1

2808

From:

Sent: To: Subject: Sierra Club Membership Services [membership.services@sierraclub.org] on behalf of Daniel Gallagher [danpatgal@yahoo.com] Monday, December 14, 2009 1:48 PM EP, RegComments

RE: Beneficial Use of Coal Ash Proposed Rulemaking [25 PA. CODE CHS. 287 AND 290]

RECEIVED

DEC 23 RECD

Dec 14, 2009

-- .-

John Hanger

Dear Hanger,

of coal ash. I have been concerned and

I am not the idealist environmentalist you think would send such a message about the dangers

writing about environmental issues (not in terms of books, but in terms of letters to editers, to government officials, etc.) I recall the coal ash spill in Tennessee a year ago ... that was a disaster. We

don't want anything like that in Pennsylvania. For that matter, I wish we'd have some better legislation to encourage renewables in our state

- we are entirely too entrenched with coal. Oh yeah - I guess they give you lots of money to ignore the fact that they produce a dirty, inefficient, polluting with toxic waste producing product. Sure, it's "cheap", but at what cost to our environment and our long term health. Just because we don't have hard facts doesn't mean it isn't detrimental. Remember that. Just because they threaten to take jobs out of the state, doesn't mean they can or will ... or that we

want those kinds of jobs. We want safe, non-polluting, healthy, growth

prospective jobs. The coal industry is holding on with all it's might, suggesting to lawmakers that we "need" to still have it in the future; that "clean coal" is a viable alternative (when

it is not). Stop dreaming - let's put reality and a sustainable future for our energy needs at the top of our priorities. That's the right thing to do. Specifically, with regard to coal ash (nasty stuff). It's is filled with toxic chemicals and heavy metals. Pennsylvania is the third largest US producer of this waste. We shouldn't allow this toxic substance anywhere near our drinking water, and this rule in no way assures me of that.

Coal combustion waste (CCW) is contaminating water sources across America including sites in Pennsylvania. Throughout the guidelines that have been proposed there are phrases like, "at the discretion of", "with department approval", or "if the Department chooses." These phrases leave significant loopholes in the guidelines and should be removed. Standards in the proposed Chapter 290 regulations must be enforceable.

This toxic coal ash should be sealed with the use of composite liners and placement guidelines that ensure isolation from groundwater. These sites should be monitored quarterly for at least thirty years after ash placement is finished.

INDEPENDENT REGULATIORS REVIEW COMMISSION The rules should require that pollutant levels are fully monitored surrounding the placement site. And if a monitoring point shows higher levels of contaminants than prior to ash placement it should trigger a requirement to investigate the causes of those increases.

Also financial assurance should be posted by operators before permits are issued and maintained throughout required monitoring at a site in amounts sufficient to monitor and abate pollution from the ash. And the public should be permitted to participate in the entire permitting process.

Sincerely,

N/A Daniel Gallagher 1151 Joann Ave Ephrata, PA 17522-1514