From: Terry Walmsley
<terry.walmsley@fibrowattusa.com>
View Contact
To: Stop Fibrowatt <stopfibrowatt@yahoo.com>
Cc: Dwayne A. Dye <IBA@hartcom.net>

I understand that there is a desire and need for information on Fibrowatt and its approach to the generation of renewable energy from poultry litter. Spend some time on our websites and you will be able to get a lot of information.

We too think it is important for the general public to have information, especially accurate information.
Therefore I do not think the way you are demanding information yet not committing to update information on your website is appropriate. If you choose not to correct errors on your website I guess that is your choice. However, by not correcting your faulty and misleading accusations on water use at this point or at least providing the Fibrowatt supplied information on your website, you are purposefully providing incorrect, misleading, or false information and your intent will be addressed accordingly.

Furthermore, we will be glad to respond to questions but according to time we have available – not necessarily your deadline.

Here is an answer to a few of your questions:

1) Water Usage:
In Minnesota, water is used primarily as boiler water and in the air emissions control system, Roughly 75% is used in the air emissions control system for (a) generating a dilute urea solution for use in the reduction of nitrogen oxide emissions in the SNCR system, (b) use to generate a slurry of lime for injection into the flue gas for the reduction of chlorine and sulfur emissions, and (c) to quench the flue gas temperature so that particulate emissions can be collected in the fabric filter baghouse. The remaining amount is used for the generation of clean water for use in the boiler and for drinking water and sanitary use. Some water is used in the truck wash but not much, as the truck wash system recycles water for reuse.

Stormwater
The facility in Minnesota is regulated according to a stormwater management plan and general permit. The intent of a stormwater system is to ensure that "stormwater" does not flow off into local waterways at a high rate carrying solids – but rather is retained on the site so that it can naturally infiltrate into the ground as would happen if these impervious surfaces (buildings and roads) were not present. This plan requires that the stormwater from the impervious surfaces is collected in on-site containment ditches/culverts and directed to a primary retention basin where contained solids are allowed to settle. This clarified water then flows to a secondary retention basin where the stormwater is retained and evaporates or infiltrates into the ground at a gradual, controlled speed.

Water Supply

The Minnesota plant does not have any water wells. Water is supplied by the City of Benson . You have already been supplied with our water use data.

EA

Based on the size and minimal impacts of the facility, a full Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was not required. The Minnesota plant did an Environmental Assessment (EA) as part of the document from which you obtained the water diagram. This EA was completed by the company indicated on the diagram, Wenck Associates. Since you were able to obtain this diagram you must also have this information.

Emissions

Emissions from a Georgia plant, if it were built, will be according to current strict regulatory requirements. In Minnesota this included the control of sulfur and chlorine emissions to prevent acid rain issues. Before a plant can be built, it will have to be demonstrated that it will have no detrimental impact on local environmental resources like lakes and streams.

Stack Emissions

As you no doubt realize, a plant like Fibrowatt is regulated for the release of emissions at rates that are demonstrated to be protective of public health, including for the young and elderly. As we report on our website, we do in fact have emissions (http://www.thestraightpoop.org/2010/04/07/fibrominn-continuous-emissions-results-2009/). With regard to the quote you reference I think the quote was related to what you see coming out of a stack. Most people continue to call them a "smoke stack" so we try to explain that what you see coming from the stack is actually steam. This steam comes from the condensation of moisture in the fuel as well as the previously mentioned water used in the SNCR system and spray dryer absorber (SDA) for the reduction of sulfur and chlorine emissions. The major parts of what come out of the stack are nitrogen (nitrogen is roughly 79% of the air we breath), carbon dioxide, moisture, and oxygen. These four constituents represent about 99.95% of what comes out of the stack. Moisture (i.e. water) is about 15% of what comes out of the stack. Most of the time, at full operation, you will not even see this moisture as it remains in vapor form. You see this steam when temperatures get cold or when the humidity is high.

Stack Height

The height of a stack is generally based on what are considered to be good engineering practices (GEP). According to GEP stack height guidelines, height of the stack is related to the height and cross-wind dimensions of nearby buildings/structures. The taller the building or structure the higher the GEP recommended stack height. In Minnesota the stack height is 300 feet though no formal design for a potential Georgia site has been considered so GEP stack height has not yet been looked at for such a plant.

Terry Walmsley
(267) 352-6589 (direct)
(267) 352-0014 (ext. 102)

From: Stop Fibrowatt [mailto:stopfibrowatt@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 11:13
To: Terry Walmsley
Cc: Dwayne A. Dye <(IBA@hartcom.net)>
Subject: Re: Needed corrections to Your Website - Water Usage

Dear Mr. Walmsley,

Thank you for the information about water. If the water information from your 2001 Fibrominn document is in error, then we will correct it when we have the exact data.

1. We would like a full description in writing of water usage including truck waste water (since each truck will have to be entirely washed and there will be waste water).
2. We would also like to know where that water will go. Please provide us with the storm drainage plan, where you will dump any waste water from catchment ponds.
3. Additionally, we would like to know if you have wells for the Fibrominn plant in Benson, Minnesota and if so, how many wells, how much water is each well capable of drawing each day.
4. We would also like to see a copy of your EIS (Environmental Impact Study), who paid for the EIS and who conducted the EIS- regarding the Fibrominn plant.
5. Furthermore, are any of the emissions from your plant going to increase the risk of acid rain falling into Lake Hartwell and the surrounding rivers and streams?
6. Did you say that what comes from your smoke stacks is just steam? In the Tribune Courier Montgomery County newspaper dated 2/20/09…Mr. Walmsley in an interview…is quoted:

"Poultry litter is the byproduct of what the birds eat and there are not contaminants in in their food and no contaminants in the steam you will see coming from the smokestacks."

