

## Document Log

From	To	
"Dave Goss" <dcgoss@acaa-usa.org>	John Sager/DC/USEPA/US@EPA	
CC	BCC	
Subject		
RE: New Draft of AG FGD Brochure	06/29/2007 08:41 AM	

### Document Body

John,

I've highlighted some of my comments. We can talk about this at your convenience, after the trace element data is inserted.

I hope these are helpful. Thanks, Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: sager.john@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:sager.john@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2007 4:58 PM

To: Dave Goss

Subject: RE: New Draft of AG FGD Brochure

Am at a Virginia Beach hotel far from the beach, could not get in the Radisson or the Marriott. Sounds like I will miss you at the meeting site in the morning.

IWEM has a land application module, and I think it is highly appropriate for reference in this regard. This deserves discussion with Bob Wright, you and other stakeholders.

I will work on the exclamation point! language, and would like to discuss which cautionary language concerns you and consider appropriate adjustments.

The biggest concerns in my office right now are: 1) putting together a table with trace element concentrations from sources that meet with approval in my Office; and 2) how to address potential increases in mercury concentration from CAMR. Ken tells me one might expect the concentration in the FGD material to double or more, but less than an order of magnitude. This can be read in different ways, to say that the concentration will increase by 100%, or the concentration will increase a small amount from a small baseline.

"Dave Goss"  
<dcgoss@acaa-usa  
.org>

John Sager/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

To

06/26/2007 05:58  
PM

cc

Subject  
RE: New Draft of AG FGD Brochure

John,

I'll look forward to the next draft. I think it is pretty much on the mark. I might have a few editorial suggestions. Is IWEM appropriate for agricultural applications? I know it is favored in many settings, but are we appropriately drawing it into agriculture. Does Bob Wright have knowledge about IWEM? We might want to ask him about the ending.

Also, it seems like a conclusion paragraph would be good as a number of "questions" have been raised through the cautionary language. If we go too heavily on the cautions, then we risk pushing someone away. It seems like some sort of exclamation point is needed at the end taking people to the references, re-affirming the environmental benefits and reminding them to evaluate the use, first. That reinforces the idea that FGD gypsum use is a good thing.

Thanks for letting me look at this one. Dave

From: sager.john@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:sager.john@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2007 7:25 PM  
To: dcgoss@acaa-usa.org  
Subject: Fw: New Draft of AG FGD Brochure

Dave, please take a look at this at your convenience. No need to do anything with it at the moment. Tim Taylor in EMRAD and I are tracking down some additional info before I ask for another round of formal comments on this draft. You may comment now if you want, but no need.