

Current Comments List Continued

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

3,733. Brandi McClain -----

3,734. Bruce Hurburt -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,735. Sklar Stacy -----

3,736. Karin Blomgren -----

3,737. Mary Zett -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,738. Resident -----

3,739. Jill M. Connell -----

3,740. Beate A. Pohlig -----

3,741. Adele M. Black -----

3,742. Russell Robertson -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,743. Kathy A. Slaughter -----

3,744. Patti Byra -----
National Parks 8-14

3,745. Michael R. Black -----

3,746. Stephen L. Whitson -----

3,747. Robert Eppinger -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,748. Douglas Leavitt -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,749. Darcie Sinciline -----
National Parks 8-14

3,750. Nichole Malone -----
PA Resident 8-14

3,751. Edward Healey -----
National Parks 8-14

3,752. Gertrude H. Whitson -----

3,753. Patricia Rainabi -----

3,754. Marguerite Reeves -----

3,755. Resident -----

3,756. Mary Purcell -----

3,757. Tom Kennedy -----

3,758. Tammy Butts -----
PA Resident 8-14

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,759. Tawala Johnson -----
- 3,760. Sael Boga -----
- 3,761. Danielle J. Terrill -----
- 3,762. Brittany, Heather, Jacqui Parker -----
- 3,763. Tracy Rizzo -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,764. Resident -----
- 3,765. Tim K. -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 3,766. Maureen Gordon -----
- 3,767. James L. Gilliam -----
- 3,768. Therese M. Gregory -----
- 3,769. Annash Bhandosle -----
- 3,770. Dina Fonseca -----
- 3,771. Madeline O'Hara-Moffo -----
- 3,772. Jeffrey Moffo -----
- 3,773. Kevin Bergen -----
- 3,774. Deanna Kuchinski -----
- 3,775. Catherine Burns -----
- 3,776. Sally Ellis -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 3,777. Ed Darpyn -----
- 3,778. Elaine and Dave Huppman -----
- 3,779. William Jewett IV -----
- 3,780. Amy Jewett -----
- 3,781. Stacey Murray -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 3,782. Eva Marie DiMichael -----
- 3,783. Jim Masciantonio -----
- 3,784. Ross Yowell -----
PA Resident 8-14

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,785. Thom Clinefelter -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 3,786. Sally McGinty -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 3,787. Resident -----

- 3,788. Patrick M. Stephan -----

- 3,789. Leonora Iford -----

- 3,790. Resident -----

- 3,791. Korejwo Family -----

- 3,792. Helene Harris -----

- 3,793. Resident -----

- 3,794. Autumn -----

- 3,795. Kevin McKeever -----

- 3,796. Connie Bergen -----

- 3,797. MaryBeth O'Shea -----

- 3,798. Eileen Kerper -----

- 3,799. James Gates -----

- 3,800. Nichole A. Callo -----

- 3,801. Nicholas Chrisanthon -----

- 3,802. Margaret Fretz -----

- 3,803. Kristi Mayo -----

- 3,804. Karen H. Messinger -----

- 3,805. Craig Smith -----

- 3,806. Samantha Goodrich -----

- 3,807. Doreen Follett -----

- 3,808. Judith Fromm -----

- 3,809. Lurleen Bontigao -----

- 3,810. R.J. William -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,811. Kirsten Halker-Kratz -----
- 3,812. Girard Kratz -----
- 3,813. Resident -----
- 3,814. Jason Kotch -----
- 3,815. James Lea -----
- 3,816. Meghan Kotch -----
- 3,817. Martha Thomas -----
- 3,818. William Thomas II -----
- 3,819. Wendy Kurtz -----
- 3,820. Ian Thomas -----
- 3,821. John Kmetz -----
- 3,822. Melissa Porter -----
- 3,823. J. Long -----
- 3,824. Nancy McQuitty -----
- 3,825. Chris Burnett -----
- 3,826. Justin Blatre -----
- 3,827. M. A. Whatley, M.D. -----
- 3,828. Resident -----
- 3,829. Resident -----
- 3,830. Virginia E. Trontan -----
- 3,831. Travis Hollenshead -----
- 3,832. S. K. Guggenberger -----
- 3,833. Nancy L. Downs -----
- 3,834. Resident -----
- 3,835. Philip and Sharon Thompson -----
- 3,836. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,837. Resident -----
- 3,838. Fred Hoffman -----
- 3,839. Robert & Dorothy Malinowski -----
- 3,840. Henry McKay -----
- 3,841. Hiver E. McKnight -----
- 3,842. Harriet Adams -----
- 3,843. Bill & Carol Morgan -----
- 3,844. Resident -----
- 3,845. Ramona Hatfield -----
- 3,846. Charlotte Maggio -----
- 3,847. Malcome Stritzinger -----
- 3,848. Mary Ann Stritzinger -----
- 3,849. Marion Mac Mullan -----
- 3,850. Marion Mac Mullan -----
- 3,851. Resident -----
- 3,852. Robert Ferreri -----
- 3,853. Robin Debraut -----
- 3,854. Michael Tulene -----
- 3,855. Susan Maxwell -----
- 3,856. Elvira Estell -----
- 3,857. Carrie Hill -----
- 3,858. Resident -----
- 3,859. Patricia Penn -----
- 3,860. Residents -----
- 3,861. Resident -----
- 3,862. Michele Johns -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,863. Resident -----
- 3,864. Resident -----
- 3,865. Art Santelli -----
- 3,866. Resident -----
- 3,867. Resident -----
- 3,868. Helene Beckaurt -----
- 3,869. Resident -----
- 3,870. Anne Chamberlin -----
- 3,871. Resident -----
- 3,872. Catherine Morani -----
- 3,873. Nichole & Gerry McShea -----
- 3,874. Resident -----
- 3,875. Michael Hayse -----
- 3,876. Zachary Shows -----
- 3,877. Jennifer Linetti -----
- 3,878. Kim Gonzalez -----
- 3,879. Cheryl Heelton -----
- 3,880. Resident -----
- 3,881. Resident -----
- 3,882. Robin Munoz -----
- 3,883. Jordan German -----
- 3,884. Resident -----
- 3,885. Resident -----
- 3,886. Paul Bartholumew -----
- 3,887. Kristin Berkenbaugh -----
- 3,888. Debra Lichman -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,889. Resident -----
- 3,890. Dan Mulhern -----
- 3,891. Brian McCullough -----
- 3,892. Justina Bahr -----
- 3,893. Karen Gamble -----
- 3,894. Jeannine Mendrola -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,895. Resident -----
- 3,896. Resident -----
- 3,897. lillian Kaeporch -----
- 3,898. Paul Formet -----
- 3,899. Resident -----
- 3,900. T.C. McKernan -----
- 3,901. J. McKernan -----
- 3,902. Barbara McCabe -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 3,903. Resident -----
- 3,904. Scott Fitzgerald -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 3,905. Resident -----
- 3,906. Andrea Shuman -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 3,907. Edward Maguire -----
- 3,908. James McBride -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 3,909. Jeffrey Dreier -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,910. Barb Begg -----
- 3,911. 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

August 14, 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,

John S. Sloyer

3,912. Noel & Jean West -----

3,913. Rob Stuart -----

Credit Trading 8-14

3,914. Joan Frist -----

3,915. Suzanne Steele -----

National Parks 8-14

3,916. Resident -----

3,917. Kelly Riley -----

National Parks 8-14

3,918. Ellie Fritsch -----

3,919. Walter A. Kauffman -----

3,920. Howard Rife -----

National Parks 8-14

3,921. Phil Terenick -----

3,922. Steven Eck -----

3,923. Christopher Warrington -----

3,924. Lisa A. Rengulli -----

3,925. Resident -----

3,926. Melinda B. Parsons -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,927. Kimberly Clemens -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,928. Mike Dellapenna -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,929. Michelle Eisele -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,930. Robert Eckel -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 3,931. Gary J. Pascuzzo -----
- 3,932. Lisa VanderGast -----
- 3,933. Patricia A. Nelson -----
- 3,934. Robert Kenney -----
- 3,935. Allen W. Smith -----
- 3,936. John Stitzangi -----
- 3,937. James, Kathy and Marion Grentzenberg -----
- 3,938. Catherine and Anthony Verdi -----
- 3,939. Susan Delank -----
- 3,940. Steven Fiergang -----
- 3,941. William Gardner -----
- 3,942. Bill Gardner -----
- 3,943. Gail E. Flegal -----
- 3,944. Priscilla Mattison -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,945. Kathy McFellan -----
- 3,946. Carol A. Mickey -----
- 3,947. Vincent L. Moran -----
- 3,948. Samantha A. Mickey -----
- 3,949. Barbara Anne Post -----
- 3,950. James Wade -----
- 3,951. Michele Helveston -----
- 3,952. Richard Slokom -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,953. Betty Flinchbaugh -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,954. Laurie Malec -----
- 3,955. David J. Williams -----
- 3,956. Jeanette Fivmenero -----
- 3,957. Catherine Ale -----
- 3,958. Marsha Tantaros -----
- 3,959. Patricia Greaves -----
- 3,960. Resident -----
- 3,961. Teri Brant -----
- 3,962. Josh Dwyer -----
- 3,963. Resident -----
- 3,964. Mary Stez -----
- 3,965. Anna Harland -----
- 3,966. Mike D. Smith -----
- 3,967. Sarah Selph -----
- 3,968. Megan Barber -----
National Parks 8-14
- 3,969. Joshua Johnson -----
- 3,970. Demetrius Harris -----
- 3,971. Marques Johnson -----
- 3,972. Steven Johnson -----
- 3,973. Greg Thompson -----
- 3,974. Barbara L. Briggs -----
- 3,975. David Klopfenstein -----
- 3,976. Virginia Fitzpatrick -----
- 3,977. Jennyfer Sgrignoli -----
- 3,978. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 3,979. Mary Katherine Frizzell -----
- 3,980. Roths Nanack -----
- 3,981. Charles Sage -----
- 3,982. Tom Skinter -----
- 3,983. Alexander Dyckman -----
- 3,984. Joe Gaspenetti -----
- 3,985. Trish Kerns -----
- 3,986. Caitlin Kelly-McNally -----
- 3,987. Mave Koethe -----
- 3,988. Darren Remsburg -----
- 3,989. Ed Mahon -----
- 3,990. Richard Frey -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 3,991. Carolyn Remsburg -----
- 3,992. Wanda Edwards -----
- 3,993. Claire Barone -----
- 3,994. Sheila Jastremski -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 3,995. Resident -----
- 3,996. Resident -----
- 3,997. Terry Reilly -----
- 3,998. Amanda Rogers -----
- 3,999. Resident -----
- 4,000. Mary Loto -----
- 4,001. Stephen Loto -----
- 4,002. Resident -----
- 4,003. Geneva Wilson -----
- 4,004. Peter Stone -----
Credit Trading 8-15

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,005. Resident -----
- 4,006. Delores Stump -----
- 4,007. Lawrence Bray, D.D., Th.D. -----
- 4,008. Debbie Mulligan -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,009. Elora MiDas -----
- 4,010. Resident -----
- 4,011. Priscilla Bray -----
- 4,012. Joe Siwarski, Jr. -----
- 4,013. Resident -----
- 4,014. Sister M. Philothea -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,015. Resident -----
- 4,016. Resident -----
- 4,017. Resident -----
- 4,018. Margaret Weaver -----
- 4,019. Libby Goldstein -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,020. Resident -----
- 4,021. Susan Das -----
- 4,022. Irene Pendze -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,023. Tony Kennedy -----
- 4,024. Michelle Coralle -----
- 4,025. Katherine M. Richardson -----
- 4,026. Gary Brayell -----
- 4,027. Corrine Koronkiewicz -----
- 4,028. Franklin Webb -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,029. S. O'Donnell -----
- 4,030. Christopher Kelly -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,031. Lauren DeCarolis -----
- 4,032. Nancy Jelen -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,033. Simone Bennett -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,034. David Gelzer, Ph.D. -----
- 4,035. Wayne Yeisley -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,036. Donna Witzleber -----
- 4,037. William Lund -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,038. James Doty -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,039. William Bluhm -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,040. Pam Detrixhe -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

We cannot live without clean water.

I am writing in support of the state moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. Coal-fired power plants are the largest unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

The technology exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading. With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

- 4,041. Daniel B. Garity -----
- 4,042. Michael Bornstein -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,043. Arlene Humphrey -----
- 4,044. Hyemi Choi -----
- 4,045. Roseanne Scanlin -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,046. Resident -----
- 4,047. Paulette Ancolli -----
- 4,048. Katherine Archibald -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,049. Resident -----
- 4,050. Chutph M. Grey -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,051. Melanie Gurdware -----

4,052. Resident -----

4,053. William McNeil -----

PA Resident 8-14

4,054. Kara Keough -----

4,055. Resident -----

4,056. Sherry Chester -----

4,057. Jenny Yang -----

4,058. Dorothea Carlin -----

4,059. Maddie Fronell -----

4,060. Tracy Bosa -----

4,061. Gregg Full -----

4,062. Helen Briuk -----

4,063. Patrick M. Myers -----

4,064. Resident -----

4,065. Catherine Marten -----

4,066. R. Katz -----

4,067. Resident -----

4,068. David Myers -----

4,069. Resident -----

4,070. Stephanie Cavaliere -----

4,071. Sherry Seese -----

National Parks 8-15

4,072. Elizabeth Thornton -----

4,073. Joseph Macavoy -----

4,074. Jon Abraham -----

4,075. Monica C. Rogozinski -----

PA Resident 8-14

4,076. Marian Weaver -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,077. Resident -----

- 4,078. Marie T. Dvogen -----

- 4,079. Thomas Miller -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,080. Kristin Hansen -----

- 4,081. Dana Wilson -----

- 4,082. Jannice Mull -----
National Parks 8-14
- 4,083. George Schaefer -----

- 4,084. Karen Reynolds -----

- 4,085. Resident -----

- 4,086. Serina Toman -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,087. Joel Lorah -----

- 4,088. Resident -----

- 4,089. Helen Bergner -----

- 4,090. Julie Stidham -----

- 4,091. Deb Nagle -----

- 4,092. Daniel Shively -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,093. Dave Schuesler -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,094. Katrina Fike -----

- 4,095. Jennifer Dish -----

- 4,096. Resident -----

- 4,097. Molly McNamara Georgetown Univ. -----

- 4,098. June Ellis -----

- 4,099. Resident -----

- 4,100. Tom Duffin -----

- 4,101. Dave Markert -----

- 4,102. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,103. Sharon Direso -----

4,104. Nathan Majewski -----

4,105. Resident -----

4,106. Mary Merz -----

PA Resident 8-14

4,107. Heather Arata -----

4,108. Sherri Michalovic -----

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

Environmental Quality Board

P.O. Box 8477

Harrisburg, PA 17105-8477

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing in support of DEP's proposed regulation to REDUCE MERCURY EMISSIONS from the Pennsylvania's coal plants by 90 percent by 2015.

