

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Thank you

Brad Schoener
udbandman@aol.com
1520 Woodland Rd
West Chester, PA 19382
368. Jill Kearney -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Jill Kearney
jdk713@yahoo.com
2162 Rolling Meadow Dr
Macungie, PA 18062
369. Brigid McDevitt -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Brigid McDevitt
brigidmcdevitt@hotmail.com
7 Saint William Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15237
370. Bart Miltenberger -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Bart Miltenberger
miltenbe@ben.dev.upenn.edu
3533 Locust Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19104
371. Thomas M. Hall -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Thomas M. Hall
1167 Skelp Level Rd
Downingtown, PA 19335-4021

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies.

Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late.

The Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later.

The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading.

The health of Pennsylvanians is at stake here and FAR more important than company profits!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

372. Audrey Glickman -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Audrey Glickman
3548 Beechwood Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA 15217-2767

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvanians of all people know the effects of pollution on the individual. We became hardened to it with the steel industry, but it is time to acknowledge that if we do it correctly we can have our industries and keep our health, too.

Mercury is deadly. The earlier we take action, the better the results both on the industry and on the individual.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

373. Ryan Snow -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Ryan Snow
64 S. 14th St
Pittsburgh, PA 15203-1548

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Rvan Snow

374. Signe Sundberg-Hall -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Signe Sundberg-Hall

hallwater@comcast.net

1167 Sklep Level Rd

Downingtown, PA 19335

375. Caroline Cotugno -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Caroline Cotugno
1100 Newportville Road, Apt. 412
Croydon, PA 19021-5031

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Caroline Cotugno

376. Ben Meyer -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a past Pennsylvania resident (where I was born and raised), I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015, as well as any other electric generating units . PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous to everyone that comes into contact with it, especially harming children who are developing.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Ben Meyer
cdbmeyer@yahoo.com
Some Street
Somewhere, AK 99515
377. Stella Bates -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Stella Bates
bates@peopleslight.org
1310 Fairview Avenue
Havertown, PA 19083
378. Giacomo DeAnnuntis -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Giacomo DeAnnuntis
gdeannuntis@netscape.net
5502 Houghton Street
Philadelphia, PA 19128
379. Melissa Lepore -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

melissa lepore
missy_hartle@yahoo.com
508 west ave
JENKINTOWN, PA 19046
380. Wayne Hyatt -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Wayne Hyatt
wehyatt@fastmail.fm
4107 Colony Dr.
Hatboro, PA 19040-3016
381. Joan Anderson -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Joan Anderson
joan.anderson@waverlyheightsltd.org
625 Woodcrest Ave.
Ardmore, PA 19003
382. Breen Masciotra -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

breen masciotra
5819 elwood street #4
pittsburgh, PA 15232-2521

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

breenn masciotra
4129524190
383. Lois Sellers -----
Lois Sellers
267 Rambling Way
Springfield, PA 19064-3513

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

In 1971, Eugene Smith, photographer for LIFE Magazine, went to Minamata, Japan to document the grievous toll exacted by a harbor full of mercury. The fish were full of mercury, the residents ate the fish.

One of the most moving photographs I have ever seen is Smith's stark image of a mother bathing her horribly deformed daughter, "Tomoko Uemura in Her Bath"

I would hope that lessons such as the one from Minamata would only need be learned once. I think each member of the House should look at this image <http://theopinionmill.com/Minamata.html>

Costs exacted on a corporation will never be as high as this mother paid.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Lois Sellers
384. Barbara Field -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Barbara Field
318 Richfield Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15234-2935

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Barbara Field

(412) 882-9651

385. Liz Dudley -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Liz Dudley
157 Larch Lane
Newport, PA 17074-8002

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Liz Dudley
717-567-3235
386. Vaughan Boleky -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Vaughan Boleky
353 Frenchcreek Rd.
Utica, PA 16362-1903

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Vaughan Boleky
387. Rev. Elizabeth Miller -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Rev. Elizabeth Miller
708 Eighth Ave
Bethlehem, PA 18018-3501

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Rev. Elizabeth Miller
610-867-4741

388. Helen Jacobson -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Helen Jacobson
609 S. Convent Rd.
Aston, PA 19014-1207

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Helen Jacobson

389. Iona Conner -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Iona Conner
HCR 83 Box 881
Shade Gap, PA 17255-9319

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Iona Conner
390. Frank X. Kleshinski -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Frank X. Kleshinski
209 North Drive
Jeannette, PA 15644-9629

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Frank X. Kleshinski

391. Steven Kokol -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Steven Kokol
219 Country Club Lane
Wallingford, PA 19086-6507

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Steven Kokol
392. Robert Calhoun -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Robert Calhoun
111 east cove lane
shohola, PA 18458-4342

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Robert Calhoun
393. Julia Johns -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Julia Johns
113 Golf View Drive
McMurray, PA 15317-5327

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Julia Johns
7249417406

394. Bill Waddington -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Bill Waddington
365 Corinne Road
West Chester, PA 19382-6766

July 18, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Bill Waddington
395. Audrey Bartholomew -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Audrey Bartholomew
abartholomew@verizon.net
841 Highland Ave.
Jenkintown PA 19046
396. Charley Wittman -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Charley Wittman
276 Briarwood Ct.
Allentown, PA 18104-9590

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Charley Wittman
397. Charlie McNutt -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Charlie McNutt
5225 Wilson Lane #2137
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055-6667

