



**United States Department of Agriculture  
Rural Development**

September 23, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)  
LanzaTech Freedom Pines Biorefinery  
Soperton, Georgia

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTION**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Business-Cooperative Service (RBS) has received an application to transfer a lender guarantee and new plant operator for an existing loan guarantee provided under the RBS 9003 Biorefinery Assistance Program. The proposed transfer of the guarantee is for retrofit actions and operations to produce advanced biofuels at the site of the existing Range Fuels biofuels facility in Treutlen County, Georgia. The applicant proposes to modify existing processes and add some additional facilities there to process woody biomass and produce approximately 2 million gallons of ethanol and 3-7,000 pounds of butanediol (2,3-BDO) annually; the production of which would help meet the national goal for renewable fuel standard production of 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2022 established by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

The environmental analysis of this proposed action are contained in a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (EA) adopted by RBS in 2009; an EA prepared by the Department of Energy (DOE) in 2007; a comparative analysis of the proposed changes are summarized in Attachment 1.

LanzaTech proposes to modify and add to existing facilities to operate a cellulosic biofuels facility on the site of the existing Range Fuels biofuel plant, a site of 281 acres located two miles north of Soperton, Georgia. The feedstock LanzaTech will use is woody biomass which is available within a 50 mile radius of the plant. The processing technology will be a hybrid approach of using Range Fuels syngas production facility with syngas fermentation from using a LanzaTech proprietary microbe, process, and bioreactor design. The existing Range Fuels facilities for feedstock handling, drying, and reactor devolatilization will be used at the site. In addition, existing utility systems, water supply, natural gas, electricity and wastewater treatment will be used.

This proposal, modification and operation of an advanced biofuels facility, does not pose significant adverse effects to the natural or human environment.


1400 Independence Ave, S.W. Washington, DC 20250-0700  
Web: <http://www.rurdev.usda.gov>

[Committed to the future of rural communities.](#)

"USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender."  
To file a complaint of discrimination write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.,  
Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (800)795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD).




## **Attachment 1**



Map of:  
Soperton, GA 30457-5270

Notes

LanzaTech Site (926 Commerce Drive)



©2011 MapQuest, Inc. Use of directions and maps is subject to the MapQuest Terms of Use. We make no guarantee of the accuracy of their content, road conditions or route usability. You assume all risk of use. View [Terms of Use](#)





copyright © 2010 Range Fuels, Inc. All rights reserved






Range Fuels Soperton Plant, Soperton, Georgia  
copyright © 2009 Range Fuels, Inc. All rights reserved








File Location: \\Seasrv01\eng\1A - Process Solutions\11-30224\_Lanzatech\Drawings\General\G-003.dwg  
 Save Date: 9/20/11 By: Korinek,Susanne



**PLAN**  
 SCALE: 1" = 100'-0"




**GENERAL NOTES**


- 1. NOT USED.

**KEYED NOTES**

- ① NOT USED.



**KEY PLAN**  
 SCALE: NONE



**PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

Reference Drawings				Revisions				Revisions					
Drawing No	Title	Rev	Date	By	Description	Rev	Date	By	Description	Rev	Date	By	Description
		A	09/20/11	DGT	ISSUED FOR PRELIMINARY REVIEW								

Rev Date App'd Client Approval Milestone

Harris Group Inc.  
 Engineering Solutions for a Better World®  
 www.harrisgroup.com

Subconsultant:  
 Drawn: SKK  
 Engr: PWS  
 Appr:  
 Check:  
 Check:  
 PMgr: DGT

**SITE GENERAL ARRANGEMENT WETLANDS LOCATION SHT. 2 OF 2**

**125 TPD SOPERTON PLANT**

Project No: 30224.00  
 Drawing: G-003  
 Rev: A



**Side-by-Side Environmental Impact Comparison - Range Fuels vs. LanzaTech  
(Tab "Inputs and Outputs" provides summary comparison of input/output streams)**

<b>Existing Environment (See excerpt from EA for more detail)</b>	<b>Consequences of Range Fuels Construction and Operation</b>	<b>Differences in LanzaTech Construction and Operation</b>
<b>1. Land Use</b>		
<p>The county is rural with forestry and some agricultural uses. Forestry accounts for 80% of the county's land use. The facility is located 2 miles northwest of Soperton in an Industrial Park occupied by 7 other commercial operations. The majority of the site was previously cleared and consists of old field plant communities, streams, and wetlands. Buffer areas around streams and wetlands were not cleared and contain mature deciduous trees.</p>	<p>Create 12.8 acres of impervious surface and 1.3 acres of planned paved road. Would not change intended industrial use of land and would have negligible impact on forest land in Treutlen county.</p>	<p>LanzaTech units are within Range Fuels' planned area of impervious surface and no paved road required.</p>
<b>2. Geomorphology, Geology, Seismic Hazard, and Soils</b>		
<p>The topography at the site ranges from 250 to 320 feet above average mean sea level (AMSL). Four soil series occur within the proposed project area: Gilead, Lakeland, Norfolk, and Plummer. The Gilead and Norfolk Series cover the majority of the proposed project area. The Gilead Series consists of moderately well drained, firm, clayey soils found in the upper coastal plain and has moderately slow permeability. Two soil types from the Norfolk soil series (Norfolk loamy sand with 2 to 5 percent slopes and Norfolk loamy sand with 2 to 5 percent slopes, eroded) that are designated as prime farmland by the NRCS occur on the proposed project site (Alex Comegys - NRCS personal communication, July 20, 2007). Based on review of the Treutlen County, Georgia Soil Survey, these soils</p>	<p>Minimal impact on geomorphology. Low risk for earthquake. New disturbance to ~48.3 acres of soils. Negligible impact on prime farmland.</p>	<p>Reduced area of soil disturbance.</p>
<b>3. Hydrology</b>		

<p><b>Surface Water:</b> There are three unnamed streams within the Range Fuels site. The primary stream is approximately 2 feet wide. This stream flows from the northeast to the southwest and is joined by two additional unnamed streams within the property. One of the tributary streams is a perennial stream that originates offsite and the other is an intermittent stream that flows only in response to an offsite water discharge. The primary drainage on the property originates from farm ponds offsite, with additional flows provided by a spring/ seep in the north-eastern portion of the property. There are no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplains or floodways on the site (Treutlen County, 2006).</p> <p><b>Groundwater:</b> Several aquifers underlie the lower half of the Oconee River basin in Treutlen County, which includes the Range Fuels site. The only aquifer that receives recharge in Treutlen County is the surficial aquifer, and this recharge area is more than 5 miles away from the site.</p>	<p>No encroachment on surface waters or existing buffers. Potential soil disturbance during construction, with possible modified surface water runoff patterns. Mitigated through use of construction and post-construction BMPs. Planned groundwater withdrawal of 316,800 gpd would have minimal impact on other groundwater users.</p>	<p>Water supplied by City of Soperton; no need for additional groundwater withdrawals.</p>
--	---	--