Mr. Walmsley, if it is just steam why does Fibrowatt need an air permit and a 300 foot smokestack?

7. Also, do you have any scientific studies that show that the emissions from Fibrowatt are safe?
8. Do you have any health impact studies from your plant in Benson , Minnesota ? Have you conducted any studies on the citizens of Benson in regard to asthma?
9. We would also like to have the written report for the extent of medical due diligence done on the Benson, Minnesota plant and for the plant in Thetford , England .
10. Were there any pre and/or post health studies done on the local population in regard to asthma or any health risks?
11. We would also like the number of emergency room visits in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 for Benson Swift Hospital .
12. Do you emit any arsenic from your plants? If so, please send the data.
13. Do you have any arsenic in the ash from your plant in Benson , Minnesota ? If so please send the data.
14. Has Fibrowatt or anyone done any arsenic levels on citizens in Benson?
15. Do you emit any dioxins from your plant? If so, please send the studies to us.
16. Your company claims continuous monitoring of emissions. Please send us the results of continuous monitoring of dioxins and arsenic.

17. Has Fibrowatt or anyone conducted any dioxin testing on citizens of Benson, on the grazing livestock, on the fish, milk or eggs in the area?
18. We have been told that the litter hauling trucks will be covered with tarpaulins. Is this true?
19. Are the tarpaulins tight enough to keep flies in and out?
20. Are you aware that flies that are on poultry litter frequently carry antibiotic resistant organism and can travel for miles once they escape?
21. We would like the names of citizens who are unhappy with Fibrowatt in Benson , Minnesota ? These would be known to you through emails, letters, and phone calls.
22. Are there any comments from citizens on the Benson town survey that are negative about the Fibrowatt plant?
23. Do the trucks from Fibrowatt drive through Benson , Minnesota ?
24. Does the town of Benson own either the land or any interest in the Benson Fibrowatt plant?

Mr. Walmsley, our group is asking you to respond to all of our questions in writing. We would like your written answers one week from today, July, 30, 2010. That date would be Friday, August, 6, 2010.

Stop Fibrowatt in NE Georgia

stopfibrowatt@yahoo.com

From: Terry Walmsley < terry.walmsley@fibrowattusa.com >
To: "stopfibrowatt@yahoo.com" <stopfibrowatt@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Dwayne A. Dye (IBA@hartcom.net)" <IBA@hartcom.net>
Sent: Thu, July 22, 2010 4:02:45 PM
Subject: Needed corrections to Your Website - Water Usage

Website

I have noticed that your website has inaccuracies and I would think that in an effort to provide accurate information you will want to know where your website is inaccurate so that you can change it to include the correct information.

Water Usage

The first area that I have looked at was about water use. After reading information on the "How Much Water" tab I think that you might want to change this to reflect accurate information. What you have is old information from a 2001 permitting document.

The drawing shown provides information used during initial permitting activities. At that point, Fibrowatt was considering the use of a wet cooling tower, which would have used treated effluent from the nearby Benson wastewater treatment plant and water from the water supply wells as cooling water.

As the design of the plant progressed, Fibrowatt was able to cut water requirements further by converting to an air-cooled condenser (ACC) for cooling. As a result of the change to an ACC, the Fibrominn plant cut its water usage to about 15 – 20% of what originally would have been required for the plant. In Minnesota , water usage amounts to about 100 – 125 gallons per minute (GPM) not 792 gpm as you quoted. **To put it this in perspective – this would be about as much water as flows out of five garden hoses not the massive draw of water that you seem to be portraying.**

As Fibrowatt continues to improve its process design and performance, a lot of effort has been taken over the past few years to reduce air emissions through improvements to the design of the air emissions control system. Along with improvements to the air emissions control design is expected to come a further reduction in water usage, possibly eliminating the need for supplemental water.

Public Statements

While I am only guessing at the relationship of the supporters of this website to comments made in opposition to Fibrowatt in a WSPA article "Concerns Raised Over Poultry Power Plant", I am going to assume that there is a link and address another water-related accusation.

According to the WSPA reporter, the statement that ***"(t)he plant is expected to take a lot water out of the area to operate, possibly draining Lake Hartwell*** " can be attributed to public opposition like yours.

Looking directly at the statement, I did some calculations, which suggests that Lake Hartwell contains about 830,920,050,000 gallons of water. Based even on Fibrominn's level of water use (100 - 125 gpm), an amount expected to far exceed water requirements for future plants, this would suggest it would take about 12,650 years for a plant similar to the Minnesota plant to "drain Lake Hartwell."

Source for Accurate Information

If you would be so kind, we would appreciate it if you contact Fibrowatt before reporting such erroneous data. Likewise, we would be willing to sit down with your group if things progress – that is, if you are interested.

Note: *Since I have been directly contacted by a other people from the area over the past few weeks that are interested in the Fibrowatt issue, I plan to copy each of these parties with this information as well. Likewise, since Mr. Dwayne Dye has been contacted by a number of people I think it is also appropriate that he receive a copy of this e-mail.*

Terry Walmsley
Vice President of Environmental and Public Affairs

Fibrowatt LLC
One Summit Square – Suite 200
1717 Langhorne-Newtown Road
Langhorne, PA 19047
(267) 352-6589 (direct)
(267) 352-0014 (ext. 102)