIRONMENT

COVERDELL LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 512
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334
(404) 656-7859
(404) 656-0250 (FAX)

STANDING
COMMITTEES:

BANKS & BANKING
JUDICIARY – NON – CIVIL
NATURAL RESOURCES &

CODE REVISION

I write concerning Plant Washington, a proposed coal-fired plant that uses outdated technology and looms on the horizon as a white elephant, the last of its kind. Today, the energy industry is changing dramatically and federal laws are also undergoing a sea-change. In this charged atmosphere it behooves us to take our time to forestall making a hasty decision that puts people's health and lives in jeopardy for years to come.

Of grave concern is that we Georgians find ourselves generating electricity for other states or shipping it across our state all the while consuming precious airsheds and watersheds, and depositing waste from the coal combustion process onto our land. Surely this makes little sense and brings us slim or no broad economic returns when the degradation of these resources is computed. To prevent our beautiful state from becoming the location of first resort for dirty energy, we need comprehensive oversight of these types of energy issues and environmental issues.

Renewable energy is here and now, and it can jump-start our economy quickly. Solar energy firms are growing at leaps and bounds and last week, within the first minutes of the \$4 million rebated offered by the state for solar installations, over \$14 million in projects had applied. This is the kind of problem that we want to have and this is the direction and these are the kinds of incentives that are more cost effective. The question must be asked: When will EPD and Power4Georgians be able to show us an operating agreement that will provide assurances that the \$2 billion investment is worth the 120 operational jobs rather than investing in a biomass plant where the jobs generations would be more in line with the recent plant in Brantley where \$130 million generated 70 jobs?

I urge you to apply great scrutiny to a project that makes no sense today, nor will it make sense 25 years from now when our children will be saddled to another 25 years of uncontrollable pollution.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Stuckey Benfield

660

From: Jeffrey Taylor <xulai75@gmail.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 4:34 PM
Subject: Project Washington
Attachments: plantwashington.doc

Please find attached my comments regarding the proposed Plant Washington.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Thanks.

October 27, 2009

Jeffrey L. Taylor
38 N Moore Street, #6
New York, NY 10013

Plant Washington Comments
Environmental Protection Division
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive
Suite 1152 – East Tower
Atlanta, GA 30334

Dear Dr. Couch and Georgia EPD Officials:

I am writing to express my concerns with respect to the proposed Plant Washington Project. There appears to be a substantive disconnect between the negative externalities that will be imposed upon the local populace and environment and the economic justification for the proposed project. On the one hand the negative impact of the pollution on local environment and the citizens of Washington County are nearly certain and yet, on the other hand, the economic benefits of proposed project appear to be speculative at best and seem to be based on significantly flawed assumptions. On this basis, I urge to you to reconsider the issuance of permits for the proposed project.

Based on the numerous scientific data currently available which clearly demonstrate the significant health risks of coal-fired power plants, it is difficult to imagine a rational basis for permitting this poorly conceived project to proceed. Plant Washington could emit up to 6.2 million tons of carbon dioxide and 106 pounds of mercury, along with other unsavory substances like nitrous oxide, sulfur oxides, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. Numerous studies have decisively demonstrated that coal fired power plants, through the release of these pollutants, substantially increase the risks for cardiovascular disorders. Already in Georgia, pollution from power plants causes over 26,000 asthma attacks, 1,300 heart attacks, and 100 deaths from lung cancer every year (Medical Association of Georgia). A recent study in the National Academy of Sciences states that burning fossil fuels costs the United States economy over \$120 billion a year in health costs. This staggering number is largely due to the 20,000 premature deaths that occur every year from the air pollution generated by fossil fuels.

According to the Health Department of Georgia, over 25% of the adult population of Georgia is obese and about 17% of Georgia's children are obese. These numbers by themselves portend a serious health crises in the great state of Georgia, however, compounding this crisis with additional air pollution to the environment will only further exacerbate the current risk factors for cardiovascular disorders among Georgia's population.

Further, the Plant Washington project will also place Georgia's water supply at risk. The proposed project, if it proceeds, will pull 16 million gallons of water every day from the Oconee River. The project also proposes to draw from the aquifer which is already overdrawn and has dropped 47 feet in the past 40 years. Local farms and other businesses as well as the citizens of Washington County depend on these already overtaxed resources for their survival. In the face of such a voracious demand for scarce water resources, one cannot help but come to the conclusion that the citizens and economy of Washington County will suffer as a result.