4 **4. Water Quality**

<p>The 303(d) List of Waters reports on streams and lakes identified as impaired for one or more pollutants and do not meet one or more water quality standards. There are no 303(d) (DNR, 2007) listed segments of impaired waters near the project area. Because there would be no changes in harvest site runoff characteristics following removal of feedstock, there would be no impacts to water quality resulting from the purchase of feedstock materials.</p>	<p>Impact of runoff during construction mitigated by BMPs. Post-construction, impact of additional impervious surfaces expected to have no direct impacts to existing stream and wetland buffers.</p> <p>Post-construction grading and detention pond to contain or treat stormwater. Facility SPCC plan to minimize potential impacts to surficial aquifer due to hazardous material release.</p>	<p>Unchanged. See Table 4-1 for specifics.</p>
--	--	--

5 **5. Wetlands**

<p>Approximately 18 acres of forested wetlands have been identified on the project site within the Industrial Park. Approximately 90 percent of the wetlands on the site are within a forested area immediately adjacent to perennial and intermittent streams that bisect the property, extending 30 to 100 feet to either side of the stream channel. The remaining 10 percent of onsite wetlands are emergent wetlands located in the eastern portion of the parcel that would remain undeveloped. Additional wetlands are located on the parcel adjacent to the Industrial Park that would contain the chipper. This parcel contains two small forested wetlands. Both wetland areas are located outside of the area proposed for the chipper, storage areas, and truck travel.</p>	<p>Layout of Range plant and supporting infrastructure avoided encroachment on wetlands and associated buffers. No long term negative impacts to wetland hydrology from replacement of the culvert.</p> <p>Encroachment into two wetlands totaling 0.61 acres were self-reported and addressed in Supplemental EA. The encroachments were found to have negligible temporary impacts to hydrology. With purchase of mitigation credits, the encroachments considered to have no net impacts on the wetland.</p>	<p>Unchanged. Facility will remain within planned footprint.</p>
---	---	--

**6. Biological Resources**

<p>The facility site includes 6 parcels totaling approximately 275.1 acres. Approximately 67.4 of the 275.1 acres would be developed for the project and the remaining acreage would be kept as natural and landscaped greenspace. The main facility site would cover 115.7 acres, much of which has been previously cleared. Within the previously cleared areas, much of the northern and western areas of the site are vegetated with native grasses, dominated by brooms edge, while the southern and eastern portions of the site are predominantly bare dirt. The areas surrounding wetlands and streams on the parcel were not cleared and a 30- to 100-foot wide strip of mature trees remains around the streams and wetlands. These forested areas are dominated by hardwoods (red maple, magnolia, sweet gum and willow oak). It is expected that the site and the surrounding areas would contain a variety of common small animals including field mice, armadillos, opossums, foxes, rabbits, snakes and squirrels, as well as a variety of birds typical of the upper coastal plain of Georgia in forested areas. The northwestern and western perimeter</p>	<p>Possible minor impacts to biological resources and habitat quality. Displacement of animals during construction mitigated by ability to migrate to adjacent habitat via preserved riparian corridors and forest habitat. Activity during operations would have negligible impact on regional populations. Feedstock is normally removed from harvest sites before replanting and therefore does not provide habitat for nearby animals.</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>
---	--	-------------------

7	<b>7. Protected Species</b>		
	<p>CH2M HILL conducted multiple site visits in the spring and summer of 2007 to assess the site for protected species. No federally protected species were identified during these site visits. Habitat and evidence of the presence for gopher tortoise, state listed as threatened, were identified. None of the other protected</p>	<p>Gopher tortoise burrows were identified. A gopher tortoise relocation program was implemented and exclusion fences constructed. Range agreed to notify USFWS if Indigo Snakes were found. No known instances of federally protected</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>
8	<b>8. Safety and Occupational Health</b>		
	<p>Firefighting services currently are provided for the Industrial Park by the Soperton Fire Department, located in downtown Soperton approximately three miles from the proposed plant. Police services at the proposed plant would be provided by the Treutlen County Sheriff's Office in Soperton. Medical services, including emergency rooms, are available at the Fairview Park Hospital in Dublin, Meadows Regional Medical Center in Vidalia, and Emanuel Medical Center, in Swainsboro, approximately 26, 21, and 25 miles, respectively, from the proposed plant.</p>	<p>Hazards result from high temperature and pressure operations, and from toxic and flammable materials. Hazards addressed in site safety plan.</p>	<p>Hazards from high temperature and pressure operations reduced.</p> <p>Significant reduction in hazard from 2,3-BDO product compared to methanol. Ethanol product unchanged. See Tables 8-1, 8-2 for details.</p> <p>See Attachment 2 regarding microbe safety.</p>
9	<b>9. Noise</b>		
	<p>Noise, in the context of this analysis, refers to sounds generated by activities that could affect employees of the facility, employees of nearby commercial operations, residents near the proposed facility, or wildlife. Noise levels within the Treutlen County Industrial Park are variable, depending on truck and train traffic in the area. While no specific data have been compiled for the Treutlen County Industrial Park, background noise levels in these areas would be expected to range from 40 db, to 75 dBa, with occasional upward spikes related to rail and road traffic.</p>	<p>Construction noise limited to daylight hours. Staff to use hearing protection and follow OSHA standards. Operational noise primarily due to chipping. No adverse impacts to outdoor or indoor activities in local residences. Noise disturbance for truck deliveries at one residence during daylight hours only.</p>	<p>Significantly reduced noise levels: (1) no chipper planned; (2) estimated 10 trucks/day at current capacity versus &gt; 500 considered in Range EA.</p> <p>Surrounding forest acreage will be maintained as a noise buffer.</p>
10	<b>10. Meteorology</b>		



<p>Treutlen County is characterized by a warm and humid, temperate climate. Average annual temperature ranges from lows of about 53°F to highs of approximately 78°F. Average annual precipitation is approximately 46 inches. Treutlen County has a low incidence of tornadoes, which is 3.1 times lower than the national average. Only one damaging tornado has occurred since 1950. Georgia has not experienced a major hurricane (Category 2 or</p>	<p>No impact on climate or weather. Minor potential risk for severe weather to adversely impact operations.</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>
--	---	-------------------