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Charlie McNutt

717 501 0727

398. Rita Rongione -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Rita Rongione

rrongione@hotmail.com

1316 Darby Rd.

Havertown PA 19083

399. Nancy Carroll -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Nancy Carroll

nlklein@cs.com

1132 Bayless Pl.

Norristown PA 19403

400. Dane Ochis-O'Neil -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Dane Ochis-O'Neil
daneo@hotmail.com
201 Serenity Drive
Douglasville PA 19518-8978
401. Kurt Schneider -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Kurt Schneider
kurtznidar2@hotmail.com
267 Yorktown Ct.
Phoenixville PA 19460
402. Diane Lester -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Diane Lester
gdlest4@msn.com
814 Campbell Ln
Glenside PA 19038
403. Chelsea Sperger -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Chelsea Sperger
momma@sperger.com
357 Tennis Ave.
Glenside PA 19038
404. Elva Eichstadt -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Elva Eichstadt
elva725@aol.com
817 Dogwood Ln
Hatfield PA 19440
405. Glenn Graeber -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Glenn Graeber
neutronglenn@yahoo.com
600 Valley Rd.
havertown PA 19083
406. Hannah Ochs-O'Neil -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Hannah Ochis-O'Neil
hannahoo@hotmail.com
201 Serenity Drive
Donelassville PA 19518-8978
407. Helen Bowes -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Helen Bowes
helboy6@aol.com
46 W. Albemarle Ave.
Lansdowne PA 19050
408. Dwayne Gordon -----
PA Resident719
409. William Orr -----
PA Resident719
410. Sharon Moeckel -----
PA Resident719
411. Steve Tomasco -----
PA Resident719
412. Barbara Dwyer -----
PA Resident719
413. Erika Maguire -----
PA Resident719
414. Dennis Greer -----
PA Resident719

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

- 415. Donna Laney -----
PA Resident719
- 416. Beth Nixon -----
PA Resident719
- 417. Joan Fedeli -----
PA Resident719
- 418. Nancy Miller -----
PA Resident719
- 419. Nick Tentsoglides -----
PA Resident719
- 420. Jay Horrow -----
PA Resident719
- 421. Jill Finlay -----
PA Resident719
- 422. Joe McNeill -----
PA Resident719
- 423. John Brown -----
PA Resident719
- 424. John Janick -----
PA Resident719
- 425. Cathy Brittingham -----
PA Resident719
- 426. Phillip Bruner -----
PA Resident719
- 427. Ben Lubker -----
PA Resident719
- 428. John Kleidon -----
PA Resident719
- 429. Susan Egan -----
PA Resident719
- 430. Phyllis Rafferty -----
PA Resident719
- 431. Celine Obrien -----
PA Resident719
- 432. Evelyn Throne -----
PA Resident719
- 433. Michelle Toth -----
PA Resident719
- 434. Patricia Derr -----
PA Resident719
- 435. Diane Sicotte -----
PA Resident719
- 436. Steve DiBello -----
PA Resident719
- 437. Debbie Brahen -----
PA Resident719
- 438. Ruth Attiani -----
PA Resident719
- 439. Paul Weintraub -----
PA Resident719
- 440. Maryjo Smith -----
PA Resident719

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

441. The Honorable Dan A. Surra Pennsylvania House of Representatives -----
Mercury Comment from Rep. Dan Surra

July 19, 2006

Environmental Quality Board
PO Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Dear Environmental Quality Board:

I am writing in support of Pennsylvania moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. Pennsylvania's power plants currently have the second highest mercury emissions in the country.

Mercury is a persistent, bio-accumulative neurotoxin that can remain active in the environment for more than 10,000 years. It endangers pregnant women, the unborn, children, subsistence fishermen and recreational anglers who are most at risk for health effects that include brain and nervous system damage in children and heart and immune system damage for adults.

The Bush administration has weakened federal mercury regulations by allowing polluters to trade emissions credits, which means that many Pennsylvania power plants could buy their way out of substantial mercury reductions. Power plants should not be able to buy their way out of reducing their mercury emissions.

In order to protect the environment of Pennsylvania and the health of my constituents, I urge DEP to move forward in enacting its proposed state-level mercury standards for coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

Dan A. Surra
State Representative
75th Legislative District

- 442. Joyce Johnson -----
PA Resident719
- 443. Joyce Brady-McClain -----
PA Resident719
- 444. Emily Hall -----
PA Resident719
- 445. Margo Fenigsetin -----
PA Resident719
- 446. Maria Alvarez -----
PA Resident719
- 447. Debbie Davidson -----
PA Resident719
- 448. Paige Habgood -----
PA Resident719
- 449. Andy Haines -----
PA Resident719
- 450. Maxine Walters -----
PA Resident719

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

451. Beth Boeggeman -----
PA Resident719

452. Paul Mimless -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

paul mimless
3176 Mayflower road
plymouth meeting, PA 19462-1908

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

paul mimless
453. Eric Potter -----
PA Resident719

454. Boomer Mitzel -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Boomer Mitzel
2711 Kimberly Road
Lancaster, PA 17603-7007

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Boomer Mitzel

455. Pamela Chaplin-Loebell -----

PA Resident719

456. Sean Guckert -----

PA Resident719

457. Andrew Lyubarsky -----

PA Resident719

458. Patria Alvelo -----

PA Resident719

459. William Peduto Pittsburgh City Council, Dist. 8 -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

July 19, 2006

Environmental Quality Board
P.O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

The purpose of this letter is to support Pennsylvania advancement towards the DEP's state level proposal to cut mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by the year 2015.

It is a great concern to me that power plants in PA have the second highest mercury emissions in the country. These emissions are a health hazard to Pennsylvania residents including my council district. It is my job to protect my constituents and their families. The federal government has weakened regulations on the power plants, further contributing to the problem at hand.

I urge you to protect the environment of Pennsylvania, and move forward with enacting the proposal of state-level mercury standards for coal-fired plants in PA. Clean air and water are the cornerstones necessary in building a better Pennsylvania for its residents.