Compounding the negative externalities of air pollution and over-use of scarce water resources is the 106 pounds of mercury, a known neurotoxin. This pollutant will build up in the muscle tissue of local fish and wildlife, rendering them unsafe to eat.

Juxtaposed with these material health and environmental concerns are significant questions regarding the economic feasibility of the proposed project. Cobb EMC has acknowledged that the cost analysis for the proposed project is based on antiquated information that significantly underestimates the project's cost structure. Further, the cost analysis did not include any costs relating to carbon dioxide mitigation measures and essentially ignores the likelihood of future federal emissions regulation. Consequently, the costs per kilowatt of the proposed project is likely significantly understated. Since the initiation of the project, 4 of the 10 initial EMC's have dropped the proposed project, calling the proposed project "not feasible".

Due to the environmental health concerns associated with coal-fired power plants, a coal-fired power plant is not the answer to the nation's energy crisis. As citizens, we have a civic duty to preserve the our planet for future generations. The health and environmental risks of this plant are too severe to proceed – particularly in light of the lack of a convincing economic case for the proposed project. Again, I urge you to reconsider the permits issued for this plant.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffrey L. Taylor, Esq.

676

From: "Mark Riner" <m.riner@washingtonemc.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 11:33 AM
Subject: Correction to my earlier email
Attachments: Giant Desert Solar Farm.doc; How the Atmospheric Sun Shade Could Work.doc

Dear EPD,

I said they were looking to build on 84,000 acres, but in fact the article states ~8200. Please read these articles and assure me that you will use logic and just common sense about Plant Washington. It is the environmentalists that wish they could have it both ways and they simply have no solution! Please issue the permit for Plant Washington so we can get on with our lives.

I hope when it comes to putting a stop to things that simply do not make sense, the EPD will be on the lookout for things such as described in these articles.

Sincerely,
Mark G Riner
Find me: m.riner@washingtonemc.com
Tele: 478-552-2577 x829
Cell: 478-232-0052

><(((°>`·.□□·□·.□·.□·...□><(((°>
·□·.□·, . . □·. . >(((°>

The New York Times

Green Inc.

Energy, the Environment and the Bottom Line

August 5, 2009, 12:19 pm

Battle Brewing Over Giant Desert Solar Farm

By Todd Woody

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Environmental groups are worried that a massive solar project in the Mojave will threaten protected wildlife, like this fringe-toed lizard.

Tessera Solar plans to plant 34,000 solar dishes — each one 40 feet high and 38 feet wide — on 8,230 acres of the Mojave Desert in Southern California.

Although the lengthy licensing process for the Calico solar farm remains in the early stages, several environmental groups are already raising red flags about the massive project's impact on such protected wildlife as the desert tortoise, the Mojave fringe-toed lizard and Nelson's bighorn sheep.

Calico is one of dozens of industrial-scale solar farms planned for the Southwest that have divided environmentalists over the need to promote renewable energy while protecting fragile desert ecosystems.

But the sheer size of the Calico project, as well as its location next to federal conservation areas, is drawing scrutiny from grassroots green activists and national organizations like the Defenders of Wildlife.

The solar farm would generate 850 megawatts of electricity for Southern California Edison.

Also jumping into the fray is a well-funded labor group that is pressing solar developers to employ union workers, and the Wildlands Conservancy, a Southern California non-profit that supports a proposal by Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democrat of California, to ban renewable energy development on hundreds of thousands of acres of the Mojave adjacent to Calico.

Most of the land for the solar farm would be leased from the federal government.

"Our feeling is the utility-scale project should first be sited on disturbed land, public or private, instead of pristine lands," April Sall, the conservation director for the Wildlands Conservancy, told California Energy Commission staff at a recent hearing on the Calico project. "There are several endangered species, plant and animal, that would be affected by this project," Ms. Sall said, adding that the "the side-blotched lizard" might also be affected.

The labor group, called California Unions for Reliable Energy, sent an attorney and biologist to testify at the hearing. The group has come under fire for inundating developers who decline to sign labor agreements with demands that they conduct scores of costly environmental studies on their solar projects.