**11 11. Air Quality**

<p>Treutlen County is in attainment for all criteria air pollutants, including the new 8-hour ozone standard (USEPA, 2007b). Because the proposed facility would not be built in a criteria air pollutant non-attainment or maintenance area or emit any criteria pollutant in excess of the major source threshold of 100 tpy, a full CAA conformity determination is not required.</p>	<p>Temporary and minor construction-related air quality impacts due to dust during construction.</p> <p>Criteria pollutants below threshold for Prevention of Significant Deterioration regulations. Facility to be constructed and operate under "Air Permit to Construct and Operate" issued by EPD.</p> <p>Ambient concentrations of all toxic air pollutants below acceptable ambient concentrations (AAC).</p>	<p>Unchanged. See Table 11-1 for details.</p>
--	---	---

**12 12. Waste Management and Hazardous Materials**

<p>Treutlen County has no landfill sites within the county. Solid wastes are collected and transported to the Toombs County Landfill. The Toombs County landfill is located approximately 18 miles southeast of the site along SR 29, and has capacity to accept solid wastes for an additional 20 years, and is permitted to accept both solids/ sludges and construction/ demolition debris. No hazardous waste sites or hazardous materials have been identified on the site of the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>No known hazardous waste sites. No impacts from hazardous materials during construction. Spill prevention and containment measure and flare placement designed to reduce impacts from fuel production, storage, transport.</p> <p>No hazardous wastes generated and solid wastes can be accommodated in existing Toombs County Landfill.</p>	<p>No hazardous wastes generated. Biocatalyst replaces solid inorganic catalyst and is disposed of through anaerobic digestion.</p> <p>Residual solids from digester are returned to gasifier feed or disposed of with char, leaving no net solid output from the unit.</p>
---	---	---

**13 13. Cultural Resources**

In July of 2007, Brockington and Associates, Inc. conducted a field survey of the site in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and 36 CFR Part 800. Research found only one previously recorded archaeological site (9TU20) within a 1.6-km (1-mile) radius of the project tract. Site 9TU20 consists of a small scatter of lithics and ceramics. The site was recorded by Garrow and Associates, Inc., in 2000 and was found to not be eligible for nomination to the NRHP. No previously recorded historic structures or other architectural resources were identified within 1.6 km (1 mile) of the field survey. During the structures survey, no intact structures older than 50 years were identified within the project area.

No NHRPO eligible cultural resources were found.

Unchanged.

14 **14. Transportation**

<p>The Georgia Central Railways local line runs along the southwestern boundary of the Treutlen County Industrial Park. This line transports goods and materials to a mainline junction in Dublin. There is no train service on weekends and the rail line does not support passenger service. Approximately 3 miles north of the Soperton Industrial Park, there is an exchange from SR 15 onto the main interstate route serving the area, 1-16. The most direct route from 1-16 to the proposed site is via SR 15 to Commerce Drive. However, SR 29 provides an alternate route to the site from 1-16 and some traffic originating west of Soperton travels via SR 29. SR 15 is a North-South rural arterial between Soperton and 1-16. The roadway consists of two twelve foot travel lanes, two foot paved shoulders, one foot grass shoulders and ditches. The traffic capacity of this section of SR 15 for its given level of service is 1,600 vehicles per hour in each direction. For this section of SR 15, the peak hour use over the past ten years would be 204 vehicles in each direction, which is 12.75 percent of the capacity of SR 15 for its given level of service. SR 29 is a North-South rural arterial between Soperton and 1-16. The roadway consists of two 12-foot travel lanes, 2-foot paved shoulders, 1-foot grass shoulders, and ditches. The intersection used to access State Route 29 is a "Y" intersection with the acute angle near 45 degrees (45°) and a large turning radius on the northern corner. The traffic capacity of SR 29 for its given level of service is 1,600 vehicles per hour in each direction. For this section of SR 29, the peak hour use over the past 10 years would be 389 vehicles in each direction, which is 24.31 percent of the capacity of SR 29 for its given level of service.</p>	<p>Will not exceed capacity. No additional facilities required.</p>	<p>Will not exceed capacity. No additional facilities required.</p>
--	---	---

15 **15. Utility Infrastructure**

<p><b>Natural Gas:</b> Natural Gas pipelines, supplied by Atlanta Gas Light, currently run immediately adjacent to Commerce Drive along a portion of the southern border of the parcel for the proposed plant. Additional four inch lines would be installed by Atlanta Gas Light along Commerce Drive and onto the facility.</p> <p><b>Potable Water:</b> Range Fuels signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Soperton Municipal Water Supply to receive up to 0.72 mgd of municipal water. Four-inch water lines are in place in the Industrial Park to provide potable and process water and fire protection for planned industrial development.</p> <p><b>Wastewater:</b> The City of Soperton WWTP receives flow from the sewer system installed in the Industrial Park. The City has indicated that its WWTP has between 0.1 and 0.2 mgd of available capacity to process wastewater from the project.</p> <p><b>Power:</b> Regionally, the existing power infrastructure was adequate to support the requirements of the proposed plant. No power lines were on the site and a 115 kV to 25 kV substation had to be built on-site to accommodate the Range Fuels project. New 115 kV transmission lines were constructed to connect the substation to the electrical</p>	<p>Atlanta Gas Light installed new gas lines. Georgia Power completed construction of new 115 kV transmission lines and a new substation.</p>	<p>No new power, water or natural gas requirements (see "Inputs &amp; Outputs" table).</p>
---	---	--

16 **16. Aesthetics**

<p>The proposed location of the Range Fuels facility is predominately within an existing Industrial Park containing seven current businesses. Most of the buildings in the Industrial Park have metal exteriors, with the exception of the Easter Seals and County Training facilities, which have brick facades. None of the existing buildings in the Industrial Park exceed 35 feet in height. There is a water tower located in the Industrial Park that is approximately 120 feet tall.</p>	<p>Plant and support facilities are minimally visible to all but neighboring businesses and not readily visible to closest residences. Plant structures &lt; 100 feet, reducing visibility. Georgia Power infrastructure had negligible impacts on aesthetics. Facility and security lighting is unavoidable long-term adverse impact to night sky views in immediate vicinity.</p>	<p>Unchanged. Maximum height of new units is 25 meters, which is below Range Fuels' planned maximum of 100 feet.</p>
--	---	--