Mercury CONTAMINATION is a serious and growing problem in our national parks, and throughout the state of Pennsylvania, and yet affordable technology can control 90 percent of a coal plant's mercury emissions. There is NO ACCEPTABLE REASON to delay reducing mercury pollution in our state any longer. The only way we will see relief from mercury-contaminated waters and fish is to REQUIRE EACH SOURCE to do their part and dramatically REDUCE EMISSIONS.

Unless DEP's mercury rule is finalized, Pennsylvania plants will have the option to purchase mercury emission credits instead of technology to clean up their pollution. This is an UNACCEPTABLE APPROACH to a very serious problem. I am grateful that the DEP has proposed this much-needed plan to protect our national parks and future generations of people and wildlife in Pennsylvania from toxic mercury exposure.

Thank you very much.

4,109. Resident -----

4,110. Richard Seaft -----

4,111. Kate Jeffe -----

PA Resident 8-14

4,112. Judith Harland -----

4,113. Melissa Brennan -----

4,114. Darla Dadey -----

PA Resident 8-14

4,115. Kate deRiel -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,116. Anita Biers -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,117. Mark Schlegel -----
Credit Trading 8-14
- 4,118. Barbara B. Cheyney -----
- 4,119. Tiffany Capaferri -----
- 4,120. Andrea Daly -----
- 4,121. Cynthia Heller -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,122. Shelley Michael -----
- 4,123. Shannon O'Connell -----
- 4,124. Eleanor Pancoe -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,125. Ryan Little -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,126. Resident -----
- 4,127. Dana Wiley -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,128. Caitlin Quigley -----
- 4,129. Rebecca Malcolm-Naib -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,130. Stephanie McCullough -----
- 4,131. Resident -----
- 4,132. Denise Prentice -----
PA Resident 8-14
- 4,133. Katie Crowley -----
- 4,134. Resident -----
- 4,135. Sarah Landenwitsch -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,136. Carol A. Wilson -----
- 4,137. Patty Orr -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

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

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing in support of DEP's proposed regulation to reduce mercury emissions from the Pennsylvania's coal plants by 90 percent by 2015.

Mercury contamination is a serious and growing problem in our national parks, and throughout the state of Pennsylvania, and yet affordable technology can control 90 percent of a coal plant's mercury emissions. There is no acceptable reason to delay reducing mercury pollution in our state any longer. The only way we will see relief from mercury-contaminated waters and fish is to require each and every source to do their part and dramatically reduce emissions.

Unless DEP's mercury rule is finalized, Pennsylvania plants will have the option to purchase mercury emission credits instead of technology to clean up their pollution. This is an unacceptable approach to a very serious problem. I am grateful that the DEP has proposed this much-needed plan to protect our national parks and future generations of people and wildlife in Pennsylvania from toxic mercury exposure.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Patty Orr
108 W Market Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17107
4,138. Barbara Hearne -----

4,139. Sharon Bleice -----
PA Resident 8-15

4,140. Resident -----

4,141. Meranda Mosher -----
National Parks 8-14

4,142. Sandy Pellegrino -----

4,143. Muriel Schultz -----

4,144. John and Patty Knebels -----

4,145. Elaine Radiss -----
National Parks 8-14

4,146. David Collins -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,147. Andrew D. Moore -----

4,148. Jessica Jones -----

4,149. Eileen Conner -----
National Parks 8-15

4,150. Robert Brown -----
National Parks 8-14

4,151. Sean Quinn -----

4,152. Wayne Laubscher -----
National Parks 8-14

4,153. Coralie Moorhead -----

4,154. David Blauch -----

4,155. Stephen Carter -----
Credit Trading 8-15

4,156. Jean Riddle Collins -----
National Parks 8-14

4,157. Gloria B. Munsell -----

4,158. Clare Szilagyi -----
Credit Trading 8-14

4,159. Sue Thompson -----
National Parks 8-15

4,160. Resident -----

4,161. Marian Stevens -----

4,162. C. B. Tustin -----

4,163. Kelly Cahill -----

4,164. Lorraine McKenna -----

4,165. Michael Mannix -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing to support DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015.

As a science teacher, I know the technology exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading.

With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that our PA state decision-makers take the lead to enforce clean air standards. For the children's sake.

4,166. Melanie Govan -----

4,167. Kate Cummings -----

4,168. David P.L. Jones -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,169. Rich Shiner -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,170. J. P. Maden -----

- 4,171. Edith McDonough -----

- 4,172. Kevin McDonough -----

- 4,173. Nick Montegna -----

- 4,174. Maryann Hagan -----

- 4,175. Kathy Coleman Martin -----

- 4,176. Mark Hanson -----

- 4,177. Emily Freedina -----

- 4,178. Debbie Taylor -----

- 4,179. Resident -----

- 4,180. Mara and Ed Meehan -----

- 4,181. Marian Meyer -----

- 4,182. Mark McKee -----

- 4,183. Mabel Bunkes -----

- 4,184. Maureen Pearlman -----

- 4,185. Resident -----

- 4,186. Ellen B. White -----

- 4,187. Bethann C. Lynch -----

- 4,188. Joanne Donofrio -----

- 4,189. James Donofrio -----

- 4,190. Dan Spade -----

- 4,191. Tom Shannon -----

- 4,192. Luke Moderacki -----

- 4,193. Keith Heinerichs -----

- 4,194. Samantha Walker -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,195. Kim Finnegan -----

4,196. Resident -----

4,197. Andre Landis -----

4,198. Joan O'Connor -----

4,199. philip baker -----

I am writing to express my support of mercury emission reduction requirements for electric generating units(#7-405) as someone who cares about the outdoors, fish, wildlife, and future generations; who will benefit from these requirements.

4,200. William Riccio, Jr. -----

4,201. Christina Liberatore -----

4,202. Resident -----

4,203. Resident -----

4,204. Resident -----

4,205. Eleanor Langan -----

4,206. Nancy McCallum -----

4,207. Robert McLaughlin -----

4,208. Mark Dawson -----

4,209. Cynthia McKenna -----

4,210. Resident -----

4,211. Kacie Fry -----

4,212. Amy Reese -----

4,213. Jo Anna Larkin -----

4,214. Resident -----

4,215. Monica Wyant -----

4,216. Resident -----

4,217. Stephanie Barbagallo -----

4,218. Resident -----

4,219. Kait Brumble -----

4,220. Linda Brumble -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,221. Michael Blanche -----
- 4,222. Dionna Britt -----
- 4,223. Resident -----
- 4,224. Judy Strickler -----
- 4,225. Resident -----
- 4,226. Charlotte Jordan -----
- 4,227. Jim Pauciello -----
- 4,228. Resident -----
- 4,229. Dan Datillo -----
- 4,230. Maria Tartaglia -----
- 4,231. Deborah Steanup -----
- 4,232. Amy Chambers -----
- 4,233. Resident -----
- 4,234. Resident -----
- 4,235. Resident -----
- 4,236. Nicole Burke -----
- 4,237. Sophie Buttiens -----
- 4,238. Nicole Rydel -----
- 4,239. Jennifer Clausen -----
- 4,240. Resident -----
- 4,241. Crystal Cable -----
- 4,242. Daniel Blonarowycz -----
- 4,243. Jami Rydel -----
- 4,244. Rob Rydel -----
- 4,245. Charles Newmiller -----
- 4,246. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,247. Beverly Schoenberg -----
- 4,248. Sandra Marker -----
- 4,249. Anne Ward -----
- 4,250. A. Kendrick -----
- 4,251. Helen Klussman -----
- 4,252. Rachel Creagan -----
- 4,253. Shuler Freedman -----
- 4,254. Jessica Wonilou -----
- 4,255. Robert Wonilou -----
- 4,256. Michael Massey -----
- 4,257. Resident -----
- 4,258. Matthew Roberts -----
- 4,259. Bryan Roberts -----
- 4,260. Joe Adams -----
- 4,261. Jake Schoneker -----
- 4,262. Resident -----
- 4,263. Judith Talley -----
- 4,264. George Louis -----
- 4,265. Juae Kim -----
- 4,266. Resident -----
- 4,267. Resident -----
- 4,268. Resident -----
- 4,269. J. Myers -----
- 4,270. Marilyn Rowan -----
- 4,271. Chris Irwin -----
- 4,272. Lisa Wilkeln -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,273. Gina, Bob & Lucas Birzes -----
- 4,274. Harry Hargesheimer -----
- 4,275. Pat Hargesheimer -----
- 4,276. Tracey Skaler -----
- 4,277. Helen Nickle -----
- 4,278. Carolyn Lester -----
- 4,279. Elaine Harris -----
- 4,280. Shae Dahmer -----
- 4,281. Dale Peck -----
- 4,282. Noreen Peck -----
- 4,283. Christine Peck -----
- 4,284. Lisa Hernandez -----
- 4,285. Richard Rowan -----
- 4,286. Resident -----
- 4,287. Alexis Powell -----
- 4,288. Heather Crist -----
- 4,289. Resident -----
- 4,290. Resident -----
- 4,291. Resident -----
- 4,292. William Fagan -----
- 4,293. Mia Mangrum -----
- 4,294. Melissa Baxter -----
- 4,295. Jessie Auritt -----
- 4,296. Resident -----
- 4,297. Resident -----
- 4,298. Joseph Marinelli -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,299. Vinny Naccarelli -----
- 4,300. Resident -----
- 4,301. Resident -----
- 4,302. Resident -----
- 4,303. Suzanne Stimpler -----
- 4,304. Eric Goodsteir -----
- 4,305. Resident -----
- 4,306. K. Weens -----
- 4,307. C. Weens -----
- 4,308. Peter Carroll -----
- 4,309. Robert Blaney -----
- 4,310. Resident -----
- 4,311. Resident -----
- 4,312. Resident -----
- 4,313. Michele Schappule -----
- 4,314. Walter Antkiewicz -----
- 4,315. B. Campbell -----
- 4,316. Karen Dougherty -----
- 4,317. Trish Van Giorden -----
- 4,318. Resident -----
- 4,319. Kim Bertino -----
- 4,320. Colleen Vogel -----
- 4,321. Lauren Plummer -----
- 4,322. Renee Bair -----
- 4,323. Resident -----
- 4,324. Manish Gopal -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,325. Mitchell Allen -----
- 4,326. Karen Sawyer -----
- 4,327. Paula Bryan -----
- 4,328. Resident -----
- 4,329. Resident -----
- 4,330. John & Lynn Walter -----
- 4,331. Resident -----
- 4,332. Resident -----
- 4,333. Donald Price -----
- 4,334. Dolores Price -----
- 4,335. Resident -----
- 4,336. Resident -----
- 4,337. Resident -----
- 4,338. Resident -----
- 4,339. Resident -----
- 4,340. Louis Shapiro -----
- 4,341. Lauren McDevitt -----
- 4,342. Justin Nickle -----
- 4,343. Resident -----
- 4,344. Resident -----
- 4,345. Resident -----
- 4,346. Resident -----
- 4,347. Joseph Berrang -----
- 4,348. Bernadette Barnhurst -----
- 4,349. W. Barnhurst -----
- 4,350. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,351. Kevin Davis -----
- 4,352. Kathleen Hughes -----
- 4,353. Brendan Delgatto -----
- 4,354. Paul Hisey -----
- 4,355. Residents -----
- 4,356. Emily Swangner -----
- 4,357. Brian Nusspickel -----
- 4,358. Resident -----
- 4,359. Resident -----
- 4,360. Gary Rea -----
- 4,361. C.J. Norton -----
- 4,362. Jeff Ingerman -----
- 4,363. Kevin Peeler -----
- 4,364. Matthew Silvey -----
- 4,365. Jim Hindorff -----
- 4,366. Resident -----
- 4,367. Marcella Adams -----
- 4,368. Resident -----
- 4,369. Resident -----
- 4,370. Frances Kenney -----
- 4,371. Julia Murphy -----
- 4,372. Resident -----
- 4,373. Resident -----
- 4,374. Resident -----
- 4,375. Lynn Booth -----
- 4,376. Dawn Fanning -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,377. Resident -----
- 4,378. Resident -----
- 4,379. Teresa Kennedy -----
- 4,380. Resident -----
- 4,381. Resident -----
- 4,382. C. Johnsonbaugh -----
- 4,383. Maryann Volpe -----
- 4,384. Residents -----
- 4,385. Resident -----
- 4,386. George Davis -----
- 4,387. Diane DiFelice -----
- 4,388. Resident -----
- 4,389. Resident -----
- 4,390. Michael Mickle -----
- 4,391. Alex Micklo -----
- 4,392. Resident -----
- 4,393. Jessica Thomas -----
- 4,394. Joe Thomas -----
- 4,395. J. Thomas -----
- 4,396. Kathrine Fischer -----
- 4,397. Sue & Mike Malone -----
- 4,398. Jake -----
- 4,399. Andy Danilchick -----
- 4,400. Harry Kilpatrick -----
- 4,401. Eleanor Wertman -----
- 4,402. Sandra Bennett -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,403. Katy Kenney -----
- 4,404. Robert Moyer -----
- 4,405. Peter Burgess -----
- 4,406. H. Gerald Shillady -----
- 4,407. Rick Coalson -----
- 4,408. Catherine Green -----
- 4,409. Katherine LoRusso -----
- 4,410. Suzanne Boyer -----
- 4,411. Anthony Feld -----
- 4,412. Resident -----
- 4,413. Sivagnanam -----
- 4,414. Charles Taylor -----
- 4,415. Donald Morgan -----
- 4,416. Carole Scott -----
- 4,417. M. Stafford -----
- 4,418. SAbrina Krouse -----
- 4,419. Judy Persing -----
- 4,420. Karl & Jennifer Woodeshick -----
- 4,421. Tisha Fromal -----
- 4,422. Connie Meyer -----
- 4,423. Debra Travers -----
- 4,424. Tim Travers -----
- 4,425. Resident -----
- 4,426. Vanessa Behl -----
- 4,427. Daniel Behl -----
- 4,428. Elizabeth Rogers -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,429. Andrea Shearn -----
- 4,430. Resident -----
- 4,431. Bruce Hetrick -----
- 4,432. Diane Mascuilli -----
- 4,433. Mae Floyd -----
- 4,434. Jim Schneider -----
- 4,435. Ben Parfitt -----
- 4,436. Resident -----
- 4,437. Alice Pearson -----
- 4,438. Marianne Sanville -----
- 4,439. Nina Sabatino -----
- 4,440. Danielle Miller -----
- 4,441. Laurie Keen -----
- 4,442. Renee Brown -----
- 4,443. Joe Seefeldi -----
- 4,444. Resident -----
- 4,445. Bernard Gowen -----
- 4,446. Marcia Pippin -----
- 4,447. Evelyn Gowen -----
- 4,448. Rhoda Romanowski -----
- 4,449. Ezra Krendel -----
- 4,450. Ray Pipper -----
- 4,451. Dr. Carl Grossman -----
- 4,452. John Whitelan -----
- 4,453. Marilyn Sobel -----
- 4,454. Ben Sobel -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,455. Bonnie & Gary Smith -----
- 4,456. Margret Skitarelic -----
- 4,457. Connie Woodring -----
- 4,458. Toks Adegboro -----
- 4,459. Kevin Cadigan -----
- 4,460. Beth Formica -----
- 4,461. Kari Fredrickson -----
- 4,462. Laura Fredrickson -----
- 4,463. Mary Barnes -----
- 4,464. E.A. Trembly, II -----
- 4,465. Jennifer & Tom Long -----
- 4,466. Jessie Morra -----
- 4,467. Marilyn Buberick -----
- 4,468. Resident -----
- 4,469. Resident -----
- 4,470. Resident -----
- 4,471. S. Muts -----
- 4,472. Muriel Schultz -----
- 4,473. Allie McAllister -----
- 4,474. Christine Tellhart -----
- 4,475. Ian Post -----
- 4,476. Jeremiah Friday -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation
Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing in support of the state moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. Coal-fired power plants are the largest unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

The technology exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading.