Sincerely,

William Peduto
Pittsburgh City-Councilman
District 8
510 City-County Building
460. K. C. Goodman -----
PA Resident719

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

461. Karl Neiman -----

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

karl neiman
1737 6th ave.
arnold, PA 15068-4301

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing." D:\K_MC_message_8914321

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

karl neiman

7243371723

462. Laura Arsenault -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Laura Arsenault
371 margo lane
Berwyn, PA 19312-1453

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

- Laura Arsenault
463. Laura Bauer -----
PA Resident719
- 464. Cheryl Hostert -----
PA Resident719
- 465. Matthew Evan -----
PA Resident719
- 466. Andrew Orliner -----
PA Resident719
- 467. Phillip Schwartz -----
PA Resident719
- 468. Michael Burri -----
State Level Mercury Rule

Dear EQB:

I am writing to voice my full support for the Pennsylvania State Level Mercury Rule, and to urge that it be implemented as quickly as possible.

Coal-fired power plants are the largest source of mercury pollution in Pennsylvania and throughout the entire United States. Every lake, river and stream in Pennsylvania is contaminated with this poison. The state level mercury rule would reduce mercury pollution from power plants more quickly and effectively than the weaker federal standards. These pollution reductions are crucial for improving air quality and protecting public health in the state.

I urge the Environmental Quality Board and the Independent Regulatory Review Commission to support Pennsylvania's own mercury rule.

Sincerely,

- Michael Burri
15 Montgomery Avenue
Apt. 6B
Bala Cynwyd PA 19004
- 469. John McKenna -----
PA Resident719
- 470. Mindy Horrow -----
PA Resident719
- 471. Linda Jeffers -----
PA Resident719
- 472. John Felen -----
PA Resident719
- 473. Natalie Fisher -----
PA Resident719
- 474. John Dunphy -----
PA Resident719
- 475. Rose Buckwalter -----
PA Resident719
- 476. Suzanne Small -----
PA Resident719

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

- 477. Lori Williams -----
PA Resident719
- 478. Sheldon Kernosh -----
PA Resident719
- 479. Ed Tucker -----
PA Resident719
- 480. Tracy Rizzo -----
PA Resident719
- 481. Jami Dominick -----
PA Resident719
- 482. Trello Gina -----
PA Resident719
- 483. Richard McMurray -----
PA Resident719
- 484. William Rorer -----
PA Resident719
- 485. Joelle Sandre -----
PA Resident719
- 486. Julie Nguyen -----
PA Resident719
- 487. Walter Lowthian -----
PA Resident719
- 488. Allen Miller -----
PA Resident719
- 489. Rory Reszler -----
PA Resident719
- 490. Margaret McLaughlin -----
PA Resident719
- 491. Jeanine Maliszewski -----
PA Resident719
- 492. John Pawling -----
PA Resident719
- 493. Edward Smith -----
PA Resident719
- 494. Chris Cayer -----
PA Resident719
- 495. Jonathan Harris -----
PA Resident719
- 496. Sharon Cerogino -----
PA Resident719
- 497. Deborah Chapman -----
PA Resident719
- 498. Otto Lehrbach -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Otto Lehrbach
282 Treichler Rd.
Alburtis, PA 18011-2035

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

- Otto Lehrbach
499. Rebecca O'Donnell -----
PA Resident719
- 500. Olga Abauer -----
PA Resident719
- 501. Karen Micek -----
PA Resident719
- 502. Heather McCann -----
PA Resident719
- 503. Tom Sexton -----
PA Resident719
- 504. Noemi Lagos -----
PA Resident719
- 505. KimberlyJames Rausa -----
PA Resident719
- 506. Kimberly Adams -----
PA Resident719
- 507. Albert Lehmicke -----
PA Resident719
- 508. William Colsher -----
PA Resident719
- 509. Frank Kubitsky -----
PA Resident719
- 510. Loren Toombs -----
PA Resident719
- 511. Orit Even-Shoshan -----
PA Resident719
- 512. Lisa Entwistle -----
PA Resident719
- 513. Marcy Rednor -----
PA Resident719
- 514. Lynn Eichen -----
PA Resident719
- 515. Agnes McLaughlin -----
PA Resident719
- 516. Jane Christensen -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Jane Christensen
9 Cabot Circle
West Grove, PA 19390-9765

July 19, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

- 517. Gretchen Fox -----
PA Resident 719
- 518. Roy Palmer -----
PA Resident 719
- 519. Michael Glatfelter -----
PA Resident 719
- 520. Stephanie Schneider -----
PA Resident 719
- 521. Roxanne Wigglesworth -----
PA Resident 719
- 522. Lori Lobb -----
PA Resident 719
- 523. C. Tiano -----
PA Resident 720
- 524. Denise Finer -----
PA Resident 720
- 525. Sarah Willie -----
PA Resident 720

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

- 526. Susan Heinerman -----
PA Resident 720
- 527. Michelle Kehl -----
PA Resident 720
- 528. Carol Poust 1314 Rowland Rd. -----
PA Resident 720
- 529. Sue Rocchino -----
PA Resident 720
- 530. Gus Mellace -----
PA Resident 720
- 531. Bill Filmeyer -----
PA Resident 720
- 532. Marc Davies -----
PA Resident 720
- 533. Joyce Spano -----
PA Resident 720
- 534. Rob Heustremburg -----
PA Resident 720
- 535. Chris Vogenitz -----
PA Resident 720
- 536. Jon Owens -----
PA Resident 720
- 537. Mary Barrington -----
PA Resident 720
- 538. Lea Stabinski -----
PA Resident 720
- 539. Kristine Todaro -----
PA Resident 720
- 540. Cindy Kahmar -----
PA Resident 720
- 541. Brian Katona -----
PA Resident 720
- 542. Michael Kahmar -----
PA Resident 720
- 543. John Sloyer -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

John Sloyer
151 Moore St
Julian, PA 16844-9521

July 20, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

John S. Sloyer

544. Bradford F. Whitman -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

267 Kent Road
Wynnewood, PA 19096
bfwhitma@comcast.net

Environmental Quality Board
Department of Environmental Protection
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
P.O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

July 14, 2006

Re: Proposed Amendments to 25 Pa. Code Ch. 123 (36 Pa. B. 3185) Limiting Mercury Emissions from Electric Generating Facilities

Dear Board Members:

I am a resident of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, a career environmental lawyer, and a frequent recreational user of the Commonwealth's parks and natural areas. I strongly support the Department's proposed rule to limit mercury emissions from electric generating facilities.