17 **17. Socioeconomic Factors**

<p>See page 16 of the accompanying excerpt from the DOE EA.</p>	<p>The project's job creation and economic impact, both during construction and plant operation, are expected to have a positive influence on all key socioeconomic factors. Minority residents are not expected to be negatively impacted by construction or</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>
---	---	-------------------

**Table 8-1****Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

	<b>With Range</b>	<b>With LanzaTech</b>	<b>Comments</b>
High temperature & pressure operations	Syngas production at high T, P	Unchanged	Existing safety plan suffices
Syngas	Mixture of PAHs	Unchanged	Existing safety plan suffices
Methanol	Toxic, flammable	N/A	Methanol replaced by 2,3-BDO. See Table 8-2 for comparison of relative hazards from methanol and 2,3-BDO
Ethanol	Toxic, flammable	Unchanged	Existing safety plan suffices
2,3-BDO	N/A	Non-toxic, non-hazardous	Replaces methanol, with reduced handling requirements relative to existing safety plan. See Table 8-2 for comparison of relative hazards from methanol and 2,3-BDO.
Solid inorganic catalysts	Non-toxic, generate dust	N/A	N/A

Biocatalyst

N/A

Non-toxic, non-GMO, naturally-occurring, anaerobic

See file "Safety of LanzaTech Biocatalyst" summarizing containment of biocatalyst in bioreactors, Health Risk Assessment of organism, and safety data sheet (SDS) of freeze-dried bacteria (method of delivery to site).

## Summary of System Input and Output Streams

	Range Fuels Plan (from Oct 07 EA from unless otherwise	LanzaTech Plan	Comments
Feedstock (tpd, dry)	2,650*	125	
Water requirements, process - from groundwater (gpd)	316,800	0	Not required
Water requirements, process - from municipal supply	N/A	66,870	City commitment to supply 200 gal/minute (288,000 gal/24 hour day) is sufficient
Water requirements, potable - from municipal supply (gpd)	5,000	≤5,000	Potable water for offices and restrooms
Natural gas demand (cubic ft/day)	11,400 (OSBL) & 3,900 (avg ISBL)	11,400 (OSBL) & 3,900 (avg ISBL)	OSBL is natural gas to flares. ISBL is natural gas demand based on yearly average for plant startup only. Atlanta Gas line can supply 32,430 cubic ft/hr.
Electricity (kWh/year)	290,832,000	13,680,000	Site has infrastructure for full Range Fuels plan
Wastewater treatment (gpd to onsite WWTP) - to municipal treatment	864,000	75,000	Existing WWTP capacity is 100,000 gpd. Wastewater is discharged to local POTW
Sanitary wastewater - to municipal treatment	5,000	≤5,000	Determined by staffing



**Solid waste**

unknown

134.1 ton/year sulfatreat waste  
2.402 8  
Assumes biomass sludge recycled to gasifier feed.

\* From Jan 09  
Supplemental EA

## Table 8-1 Comparison of Co-Products based on MSDS Information

### 2,3-Butanediol

CAS-No.513-85-9

EC-No.208-173-6

#### Hazard Rating

*Comment: hazard rating is significantly lower than Methanol*

Not a hazardous substance or mixture according to Regulation (EC) No. 1272/2008.

Not a hazardous substance or mixture according to EC-directives 67/548/EEC or 1999/45/EC.

#### Prevention

*Comment: Plant and operational controls are significantly lower than methanol*

Provide appropriate exhaust ventilation at places where dust is formed.

Store in cool place. Keep container tightly closed in a dry and well-ventilated place.

#### Toxicological information

*Comment: Toxicology effects are significantly lower than methanol*

##### Acute toxicity

no data available

LD50 Intraperitoneal - mouse - 6.075 mg/kg

##### Skin corrosion/irritation

no data available

##### Serious eye damage/eye irritation

no data available

##### Respiratory or skin sensitization

no data available

Germ cell mutagenicity

##### Carcinogenicity

IARC: No component of this product present at levels greater than or equal to 0.1% is identified as

probable, possible or confirmed human carcinogen by IARC.

**Reproductive toxicity**

Specific target organ toxicity - single exposure

no data available

**Specific target organ toxicity - repeated exposure**

no data available

**Aspiration hazard**

no data available

**Potential health effects**

Inhalation May be harmful if inhaled. May cause respiratory tract irritation.

Ingestion May be harmful if swallowed.

Skin May be harmful if absorbed through skin. May cause skin irritation.

Eyes May cause eye irritation.

Signs and Symptoms of Exposure

Gastrointestinal disturbance, Nausea, Headache, Vomiting

**Transportation**

*Comment: Significantly lower environmental impact and transport requirements*

**UN number**

ADR/RID: - IMDG: - IATA: -

**14.2 UN proper shipping name**

ADR/RID: Not dangerous goods

IMDG: Not dangerous goods

IATA: Not dangerous goods

**14.3 Transport hazard class(es)**

ADR/RID: - IMDG: - IATA: -

**14.4 Packaging group**

ADR/RID: - IMDG: - IATA: -

**14.5 Environmental hazards**

ADR/RID: no IMDG Marine pollutant: no IATA: no

**Regulatory requirements**

*Comment: Significantly lower regulatory requirements noted*

## Methanol

Cas No: 67-56-1

EC-NO.200-659-6

### Hazard rating

Flammable Liquids (Category B)

Acute toxicity, Oral (Category C)

Acute toxicity, Inhalation (Category C)

Acute toxicity, Dermal (Category C)

Skin irritation (Category A)

Eye irritation (Category A)

Specific Target Organ Toxicity (Category A)

### Prevention

P210 Keep away from heat/sparks/open flames/hot surfaces. - No smoking.

P233 Keep container tightly closed.

Sigma - M3641 Page 2 of 8

P240 Ground/bond container and receiving equipment.

P241 Use explosion-proof electrical/ ventilating/ lighting/ equipment.

P242 Use only non-sparking tools.

P243 Take precautionary measures against static discharge.

P260 Do not breathe dust/ fume/ gas/ mist/ vapours/ spray.

P264 Wash skin thoroughly after handling.

P270 Do not eat, drink or smoke when using this product.

P271 Use only outdoors or in a well-ventilated area.

P280 Wear protective gloves/ protective clothing/ eye protection/ face protection.