Please help to support our waterways.

- 4,477. Resident -----

- 4,478. Kathleen Taylor -----

- 4,479. Anna Hallowell -----

- 4,480. Carol Matthews -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,481. Laura Horsey -----

- 4,482. Ashcon Zand -----

- 4,483. Resident -----

- 4,484. S. Shah -----

- 4,485. Lora Watkins -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,486. Charlene Kuortz -----

- 4,487. Malcolm Johnson -----

- 4,488. Lewis Kwett -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,489. Linda Betz -----

- 4,490. Ian Swain -----

- 4,491. Josh Briston -----

- 4,492. Donna Grieff -----

- 4,493. Elizabeth Sullivan -----

- 4,494. Richard Sullivan -----

- 4,495. Alexis Sullivan -----

- 4,496. Richard Sullivan -----

- 4,497. John Schieber -----
National Parks 8-15

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,498. Greg Sonderschafer -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,499. Mindi Baurer -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,500. Rebecca Patterson -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,501. Erik Scheuermann -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,502. Dean Cave -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,503. Lisa Miller -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,504. Clifford S. Wagner -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,505. Elizabeth Etterich -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,506. Edward Sinkler -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,507. Jan Davie -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,508. Kimberly Evans -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,509. Michael Schapoehler -----
PA Resident 8-15
- 4,510. E A Jasiewicz -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,511. Jackie Trate -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,512. James Maynard -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,513. Eva Monheim -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,514. Joe Friend -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,515. Cheryl Parsons -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am in strong support of the sponsored letter below. With our federal government paralyzed with respect to taking much meaningful positive action to even keep our environment in a state of status quo, it is vital that the states step in. I teach public school and can see for myself each year that our children are less and less healthy. I believe there is a very strong link between mercury levels and the rising levels of autism in our children. I, myself have a chronic disease that was environmentally triggered. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE, be proactive and support Gov. Rendell's plan to reduce mercury in Pennsylvania.

I am writing in support of the state moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. Coal-fired power plants are the largest unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

The technology exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading. With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

- 4,516. Maude Kent -----
Credit Trading 8-15

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,517. Andrew Clarke -----
Credit Trading 8-15

4,518. Judith Gabriel -----
National Parks 8-15

4,519. Brenda McCormick -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,520. Gwen Carlson -----
National Parks 8-15

4,521. Alden Small -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

The mercury pollution rule proposed by the federal government fails to protect the health of Pennsylvanians. The swapping arrangements essentially allow the industry to make little or no change in mercury emissions for the indefinite future. In light of that, DEP is to be congratulated for taking steps needed to bring about real change.

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

No proposal is perfect. There is probably room for some flexibility. The Commonwealth should consider making help available to industry overcome some of the uncertainty about deploying new technology with a hard and fast target level required, and to allay the fears about jobs expressed by the unions. That said, we must be proactive and expeditious in bringing mercury emission levels down.

4,522. Deanne O'Donnell -----
National Parks 8-15

4,523. Christa Vanderbilt -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,524. Judith Henckel -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,525. Deborah Heacock -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,526. Meagan Grega -----
National Parks 8-15

4,527. Debra Wontor -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,528. Catherine Mott -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,529. Donald Waltman -----
National Parks 8-15

4,530. Melvin Gilbert, Jr. -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,531. Kay Martin -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,532. Joseph Ditty -----
National Parks 8-15

4,533. Linda Fronzoli -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,534. Lowell Gilbert -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,535. Kathryn Stacy -----
National Parks 8-15

4,536. Diane Pilotti -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,537. Ann Kiefer -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,538. John Brian -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,539. Diane Braun -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,540. Judy McCullough -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,541. Joli Schroeder -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,542. Debbie Horan -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,543. Mark & Nancy Wolfe -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,544. Suzanne Comer -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,545. Alyson Hoffman -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,546. Ann Vallejo -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,547. William Wilkinson -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,548. Gregory Barnes -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,549. Kristin Hannum Brenner -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,550. Charles Hagerty -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,551. Linda Fitz -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,552. John Strauch -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,553. Melvin Gilbert -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,554. Lisa Stewart -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,555. Nelson Gilbert -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,556. Craig Church -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,557. Barbara Docs -----
National Parks 8-15
- 4,558. Robert Grubb -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,559. Bonnie Rhoads -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,560. Desiree Wosochlo -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,561. David Dunn -----
Credit Trading 8-15
- 4,562. Herman & Ida Sheriff -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,563. Barney Gilbert -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,564. Alannah Gabriel -----

National Parks 8-15

4,565. Martin Gilbert -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,566. Kerrie Doree -----

National Parks 8-15

4,567. Philomena Morello -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,568. Matthew Hornak -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,569. Beverly Hornak -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,570. Larry Hall -----

National Parks 8-15

4,571. Lori Giagnacova -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,572. Frank X Kleshinski -----

National Parks 8-15

4,573. Scott Szoke -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,574. Christina Blackwood -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,575. Marie Guimara -----

National Parks 8-15

4,576. Frances Tilton -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,577. Virginia Sorensen -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,578. Lynette Murray -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,579. Carla Mannix -----

Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

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

I know we have the technology and the money to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent. Now all we need is the will to do it!

With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

4,580. Morton Parker -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,581. Charles Aston -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,582. Shayna Kohan -----

National Parks 8-15

4,583. Diana Rudloff -----

Fish After Fly 8-17

4,584. David Dunkleberger -----

National Parks 8-15

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,585. Michael Hornak -----
Fish After Fly 8-17

4,586. David Smith -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a long-time Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. As you well know, PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for all life forms including our children, not to mention the fish across our state that 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.

4,587. M. A. Morrison -----
National Parks 8-15

4,588. Judith George -----

To Environmental Quality Board Members:

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

I am writing to voice SUPPORT for the Department of Environmental Protection's mercury reduction plan for power plants. Pennsylvania needs aggressive action to reduce mercury pollution from power plants - our state's largest source of mercury pollution - and DEP is on the right track.

As someone who values Pennsylvania's outdoor recreation opportunities, I am deeply concerned about the levels of mercury in our fish. Mercury pollution poses a serious threat not only to our children and families, but also to the fish, wildlife, and outdoor heritage we treasure here in the Commonwealth. I want to see Pennsylvania's leaders stand up and respond to this severe pollution problem with the level of urgency it requires.

It is time for meaningful action to control the mercury pollution that is contaminating our environment, and DEP's mercury rule for power plants is just what's needed.

Explain!

The testimony presented by Sen. Marv J. White's committee is very convincing and refutes what you say.

4,589. Jane Pellowski, MMS Medical Mission Sisters -----

4,590. Helene Brown -----

4,591. Therese Connolly -----

4,592. Juanita Ortega -----

4,593. Marian Augustine -----

4,594. Mary Carlisle -----

4,595. Virginia Kirk -----

4,596. Tanya Brittingham -----

4,597. Jenny Karraker -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,598. Phil Manos -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,599. Nick Pauli -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,600. Stanley Kuzak -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,601. Enrico Corriere -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,602. Steve Harrity -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,603. Danny Deao -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,604. Joseph Toth -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,605. Richard Burkhardt -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,606. David Morris -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,607. Mel Bohince -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,608. Charles Braem -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,609. Robert Ross -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,610. Anthony Morell -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,611. Frank Pascoe -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,612. Lawrence Ault -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,613. Philip McConnell -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,614. John Zoretich -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,615. Jack Taylor -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,616. James ODenheimer -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,617. Dexter Ross -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,618. George Toth -----
Fish After Fly 8-17
- 4,619. Jeff Hudson -----
Credit Trading 8-16
- 4,620. Marguerite Nicholson-Schenk -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,621. Liz Robinson -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,622. Mario D'Achille -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,623. Margaret Gerrity -----
PA Resident 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,624. Norman Mills -----

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. From a lifelong fisherman, Father of 3, Grandfather of 8

4,625. Jeffrey Murdock -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,626. Mary Lou Bulseco -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,627. Kathy Parker -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,628. Robert Krause -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,629. Marty B O'Malley -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,630. Tom & Carrie VanDyke -----

Coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania emit nearly 8,000 pounds of mercury into the environment each year. In July 2000, the National Academy of Sciences released a report that concluded that each year in the United States some 60,000 children are born at risk for neurodevelopmental problems owing to prenatal exposure to mercury. As concerned PA residents, we live near two coal-fired power plants. We are worried about the exposure to our children. We need the most stringent regulations to reduce mercury pollution. Our childrens' futures are too important to risk.

4,631. Eugene Fehr -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,632. Amy Sullivan -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,633. Jamie Kistler -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,634. Alice Hager -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,635. Sergio Rivas -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,636. Samantha Miller -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,637. Thomas Honeyman -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,638. Thomas Pollock -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,639. Eric Holte -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,640. Warren Lewis -----

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!

As father of a two year old girl, and someone who enjoys a good fish dinner, I feel this is a matter that should be addressed.

Thank you.

4,641. Stacey Walls -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,642. Scott Malec -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,643. Scott Boyer -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,644. Tammy Santiago -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,645. William Curnow -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,646. Susan Hagan -----

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

I am a mother of a 14 year old son. I want to be a grandmother someday of a healthy grandchild. Unless you take care of our environment, I don't know that healthy grandchildren will be possible for either of us.

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.

4,647. Suzanne Young -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,648. William Chapman -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,649. Virginia Byrne -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,650. Roy Scott -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,651. Ross Kronenbitter -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,652. Ruth Fauman-Fichman -----
PA Resident 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,653. William Shaw -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,654. Talia Schiff -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,655. Terry Cooney -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,656. Walter Long -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

I am writing in support of DEP's proposed regulation to reduce mercury emissions from the Pennsylvania's coal plants by 90 percent by 2015.

Mercury contamination is a serious and growing problem in our national parks, and throughout the state of Pennsylvania, and yet affordable technology can control 90 percent of a coal plant's mercury emissions. There is no acceptable reason to delay reducing mercury pollution in our state any longer. The only way we will see relief from mercury-contaminated waters and fish is to require each and every source to do their part and dramatically reduce emissions.

Unless DEP's mercury rule is finalized, Pennsylvania plants will have the option to purchase mercury emission credits instead of technology to clean up their pollution. This is an unacceptable approach to a very serious problem. I am grateful that the DEP has proposed this much-needed plan to protect our national parks and future generations of people and wildlife in Pennsylvania from toxic mercury exposure.

Thank you very much.

4,657. Geraldine Schmidt -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,658. Lisa Flack -----

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 am writing in support of DEP's proposed regulation to reduce mercury emissions from the Pennsylvania's coal plants by 90 percent by 2015.

Mercury contamination is a serious and growing problem in our national parks, and throughout the state of Pennsylvania, and yet affordable technology can control 90 percent of a coal plant's mercury emissions. There is no acceptable reason to delay reducing mercury pollution in our state any longer. The only way we will see relief from mercury-contaminated waters and fish is to require each and every source to do their part and dramatically reduce emissions.

Unless DEP's mercury rule is finalized, Pennsylvania plants will have the option to purchase mercury emission credits instead of technology to clean up their pollution. This is an unacceptable approach to a very serious problem. I am grateful that the DEP has proposed this much-needed plan to protect our national parks and future generations of people and wildlife in Pennsylvania from toxic mercury exposure.

Thank you very much.

4,659. Sarah Batchelor -----
National Parks 8-16

4,660. Dave Leibert -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,661. Barbara Barsky -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,662. Charlene Cannon -----

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

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 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. We cant afford to keep poluting.

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

Sincerely,

Charlene Cannon
4,663. James Marciano -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,664. Becki Walker -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,665. Audrey Fisher -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,666. Greg Senft -----
National Parks 8-16

4,667. Serena Fogelberg -----
National Parks 8-16

4,668. Resident -----

4,669. Resident -----

4,670. Resident -----

4,671. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,672. Resident -----

4,673. Resident -----

4,674. Debra Miller -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,675. Fidel Cruz -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,676. George N. Schok -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,677. Kaaren Lobel -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,678. Roger Hontz -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,679. Anne-Marie Mettus -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,680. Mary Kane -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,681. Peter Sinanian -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,682. Kristin Burr -----

Reduce mercury emissions

As a new mother and 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. Plants in PA are the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. Mercury is especially dangerous for pregnant women and children, and recent studies have suggested that even fish initially considered to be safe contain worrisome levels of mercury.

I urge you to require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions by enacting the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. The future of our state—our children—is at stake, and we must do our utmost to protect it.

Thank you.

4,683. Donna Miller -----

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

As a Pennsylvania resident and a parent, 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.

4,684. Mary Beth Strowe -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,685. Peter Norman -----

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!

Mercury is a persistent, acutely toxic poison and cannot be part of any trading scheme.

Thank you.

4,686. Martin Stockman -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,687. Marianne Novy -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,688. Dorothy Dawood -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,689. Josette Sadowska -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,690. Robert Johnson -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,691. Rita Seitzer -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,692. Kathi Quinn -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,693. Ellen Poist -----
National Parks 8-16

4,694. Marilyn Long -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,695. Lauren Hagan -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,696. Joan Fabrega -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,697. Jeffrey Lieberman -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,698. Susan Porter -----
National Parks 8-16

4,699. Karen Gilles -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,700. Jill Hamnett -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,701. Rodney Saylor -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,702. George Adams -----
National Parks 8-16

4,703. Jim Hunt -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,704. Catherine Hardison -----
National Parks 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,705. Judith Mirabella -----
National Parks 8-16

4,706. James Frank -----
Brain damage / 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'm somewhat confused about pollution trading. Does that mean someone from another state that has less mercury than we do comes here and takes the mercury from PA and moves it to their state? If not, aren't the utility companies buying the right to poison me? And if they are, why hasn't anyone asked me how much money I want to let them poison me? Does mercury cause brain damage? Maybe that's why I'm so confused, I've eaten fish that were caught in this state. Could you please email to me an explanation of pollution trading? Keep in mind that I may be brain damaged so please try to keep it simple and use small words.

Until then, 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. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Awaiting your reply.