This rule is long overdue. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency should have promulgated years ago a mercury emission rule for coal-fired generating facilities pursuant to Section 112 of the Clean Air Act. It was perfectly clear to all of us practicing environmental law in Washington when Congress first enacted Section 112 in 1977 (I was representing EPA), and later in 1990 when Congress strengthened this provision, that the legislative intent was to require major sources like power plants to install maximum achievable control technology (MACT) at the source, not to allow hazardous air pollutants to be treated as conventional pollutants subject to long-distance emission trading and offset schemes that severely weakened and protracted the clean-up. There were, and are, good scientific and public health reasons for listing mercury compounds as hazardous air pollutants under the Act, and these reasons are well-documented in both the Department's record and EPA's own administrative record. For more than fifteen years we have relied on EPA to perform its regulatory duty under Section 112 for mercury (and other chemicals), and the result has been a pitiful betrayal of the public trust and a circumvention of the law.

Under these circumstances, the Department of Environmental Protection's decision to adopt its own mercury rule under the Air Pollution Control Act is highly appropriate and necessary, especially because there are major emitting facilities located here in the Commonwealth and because our waterways—and their aquatic species—are primary environmental receptors of this pollution.

I have examined the environmental monitoring data for wet mercury deposition at the sampling stations in Pennsylvania, and they provide strong support for the rule. The mercury monitoring station closest to where I live and where I enjoy the out-of-doors is PA 60 located in the Valley Forge area. The Pennsylvania State University Report (Lynch et al., Dec. 2005), entitled "Mercury Deposition in PA: 2005 Status Report", Table 3, displays the maximum and minimum weekly sample results for wet deposition of mercury from the atmosphere. In 2004, PA 60 recorded both the second highest maximum and the second highest minimum values for mercury out of all eight sample stations in the Commonwealth. Moreover, the data show no improvement in the level of mercury deposition during the five years of monitoring from 1999 to 2004 when the industry was engaged in installing and upgrading pollution control equipment for conventional pollutants. In fact, at PA 60 the maximum weekly mercury deposition in 2004 is the highest maximum reported since the monitoring began in 1999.

The fact that mercury is still being washed out of the air at the same or worse rate at stations in Pennsylvania in 2004 as in 1999 underscores the need for source control for this pollutant. The mercury emission and wet deposition data are more than ample justification for issuing the proposed rule, regardless of mercury levels in fish and other aquatic organisms.

Sincerely,

Bradford F. Whitman

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Cc: The Sierra Club, Local Chapter

545. Lois Sayers -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

LOIS SAYERS
230 WHITE OAK DRIVE
NEW KENSINGTON, PA 15068-6724

July 20, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

LOIS SAYERS

7242272100

546. Ray L. Ober Jr. -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Ray L. Ober Jr.
1752 Crooked Oak Drive
Lancaster, PA 17601-4210

July 20, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Ray L. Ober Jr.

717-569-0292

547. Neil Rapoport -----

PA Resident 720

548. Janice Fiore -----

PA Resident 720

549. Carol Cosgrove -----

PA Resident 720

550. Paul McGonigle -----

PA Resident 720

551. William Edwards -----

PA Resident 720

552. John Myers -----

PA Resident 720

553. John Hoover -----

PA Resident 720

554. Karen Raisch -----

PA Resident 720

555. Judith Forchielli -----

PA Resident 720

556. Harry Spink -----

PA Resident 720

557. Diane Schrak -----

PA Resident 720

558. Mary Beth Carroll -----

PA Resident 720

559. Pat Gaffney -----

PA Resident 720

560. Jeremy Gelb -----

PA Resident 720

561. Jean Kramer -----

PA Resident 720

562. Lori Connell -----

PA Resident 720

563. Rebecca Horner -----

PA Resident 720

564. Abbie Newman -----

PA Resident 720

565. Joe Carter -----

PA Resident 720

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

- 566. Jason Kaminski -----
PA Resident 720
- 567. Bob Pessolano -----
PA Resident 720
- 568. Marc Lombardi -----
PA Resident 720
- 569. Cindy Davidson -----
PA Resident 720
- 570. Courtland Ross -----
PA Resident 720
- 571. Dawn Kezel -----
PA Resident 720
- 572. Dennis O'Neill -----
PA Resident 720
- 573. Edith Lane -----
PA Resident 720
- 574. Edward Lee Jr. -----
PA Resident 720
- 575. Elizabeth Coyne -----
PA Resident 720
- 576. Ginny Christiansen -----
PA Resident 720
- 577. Jessica Cherry -----
PA Resident 720
- 578. John GcGramm -----
PA Resident 720
- 579. Kathy Jung -----
PA Resident 720
- 580. Lora Lehmann -----
PA Resident 720
- 581. Lorraine Zwolak -----
PA Resident 720
- 582. Lynn Morgenlander -----
PA Resident 720
- 583. Maria Chango -----
PA Resident 720
- 584. Marty Palmer -----
PA Resident 720
- 585. Mike Jacobs -----
PA Resident 720
- 586. Mindy Buckley -----
PA Resident 720
- 587. Renee Winegrad -----
PA Resident 720
- 588. Sandy Mosiniak -----
PA Resident 720
- 589. Jack Lebeau M.D., FACC -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Editor, The Patriot-News, Harrisburg, PA.