### Toxicological information

#### Acute toxicity

LD50 Oral - rat - 5,628 mg/kg

LC50 Inhalation - rat - 4 h - 64000 ppm

LD50 Dermal - rabbit - 15,800 mg/kg

#### Skin corrosion/irritation

Skin - rabbit - Irritating to skin. - 24 h

#### Serious eye damage/eye irritation

Eyes - rabbit - Eye irritation - 24 h

Respiratory or skin sensitization

no data available

Sigma - M3641 Page 6 of 8

Germ cell mutagenicity

no data available

#### **Carcinogenicity**

IARC: No component of this product present at levels greater than or equal to 0.1% is identified as probable, possible or confirmed human carcinogen by IARC.

#### **Reproductive toxicity**

no data available

#### **Specific target organ toxicity - single exposure**

Causes damage to organs.

Specific target organ toxicity - repeated exposure

no data available

#### **Aspiration hazard**

no data available

#### **Potential health effects**

Inhalation Toxic if inhaled. Causes respiratory tract irritation.

Ingestion Toxic if swallowed.

Skin Toxic if absorbed through skin. Causes skin irritation.

Eyes Causes serious eye irritation.

Signs and Symptoms of Exposure

Methyl alcohol may be fatal or cause blindness if swallowed., Cannot be made non-poisonous., Effects due to ingestion may include:, Nausea, Headache, Vomiting, Gastrointestinal disturbance, Dizziness, Weakness, Confusion., Drowsiness, Unconsciousness, May cause convulsions.

#### **Additional Information**

RTECS: PC1400000

## **Transportation**

#### **UN number**

ADR/RID: 1230 IMDG: 1230 IATA-DGR: 1230

#### **14.2 UN proper shipping name**

ADR/RID: METHANOL

IMDG: METHANOL

IATA-DGR: Methanol

#### **14.3 Transport hazard class(es)**

ADR/RID: 3 (6.1) IMDG: 3 (6.1) IATA-DGR: 3

#### **14.4 Packaging group**

ADR/RID: II IMDG: II IATA-DGR: II

#### **14.5 Environmental hazards**

ADR/RID: no IMDG Marine pollutant: no IATA-DGR: no

## **Regulatory requirements**

**Table 11-1**

**Criteria Pollutants**

**Maximum Annual (PTE) Criteria Pollutant  
Emissions\* (maximum operation)**

	<b>With Range</b>	<b>With LanzaTech</b>	<i>Emissions dominated by existing units at site</i>
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	41.2	Unchanged	
PM	93	Unchanged	
NO <sub>x</sub>	95.5	Unchanged	
SO <sub>x</sub>	0.72	Unchanged	
CO	86.6	Unchanged	
VOC	26.2	Unchanged	
HAPs (total)	9	Unchanged	
HAPs (individual)	all < 10	Unchanged	

\*Air Toxics also will be unchanged from those listed in Range EA.

## **Attachment 2**

## Safety of the LanzaTech Biocatalyst

The biocatalyst to be used in the syngas fermentation process is LanzaTech's proprietary microbe, LZ1561. LZ1561 is a naturally selected, and therefore **not** genetically modified or GMO, strain of *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. This microbe has been classified as a Risk Group 1 organism by the World Health Organization (WHO). The definition of WHO Risk Group 1 is that the organism poses no or low individual and community risk and is therefore a microorganism that is unlikely to cause human or animal disease.

LZ1561 is also a strict anaerobe, which means that small quantities of oxygen, <100 parts per million (ppm), are fatally toxic to the organism.

In the fermentation process, the microbe is contained both physically and environmentally:

**Physical containment:** The specialized gas fermentation bioreactors developed by LanzaTech to cultivate LZ1561 are designed to US ASME 8 standards, enabling the handling and containment of gases, liquids, and vapors under pressure. This design standard thus ensures that the microbes, held within this vessel, are also securely physically contained and separated from the external environment in the same manner as the liquids, gases, and vapors processed within the facility.

**Environmental containment:** The microbe is a strict anaerobe. Any unintentional release of the microbe into the environment results in exposure of the microbe environmental oxygen levels (21% OXYGEN OR 210,000ppm). Exposure to this level of oxygen is fatal to the organism. In this way, the organism is environmentally contained within the bioreactor due to its oxygen-free (anaerobic) conditions.

The following document provides a Health Risk Assessment for the *C. autoethanogenum* organism. The microbe is delivered to site in freeze-dried form, for which the Safety Data Sheet is also provided.



Auckland 02 August 2011

## **Health Risk Assessment of *Clostridium autoethanogenum*.**

### **Risk Group Classification**

The World Health Organisation (WHO) classifies the agents within a country by Risk Group 1, to 4, equivalent to Bio-safety Level 1 (BSL-1) to Level 4 (BSL-4), based on pathogenicity of the organism, modes of transmission and host range of the organism. Group 1 (BSL-1): low individual and community risk, Group 2 (BSL-2): moderate individual risk, limited community risk, Group 3 (BSL-3): high individual risk, limited community risk, Group 4 (BSL-4): high individual and community risk. This is a worldwide adopted and trusted classification.

The WHO classification of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* is Risk Group 1 (BSL-1). This is the lowest nomination possible confirming *Clostridium autoethanogenum* has no or low individual and community risk and is a microorganism that is unlikely to cause human disease or animal disease. The equivalent BSL-1 definition is a "well characterized agents not consistently known to cause disease in healthy adult humans of minimal potential hazard to laboratory personnel and the environment"

<http://www.absa.org/riskgroups/index.html>

### **Strain availability**

The German Resource Centre for Biological Material (DSMZ) provides internationally renowned services for the collection, maintenance, storage and worldwide shipment of microorganisms and their identification and characterization.

The strain *Clostridium autoethanogenum* is readily available from DSMZ for a small fee. Strain details such as isolation and growth procedure, associated publications and Risk Group are available on their website under strain identification number DSM10061.

<http://www.dsmz.de/microorganisms/html/strains/strain.dsm010061.html>


### **Origin of strain *C. autoethanogenum***

The original isolation paper published by Abrini et al, 1994, '*Clostridium autoethanogenum*, sp. nov., an anaerobic bacterium that produces ethanol from carbon monoxide' is readily available. In this publication the original isolation of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* from hybrid rabbit feces is described. The research was performed in Belgium, European Union.