California Unions for Reliable Energy has taken a particularly aggressive stance in the Calico case, dispatching its own biologist to investigate the project site. At the hearing, the biologist, Scott Cashen, accused Tessera Solar of providing scientifically invalid data in its license application as well as underestimating the solar farm's consequences for wildlife.

"Our concerns basically revolve around the lack of any sort of scientific rigor that was devoted to establishing base line conditions at the site," Mr. Cashen said.

Sean Gallagher, Tessera Solar's vice president for market strategy and regulatory affairs, said in an interview on Tuesday that the company has followed regulators' scientific protocols in preparing its license application.

Mr. Gallagher said he has been in discussions with the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club and other environmental groups and expects Tessera Solar will be able to address their wildlife concerns.

"I'm not surprised there's a lot of interest from environmentalists given the size of the project, but I don't expect this to turn into a big fight," Mr. Gallagher said.

Tessera Solar, which is based in Houston, stresses that its SunCatcher solar dish is more environmentally friendly than other solar thermal technologies, consuming less water and requiring no grading of the desert.

And while the company acknowledged in its license application that the project would have "significant" impact on the desert tortoise and other plant and animal species, it also concluded that measures taken to minimize its environmental impact means that Calico "would not substantially affect, reduce the number of, or restrict the range of unique, rare, or endangered species of animal or plant, or the habitat of these species."

How the Atmospheric Sun Shade Could Work

by John Fuller

Flying discs might be able to form a large cloud between the Earth and the sun to block sunlight, but they'd also reduce solar power generation at the same time.

Aerosols aren't the only possible theory for an atmospheric sun shade. The most recent method for giving the Earth a little rest from the sun's rays, proposed by Roger Angel at the University of Arizona, involves sending trillions of lightweight, transparent discs out into space where they could block some incoming radiation.

The discs would act like small spaceships hovering about one million miles (1,609,344 kilometers) above the Earth's atmosphere in one big cloud. The long line of discs would have a diameter of about half the Earth's (which is about 7,900 miles, or 12,700 kilometers) and be 10 times longer. Angel designed the lightweight flyers to be made of a transparent film, measure about 23.6 inches (60 centimeters) in diameter and covered with tiny holes.

The end result would be that the discs could direct as much as 10 percent of the sun's light passing through the cloud away from the Earth. This could reduce sunlight by 2 percent over the surface of the entire planet, cooling things down significantly. The lighter weight of the discs provides an advantage over the previously-mentioned glass shield theory because getting them outside the Earth's atmosphere wouldn't require quite as much effort. **In fact, hydroelectric power could be used to power electromagnetic launchers, which Angel suggests firing every five minutes for a duration of 10 years in order to send off an acceptable number of flyers. The price tag for the project is anything but tiny -- *the sunshade flyers might cost several trillion dollars*, or about \$100 billion every year, but Angel believes the benefits of his sun shade system would last for about 50 years.**

Although scientists have been speculating for decades about how an atmospheric sun shade could work, many skeptics have pointed out that the scheme won't work at all or at least that it won't help other aspects of power generation. The unfortunate side effect of shading the Earth is the unintentional reduction of peak solar power productivity. An atmospheric sun shade, whether it involves scattering particles into the air or sending out millions of thin flying discs, could deflect as much as 20 percent of solar power from power producing plants.

If you'd like to find out more about the atmospheric sun shade or other related topics, follow the links on the next page.

(691)

From: <SBOOHER@aol.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 12:35 PM
Subject: Public Commnet on permitting a NEW Coal Buring Power Plant in Washington County

EPD

I am very concerned about another Coal Burning Power plant being built in Georgia.
Why is EPD not recommending that the Washington County plan be fueled by Natural Gas?

1. With Southern Company buying Mountain Top Removal Coal from Appalachia and EPA beginning to enforce Federal Law, that will reduce and eventually stop this method of obtaining coal. Thus Southern Company may well look to Power River, Wyoming for its future coal. It would appear that Natural Gas would be a much cleaner and cheaper fuel for a new Power Plant. A Natural Gas Power Plant should be the source of fuel all of Georgia Power Plants should be converting to use.

2. Current Appalachia coal has polluted and is continuing to pollute Georgia river and especially black water coastal rivers to the point the citizens cannot swim in them or eat the fish they catch. I am told Power River Coal has a much higher (I have heard four times greater) mercury content. I cannot believe EPD is going to permit a new Coal Burning Power plant, especially one that will be releasing much higher mercury levels than even our existing Coal Burning plants.