Thank you
4,707. Lisa Giusti -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,708. L. Kim Egolf-Fox -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,709. Judith Hollinger -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,710. Larry Blankemeyer -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,711. Jeffrey Kosterich -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,712. Linda Ruggiero -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,713. Judy Faraklas -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,714. Robert Gluckman -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,715. Jennifer Reid-Holman & family -----

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. so we've got work to do here! We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are contaminated. Let's make Pennsylvania a better place environmentally for the people like me who choose to live and work here.

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 for doing the RIGHT thing for your constituents--and not just your contributors.

- 4,716. Nicole Devine -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,717. Nicole SanFillippo -----
Credit Trading 8-16
- 4,718. Dominique Baron -----
We need actual reductions in mercury - not tradable credits

Department of Environmental Protection
PA

Dear Department of Environmental Protection,

I strongly support the Department of Environmental Protection's proposed regulation to reduce mercury emissions from the state's coal plants. I applaud the DEP for taking bold action to address our state's largest source of toxic mercury pollution.

As someone who treasures the fish, wildlife and outdoor recreation opportunities in Pennsylvania, I am concerned about the high levels of mercury contamination in our environment. I want to see my state government take the aggressive action necessary to clean up our state's biggest mercury polluters.

Mercury contamination is a serious and growing problem in Pennsylvania, and yet affordable technology can control 90 percent of a coal plant's mercury emissions today. There is no justifiable reason to delay reducing mercury pollution in our state any longer. The only way we will see relief from mercury-contaminated waters and fish in Pennsylvania is to require each and every source to do their part and dramatically reduce emissions.

Unless DEP's mercury rule is finalized, Pennsylvania plants will have the option to purchase mercury emission credits instead of technology to clean up their pollution. This is an unacceptable approach to a very serious problem. I am grateful that the DEP has proposed this much-needed plan to protect future generations of people and wildlife in Pennsylvania from toxic mercury exposure.

Thank you very much.

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,719. Ronald Thrash -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,720. Lisa Hopkins -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,721. Brandon Potter -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,722. Wayne Truax -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,723. Jennifer Lively -----
National Parks 8-16
- 4,724. Cynthia Paetow -----
Credit Trading 8-17
- 4,725. Ann Sywensky -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,726. Beth Vogel -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,727. Connie Libricz -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,728. Diane Hollinger -----

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

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.

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

Sincerely,

Diane Hollinger
Unlisted
4,729. Deana Weaver -----

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

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 one of the presenters from the Harrisburg Hearing.

I recently received a letter from Senator MaryJo White, who sits on the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee. This letter indicates that Senator White has already made up her mind on how she will vote: against the tougher standards on mercury emissions preferred by PA DEP and supporting the weaker Federal Standards preferred by the polluters.

The FACT SHEET attached to her letter is clearly the information provided by the Power Industry lobbyists. I am particularly concerned by the letterhead on the fact sheet: Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee. Does Senator White speak for the whole Committee? If so, then why the facade of asking for public input?

Out of curiosity, I researched campaign contributions made to Senator White. Sure enough, the Senator's coffers are well enhanced by those who are polluting our environment.

Unfortunately, for the mercury-ingesting-breathing-public, we cannot afford to send thousands of dollars to those Senators who sit on this Committee formed to protect the public interest. All we can do is remember in November.

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

Sincerely,

- Deana Weaver
- 4,730. Arlene Baumann -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,731. Bruce Conrad -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,732. Dawn Scheets -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,733. Asha Vakil -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,734. Amy Kerlin -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,735. James Caine -----
PA Resident 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,736. Anthony A Capobianco -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17
- 4,737. Don Bradley -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,738. James Harven -----
PA Resident 8-16
- 4,739. Brian Christein -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,740. Aimee Cronin -----

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

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Aimee Cronin
4,741. Dorothy Alloway -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,742. Dan Kramer -----

Mercury Emission Reduction Requirement for. PA

As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury.

Thank you.
4,743. Bruce Carras -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,744. Cheryl Hostert -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,745. Theresa Poynter -----

National Parks 8-17

4,746. James Flanagan -----

Mercury Emissions

Please pass the proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. It is a disgrace that children and pregnant women can't eat fish now because of the mercury pollution. If that is current, what does the future hold? Please require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Thanks.

Your constituent
4,747. Alexander Hochner -----

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.

P.S. Do you really think the water you drink and swim in and the air that you breathe is any different from the rest of the population? Do you really want to secure our dependence on foreign water and air (a la SpaceBalls)? Do you really suppose that would be healthy for the economy, let alone the planet?

Sincerely

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,748. Christopher Kelley -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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 Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) does not require sufficient mercury reductions by electric generating facilities, particularly in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is currently the number two purchaser in the nation of pollution credits therefore, the only result of the CAMR for Pennsylvania will be the continuing purchase of pollution credits rather than any meaningful reduction in mercury. In fact, Pennsylvania also ranks number two in the nation for mercury air pollution from coal fired electric power plants. This is actually an increase from 2004.

It is simply unconscionable for anyone to deny the severe negative health impact of mercury, especially to the most vulnerable members of our society, unborn and young babies. It is quite clear that the electric utilities put profits ahead of the health and welfare of people. The CAMR simply does not provide sufficient impetus for these companies to reduce mercury emissions. Additionally, according to several studies, the bulk of mercury reductions that may occur under the CAMR will not be realized until 2030.

Currently, the CAMR is under review by the courts and if the courts throw out the CAMR, then there will not be any mechanism to reduce mercury emissions; unless the strict PA DEP rules are adopted and enforced.

To reiterate, I fully support the adoption of the PA DEP mercury reduction rules and encourage the IRRC, EQB and the PA legislature to enact and enforce this rule over the CAMR.

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

Sincerely,

Christopher T Kelley
4,749. Alberto Cacicedo -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,750. Debra Howe -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,751. James Callan -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,752. Dan Benster -----
PA Resident 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,753. Brenda Factor -----
WE NEED THESE REGULATONS< JUST DO IT^ NOW IS THE TIME

Pls. vote for 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
4,754. Harriet Stone -----
Reduce Mercury Emissions

Our Dept of Environmental Protection has proposed strong standards for reducing mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants. These standards should be adopted immediately. For our children's health and as responsible stewards of the land, we should be doing everything possible to keep this severe pollutant out of our air, our water, and our bodies.

Please support DEP's proposed rule to reduce mercury emissions.

Sincerely
4,755. kenneth geibel happy hunters -----
pleasc reduce mercury pollution in pa

4,756. Carol Roper -----
Mercury Emission Reduction is extremely important to me!

I understand that no issue is simple, and complexity makes decisions difficult. However, there are some issues, such as mercury contaminations, which should be dramatically reduced and as quickly as possible. Please understand that 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.

This should be a non-negotiable issue. We must consider our health and the health of our children first and foremost. Consequently, 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. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

Sincerely

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,757. Carol Layton -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,758. Janice Sullivan -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,759. Aline Otero -----

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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 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.

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

Sincerely,

Aline Otero

4,760. Clifford Hritz -----

Credit Trading 8-17

4,761. Cheryl Mychaluk -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,762. Christopher Sowa -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,763. Christina Lawless -----

Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,764. Eric Wilden -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,765. Ani Hussian -----

PA Resident 8-16

4,766. Frank Soldano -----

PA Resident 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,767. Nancy Smerecki -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,768. hajebi50@yahoo.com Nasrin Rafi -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,769. Arlene Grubbs -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

We need to take better care of the earth we live on and the life it sustains. Too often politics and expediency take the place of decisions based on strong science. Mercury is a well known carcinogen and is particularly potent to small children and the unborn. Please help Pennsylvania be among the vanguard in protecting its people and lands from mercury pollution and reduce mercury emission in the shortest possible time frame.

Thank you.

4,770. Janice Maiatico -----
PA Resident 8-16

4,771. Kelly McFadden -----
National Parks 8-17

4,772. Court Gould -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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.

Environmental protections such as the mercury rule help improve the economy rather than serve as a detriment. The Commonwealth, in order to compete in the global economy, needs to be a place of choice to live, work and play. Regions that excel in blending environmental protection, social justice, and economic development will be the international magnets for investment and talent.

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

Sincerely,

Court Gould
4,773. Asuman Baskan -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,774. Emmeline Altschul -----
Credit Trading 8-16

4,775. Matthew Reitman -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,776. Andrew Kalan -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,777. Colby Martin -----
PA Resident 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,778. Amy Howe -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-16

4,779. Robert E. Bish -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,780. Olga Guerra -----
August 17, 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 most important job of government is to protect its citizens. The lives and health of your constituents are endangered by mercury pollution and it is your job as an elected official to eliminate hazards from the air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat.

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

4,781. Marcia Bonta -----
August 17, 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.

It's an absolute disgrace that 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.

As the aunt of a child suffering from Ausperger's Syndrome, probably as a result of mercury damage from his mother's milk, it is an outrage that we can't do more to prevent this.

As a naturalist/writer, I am also deeply concerned about the effect mercury is having on wildlife.

Please do the right thing and bring Pennsylvania into the 21st century by reducing mercury reductions from coal-fired plants in our state

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,782. Beverly DeCer -----
PLEASE!! Cut Mercury emissions ASAP- (#7-405)

It is criminal what industry can get away with-there surely must be the technology!!

There should be no question that this legislature will pass,

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.
4,783. Carl Mariani -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,784. Cathy Greenland -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As a Pennsylvania resident and taxpayer, 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 that 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! As a mom and pregnant woman, I implore you to do your job and protect us.

Thank you.
4,785. Brianne Brown -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,786. Allyson de Groat -----
National Parks 8-16

4,787. David Williams -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,788. Leslie Aizenman -----
Credit Trading 8-16

4,789. Mary Richards -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,790. Cheryl Zang -----
National Parks 8-16

4,791. Averill Shepps -----

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

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.

We simply must reduce the quantity of this toxic chemical in our environment and do it as soon as possible for all our sakes.

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

Sincerely,

Avarill Shanno
4,792. Marnie Bergman -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,793. Alan Haney -----
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.

The present situation is ridiculous- we have the technology to clean the coal-burning power plants, it should be used!

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.
4,794. Jeff Hudson -----
Credit Trading 8-16

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,795. Ryan Clay -----
August 17, 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.

Please protect PA enviroment. I love to live here, and dont want my kids to grow up in a polluted world.

Take a stand against big power companies to protect us all.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule

4,796. Claudia Steele -----
National Parks 8-17

4,797. Neil J. Nitzberg -----
August 17, 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 industry's assertion that smoke-stack emissions do not settle to earth until they've dissipated for hundreds of miles is absurd, and not worth betting on regarding a neurotoxin such as mercury. Policies consistent with the "spread-it-around-until- it-dissipates" argument is what has allowed many troublesome pollutants to ultimately concentrate and come back to bite us in the collective rears. The areas with the highest concentrations correspond to those places downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants. That Pennsylvania is one of the "top" countrywide producers of mercury air-pollution (behind only Texas) is appalling and must be reversed.

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

4,798. Mary Gainer -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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 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.

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

4,799. Michael Boyle -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,800. Peter Adams -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,801. Michael Showe -----
When Rachel Carson wrote "Silent Spring", we banned DDT to protect our birds and other wildlife, at great cost to agriculture.

Now we recognize the mercury is a threat not only to wildlife, but to our own children. We now ban lead in paint and leaded gasoline & we should ban the emission of mercury from our coal-burning power plants. Both of these heavy metals have the same effects--they damage the brains of our growing children.

As a Pennsylvania resident, as a cancer research scientist, I strongly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. If anything, I think the allowed time period is too long and the final limit too high.

Trading rules for mercury will allow our power plants to continue to put our children at risk. They should be opposed.

Please enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Thank you.

4,802. Deanna Steich -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,803. Amy Howe -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,804. Stanley Hoffman -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,805. Jon Clark -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,806. Shannon Null -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,807. Myrna Pressman -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,808. Diane Boyer -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,809. Melody Kraus -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,810. Bruce Bouchard -----

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

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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.

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.

4,811. Lorena Anderson -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,812. Boomer Mitzel -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,813. Denise Hayes -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,814. Donna Cuthbert -----
PA Resident 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,815. Alice Deeny -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,816. Corrine Kucirka -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,817. Amy Gewirtzman -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,818. Deane Rosen -----
National Parks 8-17
- 4,819. Melissa Stanalonis -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
- 4,820. Joanne Konick-McMahan -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
- 4,821. Ed Brown -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17
- 4,822. Jay McGinley -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
- 4,823. Jennifer Harayda -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Jennifer Harayda
749 Pine Top Dr
Bethlehem, PA 18017-1824

August 17, 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.

As a mother, mercury related health issues are a top concern for me. Mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants affects health. 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.

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.

Please keep our babies and children safe. Let them get off to the best start they can, lower mercury emissions now.

Thank you for your time.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

Sincerely,

Jennifer Haravda
4,824. Leona Donado -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,825. Colleen Frank -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,826. William Voigt, III -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,827. Gary A. Miller -----

Gary Miller

154 Sarah Drive

Altoona, PA 16601-9436

August 17, 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.

Do the right thing for the current and future citizens of our great State!

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

Sincerely,

4,828. Susan Warner -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,829. Ethel Kinkaid -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,830. Jennifer Hewish -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,831. Shirley Beningo -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
- 4,832. John Knapp -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,833. Beverly Rae -----

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

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 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.

As you know, 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,

~~Reverly Poe~~
4,834. Dennis Mingus -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
4,835. Jody Hall -----

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.

While employed at Foster Wheeler, I personally commuted with an engineer who was actively suffering from mercury poisoning. It was devastating and very difficult to watch as this middle-aged man deteriorated before my eyes. He was receiving the best of treatment to cleanse his system. I cannot say that he "recovered" since the effects seem longlasting.

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

Jody Hall

jodyhallpa@msn.com

1845 Blossom Hill Rd

easton, PA 18040

4,836. Anne Hoban -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,837. Michael Gadowski -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,838. Kimberley Byk -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,839. Christine Hosie -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,840. Lauren Edwards -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,841. Karryn Lintelman -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Karryn Lintelman
437 Cedarville Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15224-2001

August 17, 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 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 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.

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

Sincerely,

Karryn Lintelman

4,842. Catherine Last -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,843. Margaret Perina -----

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

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,

4,844. Lori Strange -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,845. Joanne Ray -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,846. George Magaro Sr. -----

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

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. We the members of the Delaware River Shad Fisherman's Assoc. plead with you to stop this contamination of our waters,yes I said "OUR" no the companies that contaminate or use the waters for their use. Doctors tell us to eat more fish to stay and keep healthy,how can we do that with contaminated fish. The more contaminates in the waters will bring us back to the days of the great polution block in the Trenton/Phila. area. we the people of Penna. want cleaner waters now and demand that the polutions stop..

George Magaro Sr.
Pres. D.R.S.F.A.

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

Sincerely,

- George Magaro Sr.
610.433-1465
4,847. Jonathan Balcombe -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,848. Amanda Pavlo -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,849. Doris Williams -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,850. Harry Cade -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,851. Karen Williams -----
PA Resident 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,852. Resident -----

4,853. Henry Frank -----

Henry Frank
2763 Island Ave
Phila, PA 19153-2225

August 17, 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.