I am a retired PA physician with boards in internal medicine, cardiology and geriatrics and additional studies in environmental and public health. I am on no one's payroll and represent no group, lobby or other entity.

Here are some facts about mercury pollution with references. The op-ed by Mr. Gene Barr on July 17th seems to ignore them.

1. Mercury comes mainly from burning coal as a fuel for power plants here but also from burning municipal waste and other sources. Medical waste releases have been reduced as the toxicity of mercury is better understood. A 94% reduction in medical waste mercury pollution has occurred in Pennsylvania over the last two decades. PA Secretary of the Environment Kathleen McGinty.
2. The most mercury-polluted county in the United States is Armstrong County, PA (US-PIRG, 2003)
3. There is evidence of toxic levels of mercury in US citizens, in particular women of childbearing age who may become pregnant and have children who have absorbed mercury and concentrated it in their brain in fetal development. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) document Mr. Barr referenced is the "Third National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals" It assessed a tiny fraction of the US population. Here are two quotes: "mercury levels in these (US) women continue to merit close monitoring because 5.7% of women of childbearing age had levels within a factor of 10 of those associated with neurodevelopmental defects" and "The current survey design does not permit CDC to estimate exposure on a state-by-state or city-by-city basis". And we have a county with the worst concentrations of mercury in our nation. Hmm.
4. The damage to children's brains is well known (Journal of Pediatrics, February 2004) and involves intellectual damage with behavioral and IQ problems as well as an unusual effect on the nerves that go to the heart. That nerve damage destroys the ability of the heart to change rate as needed in response to stimuli like exercise. This makes the child's heart incapable of meeting the body's need for blood in exertion.
5. Here is a quote from the renowned Dr. Philip Landrigan et al. in Environmental health Perspectives May, 2005 Vol.113 (6). "Using national blood mercury prevalence data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, we found that between 316,588 and 637,233 children each year have cord blood mercury levels > 5.8 micrograms/liter, a level associated with loss of IQ. The resulting loss of intelligence causes diminished economic productivity that persists over the entire lifetime of these children. This lost productivity is the major cost of methyl mercury toxicity, and it amounts to \$8.7 billion annually (range, \$2.2-43.8 billion; all costs are in 2000 US\$)."
6. Pennsylvania's mercury comes from not only our own state, but from other parts of the country and world as well. (US EPA, other sources) It also pollutes here but also moves to other states and beyond. Thus we can make some progress in cleaning up the mess but an effective cooperative effort is needed. Pennsylvania should lead the nation in this effort.
7. Other states like Oregon are forcing action to remove mercury from the environment more rapidly than the current national legislation demands. "The Oregonian" 7/17/06
8. We must not allow an emissions trading system in which a company here can send a check to another company in another state to buy an emissions credit that gets the PA company off the hook and pays to clean up another state. Let's work together and get the cleanup done! Testimony of Secretary McGinty April 25, 2006.

We Pennsylvanians could be a beacon to other states. We can show that mercury pollution can be stopped at a reasonable cost and without the dire consequences that people being paid by power companies would like us to believe.

I am not an expert at calculating the costs of damaged health versus the costs of a cleanup. But an epidemic of brain damaged children would be far more costly than preventing such a tragedy. Autism's current epidemic is most likely unrelated to mercury poisoning but its emotional and financial costs are cruel. Imagine the destruction an epidemic of mercury damage would cause.

I need to make a final point. Perhaps some lawyers or legislators think along the lines that damage must be shown before any action must be taken. I beg to differ. If brain damage from mercury is biologically plausible, that is likely to happen based on our current knowledge then strong action must be taken promptly. Prevention has always been the best and most cost effective medicine. I do not have the space to list all the research both on humans and animals that shows what a potent toxin mercury is. "Mercury toxicity" gets 3,850,000 hits on Google! Facts are there and in Medline and other readily available sources.

We need a population that understands these facts and causes their legislators to act on mercury pollution effectively, both on a state and national level. Legislators that show influence by those who do not care for the safety of our people need to be corrected or replaced.

590. Resident -----

591. Resident -----

592. The Hon. John C. Rafferty, Jr. Senate of Pennsylvania -----

593. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

- 594. Amy Ketner -----
- 595. Pamela S. Wiley -----
- 596. Resident -----
- 597. Tami L. Scheetz -----
- 598. Richard Seip -----
- 599. Joseph J. LoBue -----
- 600. Fritz Holzer -----
- 601. Becky McNeal -----
- 602. Heather Moscrip -----
- 603. Patricia Bennett -----
- 604. Paige E. Wiley -----
- 605. Jennifer LoBue -----
- 606. Linda L. Groff -----
- 607. Dr. John P. Maher -----
- 608. Bradford F. Whitman -----
- 609. Jack Paradise -----
PAResident 721
- 610. Patricia Mareda -----
PAResident 721
- 611. Barbara Richert -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Barbara Richert
201 Market Street
Winnsboro, TX 75494-2531

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Wake up and deal with it!!

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Wake up and deal with it!!