3. As to the Augusta area, the benefit we are about to achieve by Olin Chemical converting to a non-mercury process will be lost with Power River Coal being burned South West of Augusta in a new Coal Burning Power Plant.

Sam Booher
4387 Roswell Dr
Augusta, GA 30907

(692)

From: <SBOOHER@aol.com>
To: <epdcomments@dnr.state.ga.us>
Date: 10/27/2009 8:09 PM
Subject: Public Commnet for Washington Coal Power Plant

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released a report today detailing the impacts of coal ash and smokestack scrubber sludge, toxic byproducts of burning coal, on water quality across the country. The report shows that coal power plants are discharging huge amounts of toxic pollution including arsenic, mercury, and selenium into rivers, streams, and groundwater across the country, contaminating wells, killing wildlife, and risking lives.

EPA's report concludes that an "increasing amount of evidence indicates that the characteristics of coal combustion wastewater have the potential to impact human health and the environment." The report documents decades of damage, ranging from a single spill which wiped out 200,000 fish to reports of well water laced with selenium, which can cause infertility.

The report comes after data collected earlier this year by the EPA found that problems with coal ash, including aging dams, inadequately lined ponds and lax safety enforcements, were much more widespread than previously thought. The data was released only after citizens submitted a Freedom of Information Act request.

Sam Booher
4387 Roswell Drive
Augusta, GA 30907

698

From: Thomas Smith
To: Prabhu, Purva
CC: Cornwell, Eric; Shaikh, Furqan
Date: 10/27/2009 1:29 PM
Subject: Fwd: questions concerning Plant Washington

Purva - I thought I was done receiving these comments. Maybe they'll stop soon.

In the meantime, here's another comment on Plant Washington.

Thanks.

Thomas Smith
Public Affairs Coordinator
Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Environmental Protection Division
Air Protection Branch
4244 International Parkway
Atlanta Tradeport, Suite 136
Atlanta, Georgia 30354
404-362-2790
404-362-6405 - fax

>>> Lyle Lansdell <lyle.lansdell@gmail.com> 10/27/09 1:16 PM >>>

Mr. Smith,

Please add the following questions to those that will be addressed by the EPD following the Plant Washington hearing. If the EPD does not have some of the answers, please refer the public to a source that will have the answers.

Please reply to let me know that you received this message.

- * What percentage of electric power generated in the state of Georgia is exported to other states? One speaker on October 20th who lives near Plant Scherer stated that most of the power generated there goes to Florida. The Santee Cooper Plant in South Carolina (which the Washington County Chamber of Commerce toured as an example of a plan that PW could emulate) ditched plans for a new coal-fired operation when they discovered they could buy power for less money than it would cost to build a new coal plant.
- * Could the consortium of EMCs (Power4Georgians) purchase power for less money than the \$2.1 billion cost of Plant Washington?
- * Is the life expectancy of Plant Washington 30 years or 50 years? Different sources have reported both these lengths of time.

I asked most of the following are questions verbally at the October 20th hearing, but will repeat here so that the EPD will be sure to answer:

ash pile-

- * What is the estimated volume of the dry ash pile that will accumulate over the life of the plant?
- * What are the estimated weights of arsenic and mercury (to serve as

examples of numerous heavy metals) that will accumulate over the life of the plant?

- * What is the destination of the water that will repeatedly wash the ash pile?
- * What is the estimated lifespan of the lining under the ash pile?
- * What is the actual distance from the ash pile to Williamson Swamp Creek?

new ash pile question -

- * There was a plan presented earlier than Oct 6th to sell the ash for construction materials. Was this plan abandoned?

jobs-

- * What percentage of the projected jobs both during construction and operation are estimated to fall to people who live in Washington County?
- * If the plant is approved and building proceeds, how long a time will there be until construction jobs become available, and until long-term jobs are available?

new job question-

- * When Power4Georgians says there will be 1400 construction jobs, it gives the impression that at any one time, there will be 1400 people working at the site. Is it true that the 1400 jobs are added over 5 years of construction and that during a given year the people working at the site will be more like $1400/5$, or about 280? If this is true, this should be made clear to the citizens of Washington County.

Thank you,
Lyle Lansdell