

Shoebrooks, Jeff and Robin
Lexington, KY
Page 5 of 10



Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification
Combined Cycle Demonstration Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory

Written Comment Form
Must be received by January 4, 2002.

Page 5 of 10

high potential, but still high risks. Technologies to
move out of the lab and pilot scale development and into
major engineering tests as a precursor to commercial
use. Also stated "Each project is intended as a first
of its kind test of different gasifiers, cleanup systems
and applications". Can the release of CO₂, methane, nitrous
oxide, and mercury not have local environmental as
well as global impacts? This all seems a bit scary
to me and my family living in close proximity
to such "high risk, tests". Can we assume no
adverse effects will affect the people and wildlife
surrounding this area?

Does anyone, including governor Patton think
that by "relocating" this plant from Illinois
this is really a good move for the people of Kentucky?

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
3610 Collins Ferry Road
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
(304) 285-4403

Comment No. 6

Issue Code: 11

No impacts to health and safety of the general public would be expected from the operation of the proposed facility. Wastes generated at the plant would be managed in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. Air and wastewater permits would limit these emissions to protect the public health and safety as well as the environment.

The gasification process would produce a small amount of wastewater containing primarily dissolved salts. Emissions would be primarily from the CT engines and cooling towers (see Table 5.7.3 of the EIS). Dispersion modeling conducted for the PSD/Title V Permit application covered an area about 12 kilometers (7.5 miles) from the project site, including the area of maximum air quality impact. 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 PM₁₀ 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.

5/06
(cont.)

6/11

7/08

8/22

Therefore, the overall increase in air emissions due to operation of the plant would be very low and present little risk to human health and the environment. Possible public health effects that could occur as a result of fire or a natural gas explosion would be minimized through basic facility design considerations.

Shoebrooks, Jeff and Robin
Lexington, KY
Page 6 of 10



Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification
Combined Cycle Demonstration Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory

Written Comment Form
Must be received by January 4, 2002.

Page 6 of 10

*...I think not! Not only are you planning on
contaminating our area with pollutants but the
electricity is planned for use outside of Kentucky.
No local benefit will be derived from this
endeavor. Is the bottom line money for the
state? Surely there are alternatives for relocating
to a less populated area. As a registered
Republican who helped vote Mr. Bush into office,
I am behind the president in finding new fuel
technologies but I cannot back this project as
it is planned. Why bring it out of state first
to Kentucky? Don't we have our own to get rid of?
Since I am playing catch up to these developments
I will be pursuing every possible action with
my fellow citizens, friends, neighbors, and family to
Please use other side if more space is needed*

9/16

8/22
(cont.)

10/16

Comment No. 7

Issue Code: 08

Based on the impacts analysis in the Draft EIS, Sections 5.7 through 5.9, and 5.12 and 5.13, potentially adverse impacts to wildlife would be minimized or avoided through the project design, implementation of various management plans, and compliance with permit conditions. By design, there would be no discharges into the groundwater and surface water discharges would be regulated by KPDES permit. Prior to surface discharge, pollutant loads on the river would be examined and discharge limits established to protect water quality. An SPCC plan would be in place prior to operation. This plan would set forth a series of response activities that would reduce or avoid potential impacts to groundwater and surface water during a spill event. The terms and conditions set forth in Air Quality Permit Number V-00-049 specify operational limitations and conditions, including monitoring and testing requirements that regulate the emission of air contaminants. The air permit is based on a high level of sulfur removal and recovery from the syngas stream prior to its use. The air permit application included an assessment of air toxics and a screening evaluation of risk from possible stack emission constituents. The Kentucky Department of Air Quality determined that this risk was insignificant and that no further evaluation was required. While this evaluation is specific to human health concerns, it is an additional indicator for a low probability of adverse impacts to wildlife. Additionally, a component of the air quality permit includes a Phase II Acid Rain Permit. Adherence with permit conditions would limit air pollutant emissions in the local area and reduce the likelihood of adverse impacts to both plants and animals. Prior to plant operation, the effluent temperature of discharges into the Kentucky River would also be established and regulated to minimize impacts to the aquatic organisms.

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
3610 Collins Ferry Road
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
(304) 285-4403

Shoebrooks, Jeff and Robin
Lexington, KY
Page 7 of 10



Kentucky Pioneer Integrated Gasification
Combined Cycle Demonstration Project
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory

Written Comment Form
Must be received by January 4, 2002.

Page 7 of 10

oppose this development
I appreciate your time and willingness to
listen to our concerns. Hopefully you and your
colleagues will see the human side to this
and the people whose lives will be affected.
I'm sure you could not want this in your
backyard. Also, I don't think President Bush
would like this located within miles of his
Texas ranch.

