

I want to start today with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania public health advisory 2011 fish consumption Guide. In this document it is stated as a general rule that: the state wide advisory is to consume only 1 meal of fish per week. Depending on the fish, only 1 to 2 meals a months. And even more alarming is an advisory not to eat any of the fish at all.

The answer to why the state recommends not eating the fish is also printed in the document and the reason is: they are ALL Polluted...Polluted with Mercury and PCB's.

Now If we look at the Energy Star, A U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Program we see the following information in the Frequently Asked Questions regarding Mercury and CFL light bulbs.

It reads:

“Mercury released into the air is the main way that mercury gets into water and bio accumulates in fish. Eating fish contaminated with mercury is the main way for humans to be exposed to mercury.”

So here we can see the direct relationship of mercury and PCB pollution to negative human exposure.

The document goes on to read for disposal of the light bulbs:

“NEVER send a fluorescent light bulb or any other mercury-containing product to an incinerator”.

- It is a fact that the proposed tire incinerator will release Mercury and PCB's from its smoke stack into the air and those toxins will bio accumulate thus polluting all the local water ways and fish in this area.
- It is a fact that there are an abundance of natural water ways that will be in direct contact with emissions from the tire plant and in those water ways there are fish and people eating those fish will be exposed to high concentrations of Mercury and PCB's.
- It is also a fact that the PA DEP is planning to approve an air quality permit that emits Mercury and PCB's, but yet is also the same agency responsible for providing the advisory concerning the consumption of fish with mercury and PCB's.

Doesn't that seem a bit odd to anyone here that the agency would approve the tire incinerator to emit Mercury and PCB's but then tell all the citizens not to eat anything exposed to them once they are emitted?

- It is a fact that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency specifically states that no mercury containing product should be sent to an incinerator.

- And yet it is a fact that the PA DEP plans to approve an air quality permit that will produce Mercury and PCB's from its stack.
- It is a fact that the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 directed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to ban the manufacture of PCB's and regulate their use and disposal. – And yet is 2011, 78 years since the first documented illnesses associated with PCB's, and 35 years since the ban of PCB's, the PA DEP is planning to approve construction of a PCB emitting facility.

If you go to the PA DEP website and read their mission statement it reads as follows:

The Department of Environmental Protection's mission is to protect Pennsylvania's air, land and water from pollution and to provide for the health and safety of its citizens through a cleaner environment. We will work as partners with individuals, organizations, governments and businesses to prevent pollution and restore our natural resources.

I do not see anywhere in the application by CRE where it states the positive environmental and health effects of this plant. I cannot find anywhere in the application that states the plant will restore Pennsylvania natural resources. I cannot understand how approval of this plant will protect Pennsylvania's air land and water.

So my questions to the DEP are as follows:

1. Doesn't it seem wrong to you in your moral and ethical mind to allow the incinerator to destroy the very thing your organization was created to protect?
2. Do you understand that you are planning to authorize the construction of a tire derived incinerator that will, in direct contradiction to your own Mission Statement, pollute and harm Pennsylvania and its citizens?
3. How can the PA DEP authorize the air quality permit, containing Mercury and PCB's, yet the U.S. Department of Environmental Protection clearly states that no mercury containing product should be sent to an incinerator?
4. How does the intent of the PA DEP plan to approve air quality permit in any way coincide with the DEP mission statement to protect Pennsylvania's environment and its citizens?
5. How does the approval prevent pollution and restore natural resources as stated in the DEP mission statement?