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

I am from Texas and live 15 miles from a coal plant. We cannot eat fish from the lakes here.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Barbara Richert
903 588-53252

612. Etta Albright -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Etta Albright
429 Powell Ave
Cresson, PA 16630-1312

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Reportedly the National Wildlife Federation released a report in 2003 identifying Cresson Mountain as having the highest amount of Mercury in its snow and rain fall in the United States and Canada. I LIVE in Cresson, PA. We have many learning disabled children receiving services in our schools. We must question this second only to stopping all further pollution.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Etta Albright
814 826 7211
613. Faith Slepecki -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. We need more strict rules like this to ensure that we still have a beautiful and safe environment in the future. The health and well-being of our children is not an issue to be taken lightly or swept under the rug! PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I strongly urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. We all need to remember that this Earth is our only home and time is running out to protect it from the hands of those who would only think of their own gain. It could take years, if ever, for some of the damage man has done to the planet to be reversed. Our kids' health is also at stake here, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Yours truly

Faith Slepecki
faithslepecki@yahoo.com
11 N. Howard Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15202
614. Robert Nyce -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Robert Nyce
302 W. Chestnut Street
Souderton, PA 18964-1733

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

As I am an avid fisherman and outdoorsman, I am very concerned about any pollution of our waters and the environment. We need to ignore the false arguments of the big money industries, and do what's right for the future generations of Penna.

Thank you for your consideration!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

615. Benjamin Shultz -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Benjamin Shultz
PO Box 419
Bernville, PA 19506-0419

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

Personally, I would rather pay an extra \$1.08 than risk the life of my baby. Wouldn't you?

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Shultz
616. Mary Jo Brinker -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Mary Jo Brinker
161 Leonhardt Lane
Ellwood City, PA 16117-7759

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

increasing.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo Brinker

724-924-2885

617. Daniel Samartino -----

Reduction of Mercury Emissions

I live in Glenmoore, Pennsylvania, and I think it is a good idea to reduce mercury emissions. I supports the DEP's plan to reduce these emissions by 90% and I hope that the plan is implemented.

Thank you

Daniel Samartino

dan.samartino@comcast.net

574 Greenridge Rd.

Glenmoore, PA 19343

618. Karen Commings -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

Karen Commings
6225 Blue Bird Ave
Harrisburg, PA 17112-2312

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

I find the following statistics staggering and inexcusable. Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

While mercury poisoning is bad for Pennsylvania's economy, it is worse for Pennsylvania's citizens. Please draft laws that will control emission of mercury. Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Karen Commings

717-545-7636

619. William Renninger -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

WILLIAM RENNINGER
660MAIN ST
DUKE CENTER, PA 16729

July 21, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Mercury pollution builds up in areas close to the source, creating dangerous "hot spots" of high mercury concentrations. Fish in Pennsylvania are highly contaminated with mercury in some areas, not as much in other areas. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. Recent DEP data showed that over eight years, mercury levels at a sampling station located in Cambria County near power plants were 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station located in Tioga County, which is not close to mercury sources. Recent EPA-funded studies show that up to 70 percent of mercury contamination comes from local and regional sources. The studies also show that cleaning up mercury pollution at nearby sources results in significant drops in mercury contamination in nearby fish.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises,

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM RENNINGER

620. Kate Patterson Neely, MD Forbes Family Practice -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a family practice physician and teacher, I want to support the state Department of Environmental Protection proposed mercury regulations that would require coal burning power plants to reduce their mercury emissions 90% by 2015. There is increasing evidence that environmental mercury is causing significant problems for our society, and particularly that it is linked to the epidemic of autism spectrum disorders. We as a society cannot afford the medical, social, and financial impact autism makes. Please work to pass this regulation to improve the health of our state.

Kate Patterson Neely, MD
Associate Program Director
Forbes Family Practice
2566 Haymaker Rd
Monroeville, PA 15146
412 858-3227

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the West Penn Allegheny Health System Help Desk at 412 330-4357.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by

621. Maryanne Kahmar -----
PAResident 721

622. Stephanie Ulmer -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

623. Carol McCullough -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Carol McCullough
1119 Queensbury St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15205-3728

July 23, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

As a mother and a grandmother (with another grandchild on the way) I am very concerned about the health problems caused by coal-fired power plants. This is not the legacy I want to leave my family. As a birder, I am also quite concerned about the negative effects on birds. Those animals and birds near and at the top of the food chain (including humans) are the most at risk from mercury pollution.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Carol McCullough
412-071-6873
624. Mary Hoffman -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Letter to the Children:

I wish you clean air, earth, water, shelter from storms, ample food for strength and health.

From these I wish you love to give, for then there will always be love to receive.

I wish you prosperity from which you care for those around you to seven generations.

I wish you wisdom and strength to accept the horrors, to right wrongs, to know beauty, to love and accept all, especially yourselves.

Note to Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: I wrote this last month. Notice the first wish is the basis for all the other wishes. Give your children and my children a chance for these wishes. It starts with clean air, earth, water. Require Mercury emission reduction for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Check out my Teaching & Writing blog by left clicking on the link below:
<http://360.yahoo.com/plumbranchpress>

625. Stephanie Land -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Stephanie Land
5853 Hobart St
pittsburgh, PA 15217-2109

July 23, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

I am very concerned about pollution in Pittsburgh, and considering whether I should move my family away.

This legislation will help make our region cleaner and safer.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

626. Maria Rosen -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Maria Rosen
maria.rosen@verizon.net
704 Honey Run Road
Ambler, PA 19002
627. Ashi Parmar -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Ashi Parmar
asppar@aol.com
100 Black Bass Lane E.
Media, PA 19063
628. Evelyn Harshman -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Evelyn Harshman
Eviedon@aol.com
316 Centennial Drive
Blue Bell, PA 19422-3219
629. Rivka Kerachsky -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Rivka Kerachsky
nightswim@comcast.net
1501 Woodview Road
Yardley, PA 19067
630. Katherine Detwiler -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Katherine Detwiler
606 Naomi Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144-3711