In summary: *Clostridium autoethanogenum* is:

- Non spore forming
- Strictly anaerobic

- Has no toxin coding genes
- Risk Group 1 classification
- Environmental isolate
- Not genetically modified

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

02 AUGUST 2011  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

AJIT SURJUPERSAD  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

Director of Environmental Health and  
Safety  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

### Section 1. Identification of the material and the supplier

Product: Freeze Dried Bacteria  
 Synonyms:  
 Product Code:  
 Product Use: Industrial: chemical industry and laboratory reagent  
 New Zealand Supplier: LanzaTech NZ Ltd  
 Address: 24 Balfour Road  
 Parnell, Auckland  
 New Zealand  
 Telephone: +64 9 304 2110  
 Fax Number: +64 9 929 3038

**Emergency Telephone:**  
**New Zealand** 0800 764 766 (NZ Poisons and Hazardous Chemicals)  
**Australia** 13 11 26 (Poisons Information Centre)  
**USA** 800 424 9300 (CHEMTREC)  
**Canada** 613 996 6666 (CANUTEC)

Date of MSDS Preparation: 7 June 2011 version 1

### Section 2. Hazards Identification

This substance is freeze dried bacteria Risk Group 1. No health hazard

### Section 3. Composition / Information on Ingredients

Ingredients	Wt%	CAS NUMBER.
Clostridium autoethanogenum	98-100	not available

### Section 4. First Aid Measures

**Swallowed:** Not likely to require attention. If patient continues to vomit or is distressed seek medical advice.  
**Eyes:** Flush eye with water for a minimum of 15 minutes. Seek medical attention promptly if irritation persists or any loss of vision occurs.  
**Skin:** Not likely to require attention. Wash skin with soap and water. Launder contaminated clothing before re-use.  
**Inhaled:** Not likely to require attention  
**First Aid Facilities:** Safety showers, eye wash stations and First Aid kits.  
**Advice to Doctor:** Treat symptomatically

### Section 5. Fire Fighting Measures

<b>Hazard Type</b>	Not flammable or combustible
<b>Hazards from decomposition products</b>	None
<b>Suitable Extinguishing</b>	All forms of extinguishing media.

media	
Precautions for firefighters and special protective clothing	Treat according to storage and surroundings
HAZCHEM CODE (UK, Australia, NZ)	2T (no violent reaction or explosion, dilute)

<b>Section 6. Accidental Release Measures</b>
---

- Emergency Procedure:** All microbial cultures whether hazardous or not should be handled in an emergency by qualified microbiologists using appropriate safety procedures and precautions.
- Containment Procedure:** Actions must be taken on the assumption that the culture may be a pathogen. The release area must be sealed to prevent escape to the wider environment and HAZMAT personnel trained in biological products called to advise on containment.
- Clean Up Procedure:** Seek advice on appropriate disinfection procedures for Clostridium species.

<b>Section 7. Handling and Storage</b>
--

- Approved Handlers: (New Zealand):** Not Required.
- Handling** Advisable to wear gloves and particulate cartridge mask when handling bulk quantities or for liquid transfer.
- Storage:** Store refrigerated in tightly closed containers.  
Store away from oxidizing agents.  
Keep containers closed at all times - check regularly for leaks.  
Do not eat, drink or smoke in areas of use or storage.  
Do not store next to food or animal feeds

<b>Section 8 Exposure Controls / Personal Protection</b>
--

Use Personal Protective Equipment;  
Goggles, chemical resistant gloves and appropriate clothing to prevent skin exposure.

**Engineering Controls:**

Local exhaust ventilation and/or mechanical (general) exhaust is recommended.

**Personal Protective Equipment:**

- Personal Hygiene** Protective clothing (gloves, overalls, boots, etc.) should be worn to prevent skin contact. Always wash hands before smoking, eating, drinking or using the toilet.  
Wash contaminated clothing and other protective equipment before storing or re-using.
- Skin Protection:** Avoid skin contact by the use of approved chemical resistant gloves PVC or Neoprene (AS 2161) and biological protection coveralls.
- Eye Protection:** Avoid eye contact by wearing chemical goggles with side-shields or face-shield (AS/NZS 1336) whenever exposed to vapour or mist or if there is a risk of splashing liquid in the eyes.

Respiratory Protection: Wear respirator mask with particulate filters when handling freeze dried material.

Thermal Protection: None should be needed under normal circumstances.

### Section 9 Physical and Chemical Properties

Appearance: Straw colored powder or cake  
Odour: odourless.  
pH: Not applicable  
Vapour Pressure: Not applicable  
Vapour Density: Not applicable  
Boiling Point/range (°C): Not applicable  
Flash Point: Not applicable  
Freezing Point (°C): Not applicable  
Solubility: Infinitely soluble in water  
Specific Gravity (H<sub>2</sub>O = 1): Approximately 1.0  
Flammable (Explosive) Limit - Upper: Not applicable  
Flammable (Explosive) Limit - Lower: Not applicable  
Autoignition Temperature: Not applicable  
Evaporation Rate: Not applicable

### Section 10. Stability and Reactivity

**Chemical Stability:** Stable  
**Incompatible Materials:** Strong oxidizing agents.  
**Conditions to avoid:** Heat  
**Hazardous Decomposition Products:** Nil. May form moulds and fungi if not refrigerated for several days.  
**Hazardous Reactions:** Containers should be regularly vented.  
Hazardous polymerisation will not occur.

### Section 11 Toxicological Information

**Toxicological Data:** LD50 oral (rat): not known  
LC50 inhalation (rat): not known

#### Acute Effects

**Swallowed:** May induce nausea  
**Eyes:** Powder will cause temporary eye irritation  
**Skin:** Contact with skin unlikely to have any more than temporary irritation  
**Inhaled:** Unlikely to have any effect

#### Chronic Effects

Long term chronic skin exposure could cause sensitivity or dermatitis.

**Additional Notes:** Whilst this strain is not hazardous it should be treated with caution

**Section 12. Ecotoxicological Information**

**NZ HSNO Classifications:** Not known

**Persistence and Degradability:** Likely to biodegradable and not persist in the environment

**Section 13. Disposal Considerations**

Empty containers and wastes must be decontaminated by steam sterilization or chemical disinfection before disposal

**Section 14 Transport Information**

This substance is classified as NOT a dangerous good for Land Transport according to NZS5433: 2007 and is NOT a dangerous good for rail, air, or sea transport.

