

**Howe, J.**  
**Clark County, KY**  
**Page 1 of 3**

FW: comment on KY Pioneer IGCC draft EIS

Page 1 of 1

**Itani, Maher -- Tt, Inc.**

**From:** Preston, John S LRH  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2002 1:22 PM  
**To:** Maher Itani (maher.itani@tetratech.com)  
**Cc:** Roy Spears (rspear@netl.doe.gov)  
**Subject:** FW: comment on KY Pioneer IGCC draft EIS

Maher: Below is a "phone-in" comment Lloyd forwarded to me. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----  
From: Lloyd Lorenzi [mailto:Lloyd.Lorenzi@NETL.DOE.GOV]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2002 11:48 AM  
To: Preston, John S; Roy Spears  
Subject: comment on KY Pioneer IGCC draft EIS

Commenter - J. Howe  
Residence - Clark County, KY  
Tele - 859-842-3914  
Date - 23 January 2002  
Time - ~10:00 am  
Method - toll-free number

Comments:

1. "called to protest the waste-to-energy project at the Trapp site"
2. concerned about emissions of metals and carbon dioxide, and health effects of air emissions
3. "opposed to burning trash from outside sources in New York and New Jersey - if they need to get rid of their trash, the plant should be built there."
4. "opposed to burning trash, even if the trash is from Kentucky"
5. the stacks would create a visibility issue
6. water usage from the Kentucky river is a concern
7. he would be interested in having DOE or the participants schedule another public meeting. his friends in Trapp are also concerned, and he believes that more than 50 people would attend a future meeting 8. he requested direct notification if another meeting is scheduled, and he communicated no other requests

Background:

Mr Howe's residence is located about 5 miles from the proposed project site, and he lived there for the past 7 years. He works as a nurse in Lexington, has 4 children, and moved to Clark County from out of state for, among other reasons, relocation away from areas of high pollution. He did not attend either of the public meetings sponsored by DOE or any other participant- or permit-related meetings on the project. He was not aware of the prior meetings, and he does not receive the local (Winchester) newspaper. He also was not aware of plans for the proposed project, only recently learned about the proposed project from a friend, and he indicated that news is substantially communicated by "word-of-mouth."

**Comment No. 1**  
Comment noted.

**Issue Code: 16**

**Comment No. 2**

**Issue Code: 06**

Comment noted. Heavy metal emissions from the proposed project are identified in Chapter 5, Table 5.7-2, of the EIS. These emissions would average 4.68 metric tons (5.16 tons) per year. The estimated maximum lifetime cancer risks associated with exposure to these emissions from the proposed project are presented in Table 5.7-4. As noted in the EIS, the proposed project would produce about 1.45 million metric tons (1.6 million tons) of greenhouse gas emissions per year (mostly carbon dioxide). This would be about 25 percent less than the amount produced by a comparable natural gas fueled power plant. Additional discussion of metal deposition issues has been added to Chapter 5, Section 5.7.4, for the Final EIS.

**Comment No. 3**

**Issue Code: 11**

Incremental ambient air quality impacts from the proposed project would be a very small fraction of the relevant federal and state ambient air quality standards (less than 1 percent for gaseous pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and carbon monoxide and less than 4 percent of the federal 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standard). Total heavy metal deposition in areas downwind of the project would be much less than 1.1 kilogram per hectare (1 pound per acre) accumulated over 20 years. The maximum air pollutant increase associated with emissions from the proposed project would have no significant short- or long-term air quality impacts and the health risks are expected to be minor.

| 1/16  
| 2/06, 3/11  
| 4/16  
| 5/22  
| 6/04  
| 7/07  
| 8/21

Howe, J.  
Clark County, KY  
Page 2 of 3

**Comment No. 4**

**Issue Code: 16**

Because of DOE's limited role of providing cost-shared funding for the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project, alternative sites were not considered. KPE selected the existing J.K. Smith Site because the costs would be much higher and the environmental impacts would likely be greater if an undisturbed area was chosen. Also, the relatively small amounts and generally widely dispersed nature of MSW in Kentucky does not economically support exclusive utilization of Kentucky-generated MSW to produce RDF supplies, which makes it necessary to import RDF. Importing RDF from a densely populated metropolitan area is more economically viable in order to supply the necessary amount of RDF required to operate the plant.

**Comment No. 5**

**Issue Code: 22**

Comment noted.

**Comment No. 6**

**Issue Code: 04**

Comment noted. Impacts to the aesthetic and scenic environment of the project area are presented in Section 5.5, Aesthetic and Scenic Resources, of the EIS.

**Comment No. 7**

**Issue Code: 07**

The cumulative effects of withdrawals from the Kentucky River by power plants have been discussed by the Kentucky Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet in their cumulative assessment report (KNREPC 2001) addressed in Section 5.14, Cumulative Impacts, of the EIS. The report acknowledges that because many of Kentucky's power plants are exempt from water withdrawal requirements, the Cabinet does not have an accurate inventory of the volume of water being removed each day by the existing power plants. However, the Cabinet is able to limit withdrawals from permitted sources during periods of abnormally low flow. Although the proposed plant would not be a permitted withdrawal source, KPE has stated that they would cease water withdrawals if requested to by the state.

Howe, J.  
Clark County, KY  
Page 3 of 3

**Comment No. 8**

**Issue Code: 21**

NEPA requires that one public hearing be held during the public comment period. Based on public input during the scoping period, DOE decided to hold two public hearings during the public comment period, one in Lexington and another in Trapp, Kentucky. The meeting in Lexington was included as a result of the public input. All requirements in state and federal laws, rules, and regulations regarding public hearings were satisfied and surpassed. DOE will consider all public comments before issuing the ROD. The ROD will be issued no sooner than 30 days after the Final EIS is distributed and a notice of its availability is issued.