

## Thomas Pell

There is no mitigation like not creating a mess in the first place. As a down-winder, I strongly suggest that this project be denied a permit to pollute. You cannot un-ring this bell, one that tolls tons of aeriually dispersed pollutants, and generates most of its impacts on the roads, air, landscape and water of a populace that has no say in the regulation of the plant.

The applicant has yet to present a detailed plan, and past statements from them have been shot full of contradictions and omissions. There cannot be a serious study of the impacts without a detailed description of the material sources, transportation and utility logistics, particulate and water treatment etc.

It is disturbing that an area with healthy forests and unusually clean air and water is being targeted for an industry that states without question that there will be acid rain producing stack emissions. Concerns are compounded by tons of silica dust being generated, to be captured by bag house filters, which have a horrific Superfund-generating history here in Idaho. What protections would be written into a permit to fund and enforce third party monitoring of pollutants? Industry has proven time and again that it cannot be trusted to self-monitor. Does Ecology have staff, equipment and funding to continuously monitor stack emissions, and the authority and willingness to shut down non-compliance? If not how can any new permitted activity be allowed without conceding that negative impacts are a foregone conclusion. I assume the answer is no, so I strongly suggest that we not start down this road to a bad end, and deny a permit at the start. Thank you for your interest, and wishing you courage and support in protecting the environment.