July 24, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

We have such a short space of time available to us to shift our economy to a more ecological, sustainable one, and so much work to do! Please do the right thing for our earth, for our society and ourselves by enacting the strictest mercury reduction rules in the nation as quickly as possible. Without calculating the true costs of coal-fired power plants, ie, without factoring in the costs of damage to the environment from our extraction and utilization of this dirty fuel, we cannot understand the true costs of the unwise, inefficient efforts to turn our food, our corn into ethanol, and will wreak even more havoc upon our stressed planet. By requiring strong mercury reduction from our coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania, we come closer to assessing the true costs of our energy policies, and put our state in position to be a leader among states in moving towards sustainability. As ecological sustainability becomes the biggest issue of our time, it will surely benefit Pennsylvania to represent itself on the forefront of this movement. Strong mercury reduction rules are one way in which Pennsylvania can lead the nation in caring for its people, its land and water, its wildlife, and move towards an economy of greater sustainability for the world. Please do not allow this important rule to get bogged down by special interests; just do it and get going on the many other important jobs we have ahead of us to reduce wasteful energy expenditures and move us towards a safer, cleaner renewable energy policy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Katherine Detwiler
215-848-3232
631. Pat Dengel -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

You have my support for your plan that:

reduces mercury pollution 90% by 2015;
reduces mercury from each applicable & individual PA
power plant facility; and does not allow emissions
trading.

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

632. Sarah Caspar -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Sarah Caspar
525 Hopewell Road
Downtown, PA 18335-1220

July 24, 2006

members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB)
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 15th Floor, 400 Market Street
P. O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-2063

Dear members of the Environmental Quality Board (EQB):

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. Mercury pollution from power plants forms methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Very small amounts of mercury, passed to the child through the mother's blood or milk, can cause health effects. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control verify that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in the U.S. have levels of mercury in their blood higher than that considered safe for their developing babies. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife, including song birds, mammals, and amphibians.

Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. Every water in the Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution. In over 200 sampling locations in the state, fish have such high amounts of mercury that people are advised to eat no more than two meals of those fish per month.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants. The most recent Toxic Release Inventory from the Environmental Protection Agency ranks Pennsylvania as second worst in the nation for mercury pollution to the air, behind only Texas. This is up from third in 2004.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does too little too late. CAMR proponents claim that Pennsylvania will see an 86 percent drop in mercury pollution as a result of the federal rule. But the Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading, where dirty plants are allowed to buy credits from cleaner, more modern ones. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the Congressional Research Service concluded that CAMR would result in at best a 70 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but not until 2030 or later. The Pennsylvania rule as proposed requires that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading. Further, Pennsylvania and 15 other states, are challenging CAMR as illegal under the Clean Air Act, because it fails to treat mercury as the hazardous pollutant that it is. Should the legal

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

action prevail, CAMR will be struck down, and we will be left with no protections from mercury pollution. A number of other states have already passed their own, more protective mercury reduction rules, and many others are in the process of doing so.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable, and Pennsylvania coal-fired power plants are very profitable. Like a fully paid home mortgage, capital costs at coal-fired plants in Pennsylvania have been paid off. They are baseload plants that run all of the time, making electricity at costs far below wholesale prices, which more and more frequently is set by the cost of electricity produced by gas-fired plants. Wholesale electricity prices range between six and seven cents per kilowatt hour (kWh); coal-fired power plants produce electricity at a cost of between three and four cents per kWh. A recent National Wildlife Federation report estimated that the average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills if all the cost were passed through to consumers. In Pennsylvania's competitive retail electricity market, electricity suppliers cannot just routinely pass on their costs. They can choose to pass on none, some or all of their costs, or they can decide to reduce profits.

An overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians support the state mercury rule, even if it means paying more on electricity bills. A recent opinion poll conducted by Terry Madonna Research Opinion found that 4 out of 5 Pennsylvanians support a mercury rule that is stronger and implemented faster than the federal rule. Eighty percent of the respondents would be willing to pay up to \$1.08 more on the electricity in support of the Pennsylvania rule. More than 60 health-affected, health, women's, children's, sporting, faith-based, environmental and conservation organizations around the state support the Pennsylvania rule. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the rule. Over 100 medical experts and faith leaders around the state have co-signed letters in support of the state-specific rule.

The federal mercury rule is bad for Pennsylvania's economy. Mercury contamination is threatening the Commonwealth's sporting, angling, and recreation industry, a significant source of revenue and jobs throughout the state. Because of the trading system set up in CAMR, Pennsylvania plants are more likely to pay for pollution credits than to clean up and modernize old plants. As a result, jobs are exported to other states, in the form of skilled labor required for the technological upgrades. As the electricity market becomes more integrated, cleaner plants (in other states) will out-compete their dirty counterparts (in Pennsylvania), forcing plants to close and more jobs to be lost. Pennsylvania's rule encourages use of bituminous coal (mined in Pennsylvania and in nearby states). The federal rule makes it more attractive for plants to switch to coal mined from Western states. Most importantly, there are significant costs associated with the devastating health impacts; rates of learning disabilities and associated health effects of mercury in children are increasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Sarah Caspar
610 873 1237

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

610 873 1237

633. Kathleen Krebs -----

Dear State Official:

Water is a precious resource. Any and all measures should be taken to monitor and reduce/eliminate the toxic metal, Mercury. We have a social, moral and ethical responsibility to ensure preservation of our natural resources. On behalf of my fellow citizens, I encourage your continued efforts to truly make a difference and demonstrate how we can coexist with nature and business to leave our earth "healthier" than when we first arrived.

Respectfully and Peacefully,

634. Frank Burke CONSOL Energy, Inc. -----

Southwest Region

635. Barbara Grover -----

Southwest Region

636. Claudia Kirkpatrick -----

Southwest Region

637. Heather Sage -----

Southwest Region

638. Martha Raak -----

Southwest Region

639. Paul Daly -----

Southwest Region

640. Jennifer Whiteside -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Hello,

I am writing for support of stronger environmental protections for our water sources, to decrease the mercury levels in our water. Thanks for your help.