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

Sincerely,

4,854. Jon Levin -----

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

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,

Jon Levin
4,855. Fay Sausser -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,856. Harold Sausser -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,857. Robert Kiefer -----
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' (and grandkids') health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

4,858. William Reedy -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,859. Mary Monsulick -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,860. Richard Hill -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Dear Sir,

While I am a libertarian, there are some things the free market will not curtail. Since there is no market force to counter the waste products from coal, unless the coal industry can find a way to gather the emissions and sell the mercury. Perhaps you can suggest that so they coal industry doesn't moan and groan over oppressive regulation.

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 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. Our kids' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

4,861. Arthur Moraco -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,862. Glenn Frantz -----

Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,863. Mary Betz -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,864. Lisa Fasold -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,865. Patricia Conn -----

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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.

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

Sincerely

4,866. Era Buchanan -----

Fish After Fly 8-18

4,867. Ray Scheetz -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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.

All elected officials have a chance to set a precedence for all future generations in Pennsylvania. Your ruling will effect many lives. we MUST reduce the mercury in our environment. It is a very toxic and long lasting environmental pollutant. It is time to place ALL environmental issues to the forefront. technology exists, and scientist eagerly await the chance to provide energy without destroying our land or any part of the environment. START THE MOVEMENT!!

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 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.

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.

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.

- 4,868. Leonard Riotto -----
Fish After Fly 8-18
- 4,869. Helen Walker -----

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

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.

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,

Helen Walker
215-283-7338

4,870. Lawrence Alati -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,871. Susan Alati -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,872. Matthew Roedts -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,873. Gregory Durgin -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,874. Harry Harner -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,875. Mary Ellen Snyder -----

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

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.

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,

4,876. Rosemary Caolo -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,877. William Sherwood -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,878. Stephen Hoodak -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,879. Don Kogh -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,880. Philip Sholtis -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,881. Ward Yorks -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,882. Jeremiah Couey -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,883. Harold Kilgus -----
Fish After Fly 8-18

4,884. Rafael Gonzalez -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,885. Martin Boksenbaum -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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 proposed Pennsylvania rule requires plants in the state to reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and does not allow mercury trading, both providing much greater protection from this hazardous material than does the federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR). 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 menaces people, wildlife, our water, food, and air. We need significant reductions in the amount of mercury released into the environment - reductions of mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants is long overdue and should be done as quickly as possible. 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,
4,886. David Kenosian -----

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

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 damages health. Mercury pollution from power plants creates methylmercury, which poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. In addition, mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies. Even small amounts of mercury that is 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.

For all of these reasons, I am the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants.

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

Sincerely,

David Kenosian
4,887. Richard Fay -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,888. Phyllis Arbegast -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,889. Andrea Kalan -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,890. Mark Fichman -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,891. Ppaul Hauch -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,892. Matt Leisses -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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. This is particularly important to me as I will soon be a new father and my wife will be breast feeding.

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.

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

4,893. Janet Strashosky -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Mercury Reductions (#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.

Anything less is intolerable and 2015 is a generous timeframe to get these emissions under control. In fact, 8 more years of mercury pollution in Pennsylvania is 7 years too long.

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.

4,894. Philip Bagley -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,895. Jon Burkett -----

4,896. Lucinda McCallum -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,897. Resident -----

4,898. John Meredian -----

4,899. Resident -----

4,900. Karen McFerran -----

4,901. Margaret Abrams -----

4,902. Heather Garman -----

4,903. Marguerite Nicholson-Schenk -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,904. Karen Eckstein -----

4,905. Resident -----

4,906. john kmetz -----

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!

Maybe some day our children will be able to eat the fish from Pennsylvania stream.

We need your courage to give our kids a better world to live in.

Thank you and may the Good Lord guide you to the right decision for ALL Pennsylvanian.

4,907. Resident -----

4,908. Victoria Pye -----

4,909. Anthony Trigiani -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,910. Resident -----

4,911. Mike DellaPenna -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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.

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.

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

- 4,912. Resident -----

- 4,913. Sean McHugh -----

- 4,914. Chad Hetman -----
Credit Trading 8-17
- 4,915. Jack Feeney -----

- 4,916. Resident -----

- 4,917. Jason Dear -----

- 4,918. Marian Freed -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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.

You are surely aware of the health threat posed by mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants. These plants form methylmercury in, both wildlife and humans who eat fish which, as you know, has been touted for a number of years now as a very heart-healthy food. The problems that mercury cause are neurological, beginning in babies and in developing fetuses! The mother's blood, passed to the child in the form of breast milk, can be lethal, even in very small amounts. Scientists have determined that over 600,000 women of childbearing age in our country have blood levels of mercury higher than what is considered safe for their babies.

We have all heard the warning that consuming more than two meals of certain fish taken from Pennsylvania's lakes and rivers can be dangerous to our health. Over 200 samples of fish from Pennsylvania waters have been found to carry dangerous amounts of mercury.

The highest concentrations of these dangerous amounts of mercury in fish are found in areas downwind of mercury-spewing coal-fired power plants! For example, samples taken in Cambria County by the DEP revealed mercury levels 47 percent greater than mercury levels recorded at a sampling station in Tioga County, where mercury sources are not nearby. Further studies have revealed that mercury pollution can be cleaned up, resulting in significant drops in the mercury contamination of the area's fish.

It is unconscionable that our state of Pennsylvania is ranked number two in the nation for mercury pollution to the air from coal-fired power plants! Recently, the Environmental Protection Agency's Toxic Release Inventory ranked our state as second only to Texas in being the worst polluter in the nation!

Unfortunately, we cannot rely on the federal government to fix this particular problem. CAMR is not up to reducing our mercury pollution, according to the best estimates of the Congressional Research Service experts.

But fortunately, pollution controls are both available and affordable, and Pennsylvanians by an overwhelming majority support the state mercury rule. This is a win-win situation that must be taken advantage of! Pennsylvanians who care are counting on their policymakers to support and defend the Pennsylvania Mercury Reduction Rule.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,919. M. Strathmann -----

4,920. Dan Karney -----

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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,

Dan Karney
484-873-2021

4,921. Natalya Riehter -----

4,922. Patricia Picarella -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,923. Janet Kaufman -----

4,924. Frank O'Donnell -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,925. Mike McKeever -----

4,926. Michael W. Colwes -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,927. S. Haep -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,928. Charles Lownie Jr. -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,929. Margaret Cohen -----

4,930. Bob Vollmer -----

4,931. Christine Elenay -----

4,932. John Holland -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,933. Resident -----

4,934. Peter Koros -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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 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.

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.

4,935. Susan Luu -----

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

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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.

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,

Susan Luu

4,936. Robert Gallagher -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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 poses a major health threat to humans and wildlife, primarily from eating fish. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and 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.

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.

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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.

4,937. Warren Evans -----

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

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 are dismayed that Pennsylvania ranks second, next to Texas, in toxic air pollution from mercury. We strongly urge you to create a regulation that will reduce mercury emissions from coal-burning plants by 90% and eliminate mercury contaminated 'hot spots' in the area surrounding and downwind from these plants. This will help prevent toxic pollution of our natural environment, including wildlife and our food chain, and help to prevent neurological damage to humans, especially to developing fetuses and young children.

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

Sincerely,

4,938. Phyl Morello -----
August 17, 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.

As Pennsylvanians, we DO NOT want more mercury emissions in the air or water.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in support of the proposed rule for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants
4,939. Thomas Graves -----

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

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.

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 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,

Thomas Graves

4,940. Otto Lehrbach -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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.

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,941. Walter Place -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,942. Ron Gaydos -----
August 17, 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.

This is an extremely embarrassing distinction!!! Gone is the image of Pennsylvania as a pristine outdoor tourist destination until mercury emissions are reduced by current and even stronger emissions rules.

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

4,943. Steve Boust -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,944. Robert McCarthy -----
August 17, 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.

4,945. Michael Hoffberg -----
Hot Spots 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,946. Sidney Goldstein -----
Credit Trading 8-17

4,947. Richard S. Ehmann -----
August 17, 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 proposal (the federal Clean Air Mercury Rule or CAMR endorsed by opponents to the proposed rule is another example of 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. The concept of trading of credits in this killer leaves us at risk since Pennsylvania plants are usually 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. While it may be the legislature's function to legislate necessary changes those in the Legislature that oppose this Rule should reexamine their position. From a health standpoint we cannot afford CAMR in Pennsylvania!

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

4,948. Serilio Molina -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,949. Victor Furman -----

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

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.

Protect tax-payers from mercury. Keep Big Business in check and responsible for their actions.

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

Sincerely,

Victor Furman

4,950. Rev. Elizabeth Miller -----

Hot Spots 10P 8-17

4,951. Kevin Scott -----

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

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 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.

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 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)

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,

4,952. Richard D. Ludwig -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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.

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

4,953. Robert Ferry -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,954. Nancy Holman -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,955. Yuhanna Bishar -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,956. Rhona Danzeisen -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,957. Lynda Rose -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,958. Morris Zimmerman -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,959. Joyce Durkin -----
Credit Trading 8-17

4,960. Roy LaPlante -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,961. Mary McCloskey -----

As a Cadet girl scout leader, PTA President of the Owen J Roberts Middle School and 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 childrens health is at stake, and they deserve protection starting today!

Thank you.

4,962. Sandra Wilson -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,963. Robert Fink -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,964. Paco Verin -----

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

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.

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

Sincerely,

4,965. Tony Lemisch -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,966. Sara Steele -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,967. Wood Bouldin -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,968. Stuart Wells -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Please Reduce Mercury Emissions in PA

As a Pennsylvania resident with a young child, I whole heartedly support the DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. Because Pennsylvania is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. it is especially important to take steps to mitigate this serious health and environmental issue. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish from our state's waters are contaminated.

Please take steps to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. It is my hope that the DEP's mercury reduction proposal can be put into effect as soon as possible. Our children's health is at risk, we are responsible for their health safety!

Thank you.

4,969. Terri Mehofer -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,970. William Bellew -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,971. Stephen Baker -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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.

Dear Sirs and Madams;

I have grandchildre that I want to breath healthy air. Let's move forward to reduce mercury polution now maintain the status quo.

Thank you,
Stephen E. Baker

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

Sincerely,

Stephen Baker
4,972. Thomas Fetterman -----

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

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.

Dear Commissioners,

As a life long Pennsylvanian with family roots in Centralia, I am aware of the importanace of the coal industry in our state. However the old days of mining coal by hand and burning it in power plants without regard to the people and enviornment in the region...is over...or should be! We now live in a much more enlightened age where good science has clearly shown the direct concequences of irresponsible stewardship. The only thing we lack is the will to make the positive changes we all deserve. I implore you to stand up to the power of highly paid lobbieist and do the right thing...be our leaders and show us that you are thinking about all of our best interests, including your own family.

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

Sincerely,

Thomas Fetterman

715-355-8840

4,973. Roger Nutter -----

PA Resident 8-17

4,974. Steve Markey -----

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

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.

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

Sincerely,

Steve Markov
4,975. Tressa Kopytko -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,976. Kim Merville -----
Credit Trading 8-17

4,977. Mary Wojton -----

4,978. Roy Allen -----

4,979. Catherine Fitzpatrick -----

4,980. Smita Sharna -----

4,981. Cindy Kaduck -----

4,982. Carol Bass -----

4,983. Liz Williard -----

4,984. Deb McNally -----

4,985. Nilima Mallya -----
PA Resident 8-17

4,986. Resident -----

4,987. Casey Argento -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 4,988. Kyra Schenker -----
- 4,989. James Ripper -----
- 4,990. Resident -----
- 4,991. Ruth Fox -----
- 4,992. Nicole Hostettler -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 4,993. Don Smith -----
- 4,994. Heather Crossley -----
- 4,995. Dennis Lawler -----
- 4,996. Irwin Hurst -----
- 4,997. Kathy Witsberge -----
- 4,998. Marc Julian -----
- 4,999. Kim Merville -----
Credit Trading 8-17
- 5,000. Tiesha Crossley -----
- 5,001. Brittany Crossley -----
- 5,002. Heidi Crossley -----
- 5,003. Doug Schrott -----
- 5,004. Sam Schrott -----
- 5,005. Renee Blank -----
- 5,006. Renee Thomson-Hohl -----
National Parks 8-17
- 5,007. Carolyn Griffiths -----
- 5,008. Jason Meyer -----
- 5,009. Amanda Smith -----
- 5,010. Stacie Wood -----
- 5,011. Mary Hasselman -----
- 5,012. Amy Bradley -----
- 5,013. Rich Bradley -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,014. Rachele Engel -----

5,015. Marketta Reich -----

Reduce Mercury (#7-405)

My Daughter was afraid to eat fish while she was pregnant. Then she was afraid to eat fish while she was nursing her baby. This is not a thirld world country. We should not have to worry about our food and water. As a Pennsylvania resident, I strongly support the DEPÂ'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.

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 DEPÂ's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible. Our kidsÂ' health is at stake, and they deserve protection today!

Thank you.