From me and my family, please reconsider
before proceeding

Sincerely,

Jeff Shoebrooks

JEFF ROBIN SHOEBROOKS
365 Old Buckenille Rd.
Windsor, KY 40391

Please use other side if more space is needed.

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
U.S. Department of Energy
National Energy Technology Laboratory
3610 Collins Ferry Road
Morgantown, WV 26507-0880

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Roy Spears
(304) 285-4403

Comment No. 8

Issue Code: 22

Comment noted. The benefits associated with the proposed project are increased tax revenues for the State of Kentucky and additional jobs.

Comment No. 9

Issue Code: 16

The purpose of this EIS is to evaluate public and environmental impacts caused by the proposed project. DOE will consider the information provided in the EIS and public comments in this decision process. Chapter 2 discusses EKPC's 1998 Power Requirements Study which indicates that the electrical load for the region is expected to increase by 3.0 percent per year through 2017. Net winter peak demand is expected to increase by 3.3 percent per year and net summer peak demand is expected to increase by 3.0 percent per year. Peak demand is expected to increase from 2,031 MW in 1998 to 2,394 MW in 2003 and 3,478 MW in 2015. Based on this load growth, EKPC will need additional power supply resources of 625 MW in 2003. The need is further shown by EKPC's plans to construct four new CT electric generating units to provide peaking service alongside their three existing peaker CTs at the J.K. Smith Site. The power generated by the project will be used to support Kentucky's energy needs. Because of DOE's limited role of providing cost-shared funding for the proposed Kentucky Pioneer IGCC Demonstration Project, alternative sites were not considered.

8/22
(cont.)

1/16
(cont.)

Comment No. 10

Issue Code: 16

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. 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.

Shoebrooks, Jeff and Robin
Lexington, KY
Page 8 of 10

Wildlife of 366 Old Ruckerville Road *Page 8 of 10*

BIRDS (not at feeders)	92 species	Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (4-27) (4-23) (nest)
Great Blue Heron		Eastern Bluebird
Green Heron (4-22) (4-17)		American Robin (nest)
Turkey Vulture		Gray Catbird
Black Vulture (5-21)		Northern Mockingbird
Canada Goose		Brown Thrasher
Wood Duck		European Starling (nest)
Osprey (5-21)		Cedar Waxwing
Sharp-shinned Hawk		Red-eyed Vireo (5-10)
Red-tailed Hawk		White-eyed Vireo (4-25)
American Kestrel		Tennessee Warbler
Wild Turkey		[REDACTED]
Northern Bobwhite		Black-throated Green Warbler
Killdeer		Magnolia Warbler
Solitary Sandpiper (4-23)		Black-and-white Warbler (4-27)
American Woodcock (2-25)		Palm Warbler (4-29) (5-3)
[REDACTED]		Prairie Warbler (4-25) (5-3)
Great Horned Owl		Yellow Warbler (5-10) (5-3)
Eastern Screech-Owl		Blackpoll Warbler (5-10)
Yellow-billed Cuckoo (5-29)(5-6)		Morning Warbler (10-4)
Black-billed Cuckoo (5-20)		Common Yellowthroat (4-27) (4-23)
Common Nighthawk (5-5)		Yellow-breasted Chat (5-7) (5-1)
Chimney Swift (4-30) (4-27)		[REDACTED]
Ruby-throated Hummingbird (4-27) (nest)		[REDACTED]
Belted Kingfisher		Field Sparrow (4-2-00)
[REDACTED]		Savannah Sparrow
Red-headed Woodpecker		[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		Swamp Sparrow (4-23-00)
Hairy Woodpecker		[REDACTED]
Northern Flicker		[REDACTED]
Pileated Woodpecker		[REDACTED]
Eastern Wood-Pewee (5-17)		[REDACTED]
Eastern Phoebe (3-27)(3-4-00)		[REDACTED]
Eastern Kingbird (4-30) (5-2)		[REDACTED]
Great Crested Flycatcher (5-22)		[REDACTED]
Tree Swallow (4-5)(4-6)		Baltimore Oriole (5-2) (nest) (5-3)
Northern Rough-winged Swallow (4-23)		Orchard Oriole (5-9)
Barn Swallow (4-25)		Eastern Meadowlark
Blue Jay (nest,00)		Common Grackle
American Crow		Brown-headed Cowbird
Carolina Chickadee		House Finch
Tufted Titmouse		American Goldfinch
White-breasted Nuthatch		Blue Grosbeak
Carolina Wren (nest 99,00)		Indigo Bunting (5-2)
House Wren (4-25)		Rose-breasted Grosbeak
Golden-crowned Kinglet		House Sparrow
Ruby-crowned Kinglet		

2/08
(cont.)