Jennifer Whiteside

Pittsburgh, PA

Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Make PC to Phone Calls to the US (and 30+ countries) for 2¢/min or less.

641. Ronald Gallo -----

Southwest Region

642. The Honorable Jim Ferlo Senate of Pennsylvania -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

July 24, 2006

Environmental Quality Board
P.O. Box 8477
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Member of the Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing to support the Pennsylvania DEP's rulemaking that would substantially cut mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants. As you know, mercury is an extraordinarily dangerous neurotoxin and the Commonwealth's coal-fired power plants emit the second highest levels in the nation. The long-term health problems associated with mercury exposure are most severe in infants and children and yet there is serious and cynical debate against protecting public safety in favor of shielding the generous profits of coal burning utilities.

The debate is reminiscent of the same arguments against protecting the public from lead poisoning, asbestos, PVC, and most recently the carcinogenic damage caused by cigarette smoke. The same pattern of denial and misinformation is followed to suggest the absurd: that one of the most potent neurotoxins in industrial pollution is somehow not a hazard to human health once it has been released by burning coal and finds its way into our water and into our bodies.

What I find particularly objectionable is that the weaker federal mercury regulations allow polluters to trade emissions credits. Shortsighted pollution credits trading puts our citizens in harms way in favor of rewarding an out of state location. I have rarely heard of a plan that more callously sacrifices our citizens' health at the industrial auction block.

I urge DEP to move forward in enacting its proposed mercury standards for coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania that defend the public health and embrace its duty to protect the Commonwealth's environmental assets.

Sincerely,

Jim Ferlo
State Senator
38th District
643. Daphne Champagne -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

I would like the Environmental Quality Board members to know that I support the plan of the PA Dept. of Environmental Protection to reduce mercury pollution in our state. As a resident of Pennsylvania, I am proud to see that our own state is not willing to compromise the health of our residents – despite the lack of leadership in this area at the federal government level.

Sincerely,

Daphne Champagne
3209 Willow Lane
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(dplusj@comcast.net)
644. Joan Grow Bucks County Community College -----
Mercury Standards - Do not derail tough state rules

I am unable to attend the Norristown hearing on Thursday.

I urge the legislature to continue with the state regulations rather than adopt the federal rule which allows power plants to buy pollution credits from cleaner plants. I understand from the article "State vs. federal standards" in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer reported that Pennsylvania is the second highest nationally in mercury emissions.

Please stay with the state rule requiring 90% cleanup by 2015 with no way around it by allowing power plants to buy pollution "credits" from a cleaner plant.

Thank you.

Joan Grow, Secretary
Bucks County Community College
Business Studies Department
275 Swamp Road
Newtown, PA 18940
215-968-8228 growi@bucks.edu
645. Myron Arnowitt Clean Water Action -----
Southwest Region
646. Bradford Whitman -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

Supplemental Comment from Bradford Whitman

Dear EQB Members:

I submit the following supplemental comment regarding the proposed mercury rule.

I previously commented that the past five years of mercury wet deposition data from the Pennsylvania monitoring stations, including the one closest to me in Valley Forge, provide strong scientific justification for mercury emission limits to be imposed on power plants in Pennsylvania, as proposed.

The New York Times today, July 25, 2006, reported the results of a study by the Biodiversity Research Institute of a large number of ground-foraging songbirds (the Wood Thrush) in New York state that were netted and blood-tested for mercury. The significant levels of mercury found in the birds' blood reinforce the Penn State findings of a continuing problem of wet mercury deposition in the eastern United States. The transport mechanism of mercury emitted from power plant stacks into the atmosphere, then falling back to the ground via rainfall, and finally bioaccumulating through terrestrial organisms into ground-foraging birds is very straightforward.

The findings of this new study strongly reinforce the scientific underpinning for imposing mercury source controls on electric generating plants, as proposed by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

I appreciate your consideration of this comment.

Sincerely,

Bradford Whitman

267 Vent Road

647. Loree Speedy -----

Southwest Region

648. Danielle Mink -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Danielle Mink

DanielleMink@comcast.net

121 Stirrup Circle

West Chester PA 19382

649. Ann L and Paul Rappoport -----

Current Comments List Continued

Re: Proposed Rulemaking: Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

mercury standards

To: Environmental Quality Board
Re: Mercury Standards

When it comes to protecting public health and the future of life cycles on earth, humans should err on the side of caution and *minimum disruption/damage*.

Our Earth is an intricate, interconnected system; the notion of deferred or transferred or credited pollution, is a dangerous, self-serving myth.

We urge decisions in favor of stricter standards within a shorter time frame when it comes to mercury emissions and pollution.

Thank you.

Ann L. Rappoport, Ph.D.

Paul Rappoport, Ph.D.

114 E. Waverly Road

Wyncote, PA 19095

715-884-4155; annrappoport@comcast.net

650. David H. Fowler GASP -----

Southwest Region

651. Michelle Obid -----

Southwest Region

652. Michael Pastorkovich -----

Southwest Region

653. Rachel Dolney -----

Southwest Region

654. Andrew Clearfield -----

Southwest Region

655. Sonal Bains Penn Environment -----

Southwest Region

656. Rev. William C. Thwing PA Council of Churches -----

Southwest Region

657. Tiara Wiles -----

Southwest Region

658. Robert Ashbaugh International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers -----

Southwest Region

659. Ashleigh M. Deemer -----

Southwest Region

660. Barbara Litt -----

Southwest Region

661. Robert J. Reiland -----

Southwest Region

662. Karen Giles -----

Southwest Region

663. Victor Fiori IBEW, Local 29 -----

Southwest Region

664. Etta Albright Stewardship & Sustainability for Goodness Sake -----

Southwest Region

665. Arielle Burlett -----

Southwest Region

666. Eric Mambu -----

Southwest Region