**Section 15 Regulatory Information**For New Zealand:

ERMA Approval Code: Not Hazardous

**HSNO Trigger quantities for this substance**

	<u>Quantity</u>
Approved Handler	No
Tracking	No
Location Certificate (containers)	No
Signage	No
Emergency Response Plan	No
Secondary containment	No

For USA

TSCA 8(b) Inventory : No data available  
SARA listed: No data available

For EU

Risk Phrases	R36	Irritating to eyes
Safety Phrases	S-2	Keep out of reach of children
	S-7	Keep container tightly closed

**Section 16 Other Information**

1 HSNO Approved Code of Practice: Preparation of Safety Data Sheets, September 2006.

## Disclaimer

This document has been compiled by TCC Ltd on behalf of the manufacturer of the product and serves as the manufacturer's Safety Data Sheet ('SDS'). It is based on information concerning the product which has been provided to TCC by the manufacturer or obtained from third party sources and is believed to represent the current state of knowledge as to the appropriate safety and handling precautions for the product at the time of issue. Further clarification regarding any aspect of the product should be obtained directly from the manufacturer. While TCC has taken all due care to include accurate and up-to-date information in this SDS, it does not provide any warranty as to accuracy or completeness. As far as lawfully possible, TCC accepts no liability for any loss, injury or damage (including consequential loss) which may be suffered or incurred by any person as a consequence of their reliance on the information contained in this SDS. The information herein is given in good faith, but no warranty, express or implied is made.

Please contact the New Zealand proprietor, LanzaTech NZ Ltd, if further information is required.

Issue Date: 7 June 2011

Review Date: 7 June 2015

---

*Supplemental  
Environmental Assessment and Notice of  
Wetlands Involvement*

**Construction and Operation of a  
Proposed Cellulosic Ethanol  
Plant,  
Range Fuels Soperton Plant, LLC  
(formerly Range Fuels Inc.)  
Treutlen County, Georgia  
DOE/EA 1647**

Prepared for  
**U.S. Department of Energy**

January 2009

# Contents

Section	Page
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Purpose and Need for Proposed Action .....	2
1.3 Applicable Regulatory Requirements and Coordination .....	2
1.4 Scope of Analysis.....	4
1.5 Public Scoping and Agency Consultation .....	5
1.6 Document Organization .....	5
<b>2.0 Description of Changes to Proposed Facility Design and Operation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Modifications to Facility Components From the October 2007 Proposed Action .....	6
2.2 Modifications to Proposed Facility Layout.....	7
2.3 Modifications to Proposed Operations.....	9
2.4 Modifications to Proposed Operations.....	9
<b>3.0 Environmental Consequences Resulting From Modifications to Proposed Design and Operation .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Land Use .....	13
3.2 Soils.....	13
3.3 Water Quality.....	14
3.4 Wetlands .....	14
3.5 Biological Resources.....	15
3.6 Protected Species .....	18
3.7 Noise.....	18
3.8 Air Quality.....	20
3.9 Waste Management and Hazardous Materials .....	23
3.10 Transportation .....	23
3.11 Aesthetics.....	24
3.12 Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action .....	25
3.15 Short-Term Uses and Commitment of Resources.....	25
<b>4.0 References .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## Tables

2-1	Components of Proposed Action
3-1	Maximum Annual (PTE) Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum operation) for the Initial Phase
3-2	Maximum Annual (PTE) Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum operation) for the Build-out Phase
3-3	Air Toxics Impact Analysis
3-4	Analyses for Construction and Production Traffic at RF Soperton Facility



## Figures

- 2-1 Proposed Site Layout
- 2-2 Process Flow Diagram
- 2-3 Water and Wastewater Balance
- 3-1 Stream and Wetland Locations
- 3-2 Gopher Tortoise Relocation

## Appendices

- A Confirmation and Transfer of Mitigation Credits
- B Gopher Tortoise Correspondence
- C Georgia Department of Natural Resources Water Quality Certification

# Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dba	A-weighted Decibel Scale
DOE	Department of Energy
DNR	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
dtpd	dry tons per day
EA	Environmental Assessment
EO	Executive Order
EPAct	Energy Policy Act
EPD	Environmental Protection Division
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
hr	hour
I-16	Interstate Highway 16
µg/m <sup>3</sup>	micrograms per cubic meter
mgd	million gallons per day
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWP	Nationwide Permit
PM	particulate matter
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PTE	potential to emit
ROW	right of way
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SEA	Supplemental Environmental Assessment
SR	State Route
tpd	tons per day
tpy	tons per year
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	U.S. Code
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
VOC	volatile organic compound

# 1.0 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Background

Under the Energy Policy Act (EPA) of 2005, the U.S. Congress directed the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to carry out a program to demonstrate the commercial application of integrated biorefineries for the production of ethanol from lignocellulosic feedstocks. Federal funding for cellulosic ethanol production facilities is intended to further the government's goal of rendering cellulosic ethanol cost-competitive with gasoline by 2012 and, along with increased automobile fuel efficiency, reducing gasoline consumption in the U.S. by 20 percent within 10 years.

In February 2006, pursuant to § 932 of the EPA, DOE issued a Funding Opportunity Announcement for applications to design, construct, and operate an integrated biorefinery employing lignocellulosic feedstocks (woody material) for the production of combinations of liquid transportation fuels, biobased chemicals, substitutes for petroleum-based feedstocks and products, and energy in the form of electricity or useful heat. Range Fuels, Inc., now Range Fuels Soperton, LLC (RF Soperton) applied for, and was one of six companies selected to negotiate for award of financial assistance to aid in the construction and operation of their planned cellulosic ethanol production plant. In accordance with DOE and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) implementing regulations, DOE is required to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of DOE facilities, operations, and related funding decisions. The proposal to use federal funds to support the project requires that DOE address NEPA requirements and related environmental documentation and permitting requirements.

In October 2007, DOE completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the *Construction and Operation of a Proposed Cellulosic Ethanol Plant, Range Fuels, Inc. Treutlen County, Georgia, (DOE/EA 1597)* to determine potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that would result from the construction and operation of the cellulosic ethanol production facility near the town of Soperton, Georgia, in Treutlen County. Subsequent to the issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the October 2007 EA, there were changes to the design and operating parameters of the proposed cellulosic ethanol facility. In compliance with NEPA (42 U.S. Code [USC] §§ 4321 *et seq.*) and DOE's NEPA implementing regulations (10 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 1021.330) and procedures, this supplemental environmental assessment (SEA) examines the potential environmental impacts of the changes to the original project design. The October 2007 EA is hereby incorporated by reference into this SEA.

This SEA evaluates the potential individual and cumulative effects of the modified project design relative to the No Action Alternative. No other alternatives are analyzed in detail. The October 2007 EA provides a discussion of alternate sites that were considered but determined to be unfeasible. This SEA has been prepared under DOE's regulations and guidelines for compliance with NEPA (42 USC §§ 4321 *et seq.*). This SEA will be available to

interested members of the public and to Federal, state, and local agencies for review and comment prior to DOE's final decision on the modified Proposed Action.