5,016. Tammy Desalis -----

5,017. Carol Donnelly -----

5,018. Lorelei Kubiak -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,019. Kathleen Foy -----

5,020. John Casey -----

5,021. Amy Dwyer -----

5,022. Tina Lieb -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,023. Joan Sweeney -----

5,024. Bernadette Balcer -----

5,025. Jared Melson -----

5,026. Thomas Summers -----

5,027. Kathleen Buhsner -----

5,028. Rosemary Sampon -----

5,029. Victoria Brady -----

5,030. Dana Groce -----

5,031. Jennifer Kerr -----

5,032. Greg Hartman -----

5,033. David Bussick -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,034. Sherry Reed -----
- 5,035. Alexandra Fox -----
- 5,036. Sister Genevieve Murray, M.M.S. -----
- 5,037. Christina Zalewski -----
- 5,038. Dorothy Lyons, MA -----
- 5,039. Susan McConnell -----
- 5,040. George Ellis PA Coal Association -----
- 5,041. Diane Good -----
- 5,042. The Hon. Vincent Fumo Senate of Pennsylvania -----
- 5,043. Mariangela Lorence -----
- 5,044. Resident -----
- 5,045. Resident -----
- 5,046. Lisa Rg -----
- 5,047. Resident -----
- 5,048. Resident -----
- 5,049. Resident -----
- 5,050. Brian Wetzel -----
- 5,051. Eleanor Emerich -----
- 5,052. Bernice Klera -----
- 5,053. Karla Perelstine -----
- 5,054. Janice Talotta -----
- 5,055. C. Jameson -----
- 5,056. Resident -----
- 5,057. Resident -----
- 5,058. Elisa karafilis -----
- 5,059. Resident -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,060. Lori Haviland -----
- 5,061. Peggy Patterson -----
- 5,062. Gina Chalovich -----
- 5,063. Joe Hazy -----
- 5,064. Lisa Morales -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,065. Ereka Stone -----
- 5,066. Cindy Ligman -----
- 5,067. Resident -----
- 5,068. Marlene McNaughton -----
- 5,069. Holly Williams -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-17
- 5,070. E. Sturgeon -----
- 5,071. John Brady -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,072. Ruth Haberstrah -----
- 5,073. Susan Gratton -----
- 5,074. Jocelyn Brown -----
- 5,075. Jo Anna Hebberger -----
National Parks 8-17
- 5,076. Resident Resident -----
- 5,077. Joseph Werzinski -----
National Parks 8-17
- 5,078. Robert Bittner -----
- 5,079. Heather Gustafson -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,080. Cheryl Bittner -----
- 5,081. LeeAnn Wisdom -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,082. Sharon Wallach -----
- 5,083. Joseph Mattingly -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,084. Heather Hardy -----
- 5,085. George Glaros -----
PA Resident 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,086. Linda Stutzman -----
- 5,087. M. Wingard -----
- 5,088. Ralph Cariffe -----
- 5,089. Doris Haas -----
- 5,090. Genie Esser -----
- 5,091. Justin Swanely -----
- 5,092. N. Miller -----
- 5,093. Angelika Antoni -----
- 5,094. John Wilkinson -----
- 5,095. Tina Diehl -----
- 5,096. Ellen Greis -----
- 5,097. Philip & Karen Murray -----
- 5,098. David Gallagher -----
- 5,099. Carol Mysluviac -----
- 5,100. Andrew & Linda Feldstein -----
- 5,101. Linda Getz -----
- 5,102. George Clothier -----
- 5,103. Grant Moyer -----
- 5,104. Tom Miller -----
- 5,105. Ed & Donna Van Valkenburgh -----
- 5,106. Debra Goodyear -----
- 5,107. Linda O'Kane -----
- 5,108. Carolyn Page -----
- 5,109. Lauren Dougherty -----
- 5,110. Scott & Cindi Schaediger -----
- 5,111. Teresa Harple -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,112. Jordyn Thomson -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,113. Teresa Harple -----

5,114. Cindi Schaediger -----

5,115. Jill Gleeson -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 17, 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 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.

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,

Jill Gleeson
814-342-5882
5,116. David & Sarah Farnsworth -----

5,117. Dorothy Elking -----

5,118. Jill Gleeson -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Jill Gleeson
401 5th St.
Philipsburg, PA 16866-2324

August 17, 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 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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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,

Jill Gleeson
814-342-5882

5,119. Lindsay Edmunds -----

5,120. Julie Tonnessen -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Julie Tonnessen
1262 N. Adams St.
Pottstown, PA 19464-2402

August 17, 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.

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.

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)

Julie Tonnessen

5,121. B. Fisher -----

5,122. Joan Fox -----

5,123. Lauren Miller -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,124. Elizabeth Norris -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,125. Katherine Lopez -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,126. Kay P. Cloud -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Kay P. Cloud
300 Willow Valley Lakes Dr. Apt. E-M27
Willow Street, PA 17584-9442

August 17, 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.

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.

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)

Kay P. Cloud
717-464-1591
5,127. Lauren Chiong -----
Lauren Chiong
8 Crum Ledge Lane
Swarthmore, PA 19081-1301

August 17, 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'm strongly in favor of strengthening rules on mercury output to reduce the mercury in our environment. I'm planning on having a baby and I worry about mercury levels in the environment. For the health and safety of our kids please make sure the rules go into effect to lower mercury emissions.

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

Sincerely,

5,128. Joel Hecker -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,129. Kenneth Kay -----
Please take a long term view of the mercury emissions reduction bill. Not only will our health be at stake in the future, but economic repercussions will be considerable if we do not become proactive.

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

Kenneth Kay
duchess3@comcast.net
504 Merwyn Road
Narberth, PA 19072
5,130. Joseph Ellmer -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

As a friend of Pennsylvania residents, 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

Joseph Ellmer
jfesoftware@earthlink.net
26 Croydon RD
Mays Landing, NJ 08330
5,131. Kathy Stewart -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Kathy Stewart
6510 Union Deposit Rd.
Harrisburg, PA 17111-4805

August 17, 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. It is a moral transgression to jeopardize the health of the future of our state. No amount of wealth/profits can be worth risking the health of future generations.

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

Sincerely,

~~Kathy Stewart~~
5,132. Lisa O'Donnell -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,133. Joseph Monkiewicz -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,134. Hillary Bright -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Hillary Bright
1157 Chestnut Street
Indiana, PA 15701-1683

August 17, 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.

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

Sincerely,

Hillary Bright
5,135. Caroline Cotugno -----

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

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 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.

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,

5,136. Jean Seibel -----
Credit Trading 8-17

5,137. Kevin Korowicki -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,138. Judith Rush -----
PA Resident 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,139. Frank Ammon -----
Frank Ammon
209 Coleman Road
Saltsburg, PA 15681-1455

August 17, 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,

- 5,140. Karl Neiman -----
Hot Spots 8-17
- 5,141. Ellen Zaleta -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,142. Elaine Nace -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,143. Jeffrey Strow -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,144. Janet Oser -----
Credit Trading 8-17
- 5,145. Hilliard Cohen -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,146. Doreen Shiavi -----
Credit Trading 8-17
- 5,147. Doreen Shiavi -----
Credit Trading 8-17

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,148. Gregory Daley -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,149. Judy Halliwell -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,150. Jacqueline Sloan -----
National Parks 8-18

5,151. Karl Neiman -----
National Parks 8-17

5,152. Karen Ceci -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,153. Elizabeth Parziale -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,154. Teresa Dalla Piccola Wood -----
Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing in support of the state moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. Coal-fired power plants are the largest unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

The technology exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading. With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

The citizens and children of Pennsylvania are a precious natural resource that we must take action to protect. Their health and their future in fact is the health and future of our state.

Sincerely,

Teresa Dalla Piccola Wood
6315 Bartlett st.

Pittsburgh PA 152171829

5,155. Ruth Luther -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,156. Emilie Marlier -----

The DEP's proposed mercury emission rule to reduce mercury emissions from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015 is a good idea. PA is the second largest source of mercury pollution in the U.S. Mercury is dangerous. Fish across our state are contaminated.

Please oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Enact the DEP's mercury reduction proposal as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Sincerely

Emilie Marlier
reilram@earthlink.net
1617 Belasco Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15216

5,157. Barbara Kilgallon -----
PA Resident 8-19

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,158. Mary Brown -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,159. Carole Wenborg -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,160. Christel Horner -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,161. Thomas J. Mrozinski, Jr. -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,162. Alana Rykala -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,163. Andrea Saah -----

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 for putting the health of Pennsylvania's citizens above the interests of the coal-fired power plants.

Sincerely

Andrea Saah
andreaaah@comcast.net
1765 Forest Creek Dr.

Blue Bell PA 19422
5,164. Cynthia Tuite -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,165. Dana Monroe -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,166. Renee Thomson-Hohl -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,167. Veronica Ellers -----
PA Resident 8-19

5,168. Margaret Maurin -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Margaret Maurin
14 Westview Rd
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-3717

August 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 is a major threat to human health and wildlife due to the formation of methylmercury, which is now found in most fish species. Mercury causes serious neurological problems in developing fetuses and babies, even in very small amounts. The U.S. Center for Disease Control has found 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. I strongly urge you to put the health and well-being of the people and our precious wildlife first, and resist the pressure from the energy industry, which simply wants to preserve the status quo and continue poisoning our streams and our citizens. Sincerely,

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

Sincerely,

Margaret Maurin
5,169. Kenneth Trauger -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Kenneth Trauger
921 Virginia Ave.
Lancaster, PA 17603-3115

August 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.

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, 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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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 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,

Kenneth Trauger
717-392-2092

5,170. Greg Petrick -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,171. Kevin Galvin -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,172. Guy Ryno -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,173. Jennifer Anthony -----
National Parks 8-18

5,174. Claire Zamorski Cavoto -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,175. Terri Davin -----
Treasures 8-18

5,176. Douglas Stewart -----

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

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.

How can allowing high levels of mercury pollution from Coal Fired Power Plants be in the Public Interest?

The DEP has acted wisely to require a reduction in Mercury pollution using very well established technology. The scrubbing systems have been used for decades at other power plants. It is well past time that these pollution reduction systems be installed.

The benefits to everyone in the state, particularly children and sportsmen, will be enormous.

By requiring a low level of mercury pollution, the state has acted prudently, without requiring an unreasonable burden on the coal plants.

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

5,177. David Morgan -----
Please Reduce Mercury Drastically

As a Pennsylvania taxpayer interested in a safe environment, I commend the DEP for its new mercury emission rule to reduce mercury coming from coal fired power plants 90% by 2015. PA is a major source of mercury pollution in the U.S. We know that mercury is dangerous for children, and fish across our state are being decimated.

I urge you to oppose any pollution trading rules for mercury, and require all coal plants in PA to reduce their mercury emissions. Please facillitate the DEP's mercury reduction proposal quickly . Think of our children, please.

Thank you.
5,178. David Montemurro -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,179. John Bradley -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,180. Jennifer Sheats -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,181. Joseph Toth -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,182. Barbara Seiple -----
PA Resident 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,183. Bonnie Sonder -----
National Parks 8-18
- 5,184. Lisa Altman -----
Credit Trading 8-18
- 5,185. William Bayle -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,186. Cathy Rodgers -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,187. Michael L. Stibich -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,188. Robert Kramer -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,189. Monica Oswald -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,190. Daneen Kinsey -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,191. Karllice Makuchan -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,192. Jeffrey Kalan -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,193. Geoffrey Heineman -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,194. Marianne Susseri -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,195. Nancy Byerly -----
PA Resident 8-19
- 5,196. Lauren Verruni -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Lauren Verruni
R. R. #2 Box 165-V
Mount Pleasant Mills, PA 17853-9202

August 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 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,

Lauren Verruni
570-539-8357
5,197. George Ellis PA Coal Association -----
Hard Copy
5,198. Timothy Pearce -----
TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Protecting the environment protects us, because we eat breathe, and drink the environment.

5,199. Phyllis Dreyfuss -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,200. Scott Harris -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,201. Auden Thomas -----

I support legal enforcement of mercury pollution reduction. Please move to reduce mercury in our environment. There is indisputable evidence that mercury is harmful to human health. Please do NOT allow emissions trading.

Sincerely,
Auden Thomas, Ph.D.
5,202. Linda Sanders -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,203. Robert Hoffmann -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,204. Edward Dinnen -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,205. Sarah Polansky -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,206. Stanley Barish -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,207. Sarah Alexander -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,208. Mary Ann Hamlyn -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,209. Gilbert Friedman -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,210. Jack Grzybek -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,211. Tasia Kavalek -----
PA Resident 8-20

5,212. Amy Brazill -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,213. Melinda Disque -----
National Parks 8-20

5,214. Robert Kelley -----
PA Resident 8-20

5,215. Roxann Curran -----
National Parks 8-20

5,216. A. Moyer -----
Credit Trading 8-20

5,217. Roseanna Downey -----
PA Resident 8-20

5,218. Peter Stone -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Peter Stone
924 Laurel Dr
Bethlehem, PA 18017-1909

August 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.

All in all, there is plenty of evidence to support a strong mercury reduction rule. Please act appropriately so as to protect the public health.

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

Sincerely,

- 5,219. Victoria Todd -----
Credit Trading 8-20
- 5,220. Julie Ambler -----
Credit Trading 8-20
- 5,221. Michael Conley -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,222. Dan Barnes -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,223. Jill Barnes -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,224. Rondi Lang -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,225. Melissa Barnes -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,226. Dorothy Chetkowski -----
Credit Trading 8-20
- 5,227. Rhoda Eligator -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,228. Mildred Barnes -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,229. Craig Conn -----
National Parks 8-20
- 5,230. P.G. Connelly -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,231. Ellen Smith -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 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 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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

for cutting mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's power plants.

Sincerely,

Ellen Smith

5,232. April Hilling -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

April Hilling
1001 Saint Michaels Ct.
Chester Springs, PA 19425-8705

August 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 detrimentally affects human health, as well as 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 second worse in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants, behind only Texas. 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.

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.

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,

April Hilling

Employer City: Cherry Hill
Position: Regulatory Analyst

Current Comments List Continued

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

Are you a registered voter?: Yes
Did you vote in the last election?: Yes
Gender: Female
Would you like a reply?: Yes
Have you visited our website?: No

- 5,233. P.G. Connelly -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,234. Robin Hetrick -----
PA Resident 8-20
- 5,235. Loreta Kass -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,236. April Jackman -----
PA Resident 8-20
- 5,237. Resident -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,238. Margaret Wilson -----
PA Resident 8-20
- 5,239. Beatrice Goldszer -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,240. Louis Goldszer -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,241. Joan Narkum -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,242. Karen Clay -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,243. Robert Alexander -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,244. Helen Andrascik -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,245. Suzanne Crews -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,246. Valda Cox -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,247. Carol Azar -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,248. Morton Alman -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,249. Marty O'Malley -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,250. Mary Slirva -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,251. John Slirva -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,252. Teresa Brown -----

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

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.

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

Sincerely,
5,253. Senator Mary Jo White Senate of Pennsylvania -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

August 23, 2006

Deana Weaver
47 Dogwood Ln
Dillsburg PA 17019

Dear Ms. Weaver:

I received a copy of your August 21, 2006 email to the Environmental Quality Board. I would like to address some of the points you raise.

As chair of the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee, I sit on the Environmental Quality Board. The purpose of my letter to you was to offer a different perspective on the issue.

In my view, the protections afforded to the public's health are essentially the same under SB 1201 as they are under the mercury rule drafted by the Department of Environmental Protection. Calling these standard less stringent, or favored by the 'polluters', does not really dispel or argue effectively against this belief. I am always open to reasoned debate on an issue.

The fact sheet information you received was prepared by my office and no one else. Every chair of every committee in the General Assembly has letterhead, so I am not sure why this is of concern. My letter clearly speaks only for me. While you take me to task for the façade of soliciting public input, please note that it was the Environmental Quality Board – not the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee – which was formally accepting the comments you submitted. You might question whether DEP is creating a façade however, since the agency has clearly made up its mind on a mercury regulation – regardless of whether public comments are supportive, opposed or offer constructive criticism.

I might note that the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee did have an extensive public input process, including three hearings. After sorting through the emotional rhetoric and misinformation, the committee voted 10-1 to support SB 1201. The full Senate voted 40-10 in a bipartisan manner to approve of SB 1201 as well.

The fact that you may disagree with my position is not license to accuse me of corruption. Reasonable people can disagree on how best to cut mercury pollution. However, stating that those who hold a viewpoint different than your own must therefore be motivated by campaign contributions is not only unfair, but undermines any credibility you may have had.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo White, Chairman
Senate Environmental Resources
& Energy Committee

- 5,254. Catherine Whelan -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,255. Steven Ross -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,256. Catherine DiOrio -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,257. Fred Metzler -----
National Parks 8-21
- 5,258. Michael Tinker -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

I have two grandchildren, one of whom lives in Pennsylvania. I want them to be safe.

