

January 9, 2007

Mesaba Energy Project, PUC Docket No. E6472/GS-06-668
DOE Draft EIS for the Mesaba Energy Project (DOE/EIS-0382D)

Carbon capture and sequestration is the main potential advantage of IGCC technology. The draft EIS states that CCS is not feasible or economically viable for the proposed Mesaba Energy Project. I would hope that the DOE would have the sense to build a demonstration IGCC plant closer to the coal, closer to where the power is needed, and especially closer to where sequestration is possible. If there is not a better place to build a DOE demonstration IGCC plant than the proposed Mesaba Energy site, then IGCC has no future and is not worth risking taxpayer money.

The Draft EIS does not reflect the importance of the Canisteo Mine Pit as one of the best trout fisheries in Minnesota.

Why does the Draft EIS use an air emission impact area of only 3 km? The impact area will be much larger and will also overlap with the emissions of MSI. In the final EIS, please include emissions from MSI and expand the impact area to include an area of at least thirty miles.

The Draft EIS states there is a need for the power from the Mesaba Energy Project. The Army Corp of Engineers says that is not true. Please include information indicating where the power is needed in the final EIS.

Thank you.

Jim and Steph Shields
Pengilly, MN

Get the power of Windows + Web with the new Windows Live. [Get it now!](#)