I urge you to 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

Michael Tinker
michaeltinker@aol.com
35 Highland Drive
Yardley PA 19067
5,259. Mike Sheldon -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,260. Sue Bialostosky -----
As resident, taxpayer, voter, mother and grandmother in Pennsylvania, 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--they are our future!

Thank you.

Your constituent

Sue Bialostosky
sue.bialostosky@verizon.net
1126 Heberton .
Pittsburgh, PA 15206
5,261. Kathy Wescoat -----
PA Resident 8-21
5,262. Dawn Lysko -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,263. Nancy DelPresto -----
PA Resident 8-20
5,264. Ann Rose -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,265. Karen Kite -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Karen Kite
7376 Campbell Ln
Pennsylvania Furnace, PA 16865-1017

August 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.

Think of the future for humans and animals in a mercury-safer environment vs. an exponentially-increasing production of mercury environment. Is there a choice about what to do NOW for the FUTURE? We should all agree that mercury is dangerous, therefore, increasing it's level affects more and more of us now and into the future.

The facts are simple and clear about mercury -- it's DANGEROUS!

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

Sincerely,

- Karen Kite
5,266. Sandy Copper -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,267. Joan Steinberg -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,268. Sue Curran -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,269. Kimberly Adams -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,270. Dianne Dencler -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
5,271. Janet Marvin -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
5,272. Frances Zakraysek -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
5,273. Karen Zakraysek -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
5,274. Merle Hribar -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
5,275. Craig Hribar -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,276. Mary Smith -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,277. James Hicks -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,278. Members Rush-Middletown Sportsmen -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,279. Laura Cincotti -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,280. Brandy Decker -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,281. Donald Hinderliter -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,282. Boomer Mitzel -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,283. George Reilly -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,284. Mary Reilly -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,285. Kathleen McDonough -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,286. Donna Smith-Remick -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,287. Kristie Hudzik -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,288. Scott Kepner -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,289. Joseph Dunleavy -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,290. Janet Roeber -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,291. Michele Brown -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,292. Corey Fuhrer -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,293. James Sickles -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,294. Charles Nauman -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,295. Lloyd Hartman -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,296. Claire Schultz -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,297. Thomas Kakabar -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,298. Roy Bires -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,299. Barbara Lindline -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,300. David Mummert -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,301. Walton Coates -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,302. Michael McLane -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,303. Robert Houck -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,304. Steven & Kathryn Malaico -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,305. Jill Kilmartin -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,306. Eleanor Osman -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,307. Donald Schmidt -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,308. Diane Krassenstein -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,309. Margaret Ryall -----
TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Pennsylvania has dropped like a load from the high estimation I used to have of it!

5,310. Corey Jackson -----
TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I'm a mother with 3 small children and I want them to be protected.

5,311. Marcia Davis -----
TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I have 3 children, I'm a vega and I'm really concerned about the mercury in our water.

5,312. S. Bennett -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Mercury is hazardous to people's health.

5,313. Resident -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Get the mercury out of the air, water and ground.

5,314. E. Teverzezuk -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Keep Mercury out of our food and water.

5,315. Denise Howell -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I have a six month old child that I would not want to be exposed to mercury.

5,316. Reuben Cruz -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I have a disability and I do not want mercury in my life.

5,317. Anna Early -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Also, by having children this is very important in keeping them safe.

5,318. Vee Marseille -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I'll be glad if DEP finds a way to resolve this problem, because fish is the one meat I love.

5,319. M. Thomas -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Yes indeed, I want the mercury taken away so our fish will be free of this mercury which is doing so much trouble.

5,320. Mary Kerns -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

We need to protect ourselves from mercury.

5,321. Tammy Slivka -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,322. Beth Pirolli -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,323. Dr. Joann Kirchner -----
TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Please remove mercury now.

5,324. Sheila Kennedy -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,325. Sister Ann Vincentia -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,326. Lisa Leshinsky -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

lisa leshinsky
2008 maxwell ln
adams twp., PA 16046-2136

August 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. Mercury pollution is also causing developmental problems for a wide variety of wildlife.

Every water in the Pennsylvania Commonwealth has advisories on fish consumption due to high levels of mercury and other types of pollution.

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 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. 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. How sad that money is more important than our health. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. Overall, the reduction in mercury emissions, will not take place 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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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,

lisa leshinsky

5,327. Alison Bendixen -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,328. Sabra Sutow -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,329. Raymond Joseph -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,330. Mary Anne Stinner -----
Credit Trading 8-21

5,331. Sister Marion Ffaff -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,332. Phil Grenetz -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,333. Jennifer Burns -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,334. Thomas Earle -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,335. Diane McMahon -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,336. Marie Mott -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,337. Jeremiah Casey -----

As a Pennsylvania resident, professional research chemist and instructor of environmental chemistry at the college and university level, 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

Jeremiah Casey
JCasey8389@AOL.com
2665 Arbor Circle
Emmaus, PA 18049

5,338. Joan Keenan -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,339. Scott McBurney McBurney -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,340. Mary McGrath -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,341. Elizabeth Barchi -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,342. Judith Braun -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,343. Jeremy Gecker -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,344. Kevin Kromash -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,345. Michael Fischer -----
Michael Fischer
88 Drummers Lane
Wayne, PA 19087-1515

August 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.

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

I'd truly like to hear back from you on why you agree or disagree with DEP proposal.

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,

5,346. Ruth Pugh -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,347. Tom Marrollo -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,348. Terri Kelly -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,349. Lauren Silverman -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,350. Victoria Heredia -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,351. John Broschious -----
National Parks 8-21

5,352. George Braun -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,353. Joseph Mercurio -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,354. Peter Jamnicky -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,355. Judith Maile -----
Credit Trading 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,356. Mathew & Jennifer Hammer -----

Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,357. Janna Francis -----

PA Resident 8-18

5,358. Margaret Sofio -----

Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,359. John Meyer -----

Credit Trading 8-21

5,360. Carlos Ferran -----

Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,361. Michele Mazza -----

Sierra Club Ver3 8-21

5,362. Darree Sicher -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Darree Sicher
348 Pine Creek Rd.
Kempton, PA 19529-8806

August 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 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,

- Darree Sicher
- 5,363. Kathyjoy Hammer -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,364. Laurel Person -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,365. Mary Howe -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,366. Michael Meyer -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,367. Zach Braun -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,368. Hilary Decker -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,369. Savita Subramanian -----
Sierra Club Ver3 8-21
- 5,370. Lois Peddicord -----
National Parks 8-21
- 5,371. Emily Greenberg -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,372. Brigitta Arden -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Brigitta Arden
2020 Sarah Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15203-2022

August 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.

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 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.

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

Please protect the health and welfare of all Pennsylvanians

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,

- 5,373. ~~Benita Arden~~ Kim Daly -----
National Parks 8-21
- 5,374. Michael Cronin -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,375. Richard Jarrett -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,376. Kathryn Delaney -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,377. Marlin Hoffmaster -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,378. David Russell -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,379. William Yohn -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,380. Michael Tinker -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,381. Dorothy Yohn -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,382. Leslie Hower -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,383. Keith Thackaberry -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,384. Kathleen Hornberger -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,385. Lawni Zimmerman -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,386. Willard Raker -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,387. Resident -----
National Parks 8-21
- 5,388. Terry Troup -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,389. Ronald Hower -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,390. Joan Carr -----
PA Resident 8-21
- 5,391. Dale Yarger -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,392. Nancy Allison -----
National Parks 8-21
- 5,393. Timothy Jarrett -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,394. Robert Correy -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,395. Alice Robbins -----
PA Resident 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,396. Barry Allison -----
National Parks 8-21

5,397. Doris Brooke -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,398. Romain Dormon, Jr. -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,399. Jack Wishnow -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,400. Mary Dorman -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,401. William Fultz -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,402. Lee Bogart -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,403. Jessee Schwetizer -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,404. Amy Wilson -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,405. Gerald Baker, II -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,406. Allen Kistler -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,407. Paula Gregorowicz -----
National Parks 8-21

5,408. Ray Bilgas -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,409. William Keany -----
PA Resident 8-21

5,410. James Jefferies, Sr. -----
Fish After Fly 8-21

5,411. Lois Sellers -----

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.

And as I wrote previously, physical results of mercury poisoning can be viewed in Eugene Smith's photos of Minamata, Japan, taken in 1972. Horrible.
<http://www.geocities.com/minoltaphotographyw/willameugenesmith.html>

Sincerely

Lois Sellers
lsellers555@yahoo.com
267 Rambling Way
Springfield PA 10064-3513

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,412. Jenaro Rodriguez -----
Jenaro Rodriguez
166 Bridge St.
Hastings, PA 16646-0266

August 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 causes serious health problems for both humans and wildlife.

Our lakes, rivers and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. We can't eat fish as we'd like.

Mercury levels in Cambria County are much higher than say, in Tioga County.

Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury pollution to air from coal-fired power plants.

The federal CAMR does too little too late. PA and 15 other states are challenging it as illegal under the Clean-Air Act.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable. PA coal-fired power plants are very profitable. An average customer would see an increase of \$1.08 on monthly electric bills. I and 80% other Pennsylvanians are willing to pay if necessary. Over 100 hunting and angling clubs around the state support the PA rule. The federal mercury rule is bad for our economy. I strongly support DEP on this matter.

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

Sincerely,

5,413. Victoria Maloney -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I support DEP's proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90% by 2015. They are the largest unregulated source of the pollution contaminating our waterways and fish. Mercury exposure affects the way children learn, think and behave.

I support DEP's efforts to require cuts and not allow for pollution "credit" trading. With the weakening of federal protections, states must take the lead in protecting our environment and public health.

Sincerely,

Victoria Maloney
868 N. Beechwood St.

PHILADELPHIA, PA 191201427

5,414. Gianna Ruggiero -----

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.

p.s

this is the only earth we have. lets pretend we care about it.

Sincerely

5,415. Ingrid Peeters -----

PA Resident 8-18

5,416. Joseph Stinson -----

PA Resident 8-18

5,417. Jimmy Hoffmaster -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,418. Nathan Wenger -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,419. Garry Bucher -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,420. Scott Darkes -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,421. Glenn Reichardt -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,422. Richard Kern -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,423. William Swalm -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

5,424. Richard Kern, Jr. -----

Fish After Fly 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,425. Samuel Blauch -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,426. Joseph Miller -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,427. Clarence Snyder -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,428. Wallace Eberly -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,429. Glenn Blauch -----
Fish After Fly 8-21
- 5,430. Catherine Blecker -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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.

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

Sincerely,

5,431. Sister Margaret Maguire, SSJ -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Mercury is hazardous to people's health.

5,432. Sister Mary Willmanns -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

Mercury is hazardous to people's health.

5,433. Kathleen Mackener -----

TO: Members of the Environmental Quality Board
RE: Pennsylvania Specific Mercury Reduction Rule

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) federal mercury rule will result in more mercury in our air and water than simply fully enforcing the Clean Air Act. PA is currently the 2nd worst polluter of mercury from coal-fired power plants in the country. PA coal is also higher than most in chlorine content which makes it more apt to fall closer to it's source. Our children deserve to grow up in a state that leads the way on reducing mercury pollution. I encourage the adoption of the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed PA specific mercury rule which aims to reduce mercury pollution by 80% in 2010 and 90% in 2015 at all applicable sources, and prohibits the trading or netting of mercury pollution credits. We have the opportunity to protect our families' health and safety by implementing a PA specific mercury reduction rule as soon as possible for the sake of our community and our children's health.

I am very concerned about the effects of mercury on our health.

5,434. Marguerite Zuccarello -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,435. Anne Van Meter -----

PA Resident 8-18

5,436. Patrick Hynes -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,437. S. Eleanor Day -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,438. Sister Alexander Machain -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,439. Joan Dobson -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,440. S. Ann Kirby -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,441. Dolores Swanni -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,442. S. Joyce Ballerino -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,443. Sister Catherine Donoline -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,444. Loretta Long -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,445. William Zuccarello -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,446. Margery Butler -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,447. Sister Jane Day -----

Sierra Club Ver2 8-21

5,448. Theresa Watson -----

PA Resident 8-17

5,449. Tim Pearce -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Tim Pearce
1618A Denniston
Pittsburgh, PA 15217-1458

August 17, 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.

As humans, we understand that mercury pollution negatively affects human health and that mercury pollution is released by coal-fired power plants.

We know that Pennsylvania lakes, rivers, and streams are contaminated with mercury pollution. In fact, Pennsylvania is number two in the nation for mercury air pollution from coal-fired power plants.

The federal Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) would do too little too late. Congressional Research Service has detailed that CAMR won't deliver the 86% reductions it promises, due to mercury pollution trading. Pennsylvania plants are traditionally the number one purchasers of pollution credits. In contrast to CAMR, the proposed Pennsylvania rule would require that plants in the state must reduce their mercury emission levels by 90 percent by 2015, and would not allow mercury trading.

Mercury pollution controls are available and affordable. Do the right thing for human and environmental health. Please adopt the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rule on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

Thank you for your attention.

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

Sincerely,

5,450. Susan Metzger -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,451. Theresa Essig -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,452. William Esig -----
PA Resident 8-17

5,453. 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

August 17, 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.

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
5,454. Stephen Swider -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,455. Stacy Stull -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,456. Steven Wolbach -----
PA Resident 8-17
- 5,457. Stephen Ream -----

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!

Just look at the reactions to the New Jersey Day Care built on a toxic site.

Thank you.

Sincerely

Stephen Ream
stever1138@comcast.net
301 Coebourn Blvd
Brookhaven PA 19015
5,458. Emily MacDonald -----
National Parks 8-17
5,459. Gary Keefer -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,460. Jack Mahaven -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,461. Robert Grim -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,462. David Rider -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,463. Michael Benning -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,464. Kate St. John -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Kate St. John
731 McCaslin St
Pittsburgh, PA 15217-2629

August 22, 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 poses a dangerous health risk in Pennsylvania. Our streams, lakes and rivers all have mercury fish advisories and one sixth of all women of child-bearing age have mercury levels in their blood that are unsafe for a developing fetus.

Coal-fired power plants are the only industrial sources of mercury pollution not required to install modern mercury pollution controls. As proof of this lack of control, Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants are second only to Texas in the volume of mercury pollution they produce.

This is an easy problem to fix. Allow DEP's mercury rulemaking to move forward.

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

Sincerely,

- 5,465. Christopher Palochak -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,466. Nicole Sohenick -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,467. Emily Broich -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,468. Sandy Miller -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,469. Jason Leigh -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,470. Margie Shannon -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,471. David Sacks -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,472. Kristy Gingras -----
PA Resident 8-22

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,473. Daniel Pavord -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,474. Tom Mohr -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,475. Brian Brandis -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,476. Kimberly Donovan -----
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 am highly concerned by the lack of political will to decrease mercury emissions from coal powered plants.

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

Kimberly Donovan
kimberlox@hotmail.com
771 Davis Road
Ellwood City, PA 16117

5,477. Ronald Jones -----
Credit Trading 8-22

5,478. Karyn Delaney -----
National Parks 8-22

5,479. Phyllis Barber -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,480. Barbara Field -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-18

5,481. Eric Jeandell -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,482. Ivan Chan -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I am writing to support the state moving forward with DEP's proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. According to emissions statistics, they are the largest source of mercury pollution, which contaminates waterways and the fish that are caught and eaten. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect brain development and function.

The technology has existed to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts not to allow for mercury pollution credit trading given the existence of mercury hotspots.

Therefore, I support the DEP's efforts to reduce mercury pollution in the state and the rules which it has proposed.

Sincerely
5,483. Michael Westermann -----
Credit Trading 8-22

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,484. Libby Blackman -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,485. Alan Jenkins -----
Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units (#7-405)

As Pennsylvania residents, we 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.

We 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.

5,486. Scott Lofland -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,487. Sarah Kietzman -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,488. William Quinn -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,489. Frank Belfie -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,490. Elise Rosenblatt -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,491. Helen Ciglar -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,492. Kathleen Maits -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,493. Janet Henry -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,494. Chris Cousart -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,495. Victor D'Annunzio -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,496. Tonia Betancourt -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,497. Anthony Kreft -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,498. Lorrie Clare -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,499. James M Gunning -----
Treasures 8-18

5,500. Marcia Hole -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,501. Imogene Leitch -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,502. Hollis Zelinsky -----

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

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 serious toxic effects of mercury -- even in small amounts -- is indisputable. Mercury contamination of the air, soil, plants, fish, and animals is poisoning our environment and our people.

Please remove Pennsylvania from its dubious distinction as the #2 nationally for mercury pollution from coal-fired power plants and support rules to ensure that mercury emissions be reduced by 90%. Given the horrible consequences of mercury pollution, to do anything less would be criminal -- and suicidal.

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,
5,503. Kathy O'Connell -----

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.

I have also written to my state representative and senator to support legislation in Pennsylvania to force reduce mercury emissions.

Thank you.

Sincerely

- Kathy O'Connell
docsglock@msn.com
20 School Lane
Willow Grove, PA 19090
5,504. Gregory Murray -----
National Parks 8-18
5,505. Howard Arian -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,506. Mike Tobin -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,507. Ernest Petrillo -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,508. Terry Dotts -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,509. Dexter Childs -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,510. Joanne Mears -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,511. Jean Lana -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,512. Frank X. Kleshinski -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-18
5,513. David Piccoli -----
PA Resident 8-22
5,514. Teresa Mendez-Quigley -----

Current Comments List Continued

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

Dear Environmental Quality Board:

Thank you for your interest and consideration in the discussion and decisions on the Mercury Emission Reduction Requirements for Electric Generating Units. I appreciate your unbiased attention to this critical issue facing our Commonwealth. The arguments have been made and will continue to be made by people on both sides of this discussion. What will be tragic is the lack of voice from those most directly affected.

How many children will voice their concerns about being continually exposed to mercury pollution and it's effects on their health and development? Which fetuses will have a choice to be born mercury-free? What children have voluntarily signed on to having decreased mental capacity for the rest of their lives? How many mothers will know to grieve the loss of their children's full potential? How many future teachers will be frustrated at having to teach children with even slight limitations? How many homeowners are willing to for increases to their real estate taxes because more children are in need of special education services? How many taxpayers are willing to pay more for needed community services because children continue to be assaulted with mercury?

Please consider the answers to these questions as you debate this issue. Please ask each person testifying on what side of children's rights are they on. Please consider these unheard voices and be willing to have them in your thoughts when making final decisions on this issue. You will be making a rule for our children of Pennsylvania and near borders for now and years beyond. Thank you

5,515. Joan Narkum -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,516. Susan Wrick -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,517. Lauren Ehrlich -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,518. Arlene Kushwara -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,519. Ashley Warren -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,520. Marcia McAllister -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,521. Heidi Heller -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,522. Nancy Ring -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,523. Patty Duffy -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,524. Shirley Lindgren -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,525. Linda Simpson -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,526. Ellen Coates -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,527. Amy Haring -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,528. Wakaki Thompson -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,529. Martina Ruthrauff -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,530. Toni Sullivan -----
PA Resident 8-22

5,531. Doris Wilson -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,532. Michael Malone -----
PA Resident 8-22

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,533. J. A. Wales -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,534. Karen Kabnick -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,535. Jane Mihelic -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,536. Joe Klinowicz -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,537. Mary Ann McDonough -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,538. J. Paul Gay -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,539. Juliana Brafa -----
Credit Trading 8-23
- 5,540. William Foley -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,541. Mike Campbell -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,542. Jeffrey Trapani -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,543. Arlene Daily -----
Dear Environmental Quality Board,

Please support DEP's proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015.

Coal-fired power plants are the LARGEST unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates! Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

The TECHNOLOGY ALREADY EXISTS TO CUT MERCURY POLLUTION BY 90 PERCENT! I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution "credit" trading.

With the Bush administration weakening our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

Sincerely,

Arlene Daily
1924 Virginia Street
Allentown, PA 18102-8606

- 5,544. Chrissa Kuntz -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,545. Marlene Bria -----
PA Resident 8-22
- 5,546. Susan Sacks -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,547. Scott Newman -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,548. Pamela Scott -----

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

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.

It is the right thing to do.

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,

Pamela Scott

5,549. Julia Polczynski -----

PA Resident 8-23

5,550. Marion Constantinides -----

Hot Spots 10P 8-18

5,551. Carl McGrady -----

Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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,

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,552. Marsh Irvin -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,553. Nadine McCarthy -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,554. Brian Dunn -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,555. Sara Smith -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,556. Patricia Hickey -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,557. David Ardamoy -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,558. Anne Ewing -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,559. Julie Gilbert -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,560. Daniel McManus-Sullivan -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,561. Lester High -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,562. Diane DiLorenzo -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,563. Mark Swank -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,564. Gary Dukart -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,565. Jack Trautenberg -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,566. Anne Hatala -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,567. Stacy Riffert -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,568. Robert Ross -----

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

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.

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

- Sincerely,
5,569. Sharon Mayer-Conroy -----
PA Resident 8-23
5,570. Jim Williamson -----
PA Resident 8-23
5,571. John Benner -----
PA Resident 8-23
5,572. Gil Smith -----
PA Resident 8-23
5,573. Stephanie Bock -----
PA Resident 8-18
5,574. William Luttrell -----
PA Resident 8-23
5,575. Ramona Sahn -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
5,576. Cheryl Zang -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
5,577. Carol High -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
5,578. Robert Russo -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
5,579. Erik Lipnis -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
5,580. John Smeaton -----
PA Resident 8-23

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,581. Nate Blevins -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,582. Timothy Gavin, Jr. -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,583. Debbie Matz -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,584. Charles Pelletreau -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,585. Glenn Kulp -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,586. Christine Basilis -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,587. Rebecca Bindish -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,588. Mercedes Ku -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,589. John Brady -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,590. Timothy Emenheiser -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,591. Rodger Palko -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,592. Mary Reese -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,593. Susan M. Campbell -----

- 5,594. Celesta Powell -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,595. Timothy J. Campbell -----

- 5,596. Jeanette Quirus -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,597. Darryl Farber -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,598. Alayna Hackert -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,599. Amy Elliott -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,600. Abigail Minor -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,601. Brian Malloy -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,602. Mary Nolan -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,603. Gene Odato -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,604. Conrada Skindzier -----

- 5,605. Jeff Gossert -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,606. Evelyn Vlecil -----
PA Resident 8-23

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,607. Ken Manno -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,608. Cynthia Rogers and 8 others -----

- 5,609. Mark Ott -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,610. Linda Finley -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,611. Jo Anne Koning -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,612. Kelvin Dixon -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,613. Kenneth Kerstner, CWD/PI -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,614. Arlene Clendenning -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,615. Gorla Shaner -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,616. Dawn Zongora -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,617. Jim Donahue -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,618. Neil Neglef -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,619. Stephanie Clemens -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,620. Susan Eisenhauer -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,621. Sharon Duffy -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,622. Joe Mundy -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,623. Annette Unterkoefer -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,624. Andrew Asheimer -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,625. Nancy Newman -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,626. Resident -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,627. April Hartle -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,628. Mitch Johnson -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,629. Sarah Lisbon -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,630. Charles Eustance -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,631. Mary Betz -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,632. Dan McIntyre -----
PA Resident 8-23

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,633. Bill Laird -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,634. Kris Pietrangelo -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,635. Paul Kovarick -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,636. Jamie Masterson -----
National Parks 8-23
- 5,637. Ann Kraemer -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,638. Marie Freeman -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,639. Rosemarie Cleaver -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,640. Paula Leppert -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,641. David Brown -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,642. Grace DiCecco -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,643. Edward Moss -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,644. T Wallace -----

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

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 remember seeing pictures of children of Japan who had mercury poisoning and will never forget them. The mercury poisoning became known as Minamata Disease because of the Japanese island and bay where it happened.

The Chisso Corporation dumped mercury into the bay from the 1930's through the 1960's denying all allegations that it was responsible. Chisso finally lost in court in 1973 and was still making payments to the injured in the late 1990's.

The Chisso Corporation sounds much like our own power companies who care not one whit that the fish and the people who are foolish enough to eat the fish are poisoned.

The power companies encourage reducing pollution from automobiles and sources other than power plants, they neglect their own poisonous output.

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. Cleaning up our own plants will have the greatest impact on reducing mercury pollution in our own state.

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. My family will happily pay an extra amount for our electricity to clean the plants.

Last November, our family went to 100% wind energy from PECO. This costs us approximately \$36.00 more per month than PECO's normal cost. The estimated additional cost of \$1.08 per month for cleaning the plants is a pittance and well worth the price.

I urge the Independent Regulatory Review Commission and the members of the Environmental Quality Board to support the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) proposed rulemaking on mercury reductions from coal-fired power plants in Pennsylvania.

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)

T Wallace
610-942-2672

5,645. Jean Murin, RSM -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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. As a citizen of this beautiful state, we need to make it as safe as possible for the present and future generations.

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

Sincerely,

5,646. Graeme Thomson -----
Re: Mercury Emission Reduction Proposed Regulation

Dear Environmental Quality Board,

I want to support the state moving forward with DEP's state-level proposal to cut mercury pollution from Pennsylvania's coal-fired power plants by 90 percent by 2015. These power plants are the largest unregulated source of mercury pollution, which contaminates our waterways and eventually the fish that end up on our dinner plates. Medical experts say that even low levels of mercury exposure can affect the way kids learn, think, memorize and behave.

Technology now exists to cut mercury pollution by 90 percent, and I support DEP's efforts to require these cuts at Pennsylvania power plants, without allowing for mercury pollution credit trading. With the Bush administration continuing to weaken our federal mercury protections, it is essential that state decision-makers take the lead in protecting our environment and public health by cutting this toxic pollution from Pennsylvania power plants.

Sincerely,
Graeme Thomson

5,647. Teresa Cappello -----
PA Resident 8-18

5,648. Tom Quaituch -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,649. Carolyn Rumpf n/a -----

I feel Federal and state government owe the people protection against harmful pollutants such as mercury. The laws that presently exist need no modification. In the future it is hoped a mercury emission bill will reduce such admissions to the minimalist. Those companies/corporations who abuse the bill and environmental laws should be held accountable.

5,650. William Hannisch -----
PA Resident 8-18

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,651. Pat Depero -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,652. Frank Fiorilli -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,653. Marty B. O'Malley -----
Comments in favor of DEP Proposed Mercury Rulemaking

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.

Enough is enough.

Mercury is causing uncountable damage to humans and the ecology.

This damage can be avoided.

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

Sincerely,

- Marty B. O'Malley
- 5,654. Elinda Kiss -----
Credit Trading 8-18
- 5,655. Brenda Reffner -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,656. Georgian Mittl -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,657. Timothy A. Pearce -----
Hard Copy
- 5,658. Edward Berg -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,659. Andrea Erickson -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,660. Sheila Brann -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,661. Margaret Ryall -----
Hard Copy
- 5,662. Randi Serota -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,663. Corey Jackson -----
Hard Copy
- 5,664. Robert Fuhrsmaan -----
PA Resident 8-23

Current Comments List Continued

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

- 5,665. Megan Hess -----
PA Resident 8-23
- 5,666. Marcia Davis -----
Hard Copy
- 5,667. S. A. Bennett -----
Hard Copy
- 5,668. John Bradlee -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,669. Resident -----
Hard Copy
- 5,670. S. Smith -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-18
- 5,671. David Sheats -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,672. Gregory Schreiner -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,673. Jo Recht -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,674. Tracey Le -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,675. Joel Stern -----
PA Resident 8-18
- 5,676. Trent Bevers -----

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! Would you let your children play with the contents of a broken thermometer? Why then permit already wealthy companies to further gain by carelessly releasing mercury into the public environment where it will toxify our FOOD?

Thank you.

- 5,677. Kristina Weaver -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,678. Tina Berls -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,679. Douglas Kauffman -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,680. E. Tererzczuk -----
Hard Copy
- 5,681. Susan Read -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,682. Barb Deibler -----
Fish After Fly 8-23
- 5,683. Denise Howell -----
Hard Copy

Current Comments List Continued

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

5,684. Mary Riner -----
Fish After Fly 8-23

5,685. Reuben Cruz -----
Hard Copy

5,686. Fred Couch -----
Fish After Fly 8-23

5,687. Terry Buhite -----
Fish After Fly 8-23

5,688. Jen Walker -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,689. Ruth Neifeld -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,690. Anna Early -----
Hard Copy

5,691. Jim Michaels -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,692. Jack Creighton -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,693. William Zachman -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,694. Jan Harris -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,695. Jan Edwards -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,696. Kathy Smith -----
PA Resident 8-23

5,697. Julie Vanneman -----
Hot Spots 10P 8-23

5,698. Mary Kramer -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,699. Harold Poliskin -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,700. Laura Gilbert-King -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,701. Luis Berdecia -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,702. Stacey Cleary -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,703. Sara Cagno -----

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

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 contamination affects everyone - including politicians. Voting against mercury reductions means more contamination for all of us.

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.

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

Current Comments List Continued

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

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,

Sara Caprio

5,704. Bill Wiley -----

Credit Trading 8-23

5,705. James Leigh -----

Credit Trading 8-23

5,706. Amy Amato -----

Credit Trading 8-23

5,707. Thomas C. Hoopes -----

Credit Trading 8-23

5,708. Mark Bluestein -----

Credit Trading 8-23

5,709. Joe & Rosemarie Shirk -----

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

August 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.

Dear Madam or Sir:

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,

Joe & Rosemarie Shirk

5,710. Clare -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,711. Courney Rollack -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,712. Terry -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,713. Mike -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,714. Mike Brotschol -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,715. David W. Long -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,716. Felicity Hanks -----
Credit Trading 8-23

5,717. Deborah Miller -----
Credit Trading 8-23