DOE proposes to provide up to \$76 million in financial assistance to RF Soperton to support construction and initial operation of a cellulosic ethanol production plant in the Treutlen County Industrial Park near Soperton, Georgia. As noted above, DOE is required to evaluate the potential environmental impact of this funding decision. Environmental impacts could result from this funding decision as a direct result of construction supported by the financial assistance or from the subsequent operation of the facility, which is directly tied to its construction. Initial analysis of the proposed RF Soperton project determined that no significant impacts to the human environment would result. However, because NEPA encourages completion of environmental analysis early in the project process, it is not unusual for project design to change from the preliminary designs analyzed through an EA, resulting in the need for additional analysis. Because of the changes to design and operation since completion of the October 2007 EA, DOE has chosen to complete a Supplemental EA to address potential impacts from those changes.

It should be noted that even if DOE does not ultimately provide any funding in support of construction or operation of the facility, RF Soperton would be able to pursue other funding to support the project and still could potentially construct the facility.

## 1.2 Purpose and Need for Proposed Action

The purpose and need for the Proposed Action have not changed from the October 2007 EA. In compliance with the statutory mandate of EPCA § 932, DOE has implemented a program to demonstrate the commercial application of integrated biorefineries that produce ethanol from lignocellulosic feedstocks. The facility that would be constructed and operated as a result of the Proposed Action would meet the requirements of EPCA §932 by using renewable supplies of timber and forest residue, to produce ethanol, methanol, and other mixed alcohols. The Proposed Action also would support DOE's mission to reduce dependency on fossil fuels and commercialize biomass technologies. By providing financial assistance to support the construction of the proposed cellulosic ethanol production plant, DOE would support national energy needs and the development of alternative fuel sources.

## 1.3 Applicable Regulatory Requirements and Coordination

NEPA is integrated with other planning activities early in project planning to ensure that Federal decisions consider environmental and socioeconomic factors in a systematic manner. Requirements of applicable permits and regulations are also included in the evaluation performed under the NEPA process.

Federal statutes, regulations, and executive orders (EOs) applicable to one or more components of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative were identified in the October 2007 EA and are not repeated here. The reader is directed to the October 2007 EA for that information.

The following is a list of permits and regulatory approvals that are planned for the Proposed Action.

- Georgia SIP Air Construction Permit: Application submitted April 9, 2007, Permit Issued June 27, 2007, Permit No. 2869-283-0005-S-01-0
- Georgia SIP Air Construction Permit Modification: Permit Issued June 27, 2007, Permit No. 2869-283-0005-S-01-0, Application submitted November 19, 2008, Expect Permit issued by February 2009.
- Georgia SIP Air Operation Permit is issued in conjunction with the SIP Air Construction Permit, expect permit issued by February 2009
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Individual Permit to replace culvert under Commerce Drive and to provide after-the-fact authorization for inadvertent encroachment into two wetland areas on the property. A Jurisdictional Determination was received at the end of October, 2008 (signed 10/24/08), and permit approval was received on December 2, 2008.
- Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification for CWA Section 404 Individual Permit (required for the 404 permit to be authorized). Certification signed November 17, 2008 (Appendix C).
- USACE CWA Section 404 Nation Wide Permit (NWP) to construct new electric transmission line. Permit issued to Georgia Power who has completed construction of transmission line and new substation.
- Georgia General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit due to Construction Activities For Stand Alone Construction Projects – GAR100001: Permit coverage granted November 2007
- Industrial Wastewater Pre-Treatment Discharge Permit to Soperton: Submit application March 2009, Expected Permit by September 2009
- Georgia General NPDES Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity – GAR000000, Submit application March 2009, Expected Permit coverage granted by September 2009
- US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) NPDES Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit – Forms 1 and 2D and per Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control, 391-3-6-.06, Submit application March 2009, Expected Permit issued by September 2009
- Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan – 40 CFR 112, Plan development pending. Plan completed and implemented by December 2009.
- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan – Requirement of Georgia General NPDES Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity – GAR000000, Plan development pending. Plan completed and implemented by December 2009.
- Is there a need to prepare a Land Disturbing Activity Plan in accordance with Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1975

## 1.4 Scope of Analysis

This document analyzes the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that would result from the changes in proposed project design and operation. This SEA evaluates the potential individual and cumulative effects of the modified Proposed Action. This SEA considers the same No Action Alternative as the October 2007 EA, the potential impacts that would occur if the proposed cellulosic ethanol production plant were not built and operated. Because the modifications to the Proposed Action would not change the analysis of the No Action Alternative, the No Action Alternative is not discussed further in this SEA. The reader is directed to the October 2007 EA for a description of the No Action Alternative and discussion of its potential impacts.

With the exception of the wetland impacts, the Affected Environment has not changed substantially since completion of the October 2007 EA. Therefore, description of the Affected Environment is not repeated in this SEA and the reader is directed to October 2007 EA for that information.

### 1.4.1 Resource Areas Eliminated From Detailed Analysis

Certain resource areas previously evaluated in the October 2007 EA would have no potential for additional or altered impacts as a result of the modification to the proposed facility design and operation. Therefore, this SEA does not further evaluate potential impacts to:

- **Geomorphology, Geology, and Seismic Hazard:** There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of these resource areas and they are not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Prime Farmland:** No additional prime or unique farmland would be impacted as a result of the modifications and this resource area is not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Safety and Occupational Health:** There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of these resource areas and they are not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Meteorology:** There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of this resource area and it is not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Waste Management (construction wastes):** There would be no change in the waste generated by construction of the facility and this is not discussed further in this SEA. There would be an increase in use of feedstock and an associated increase in char remaining. The change in volume of this waste product is addressed in this SEA.
- **Cultural Resources:** There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of this resource area and it is not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Utility Infrastructure:** There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of this resource area and it is not discussed further in this SEA.
- **Socioeconomic Factors:** There would be no change in the construction workforce, construction duration, number of workers employed, or feedstock consumption once the

facility is operational. Therefore, there would be no change in the socioeconomic conditions relative to these factors from the October 2007 EA.

- Environmental Justice: There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of this resource area and it is not discussed further in this SEA.
- Protection of Children: There have been no modifications to the project that would result in changes to the analysis of this resource area and it is not discussed further in this SEA.

## 1.4.2 Resource Areas Considered In Detail

Potential impact to the resource areas below are discussed in detail in this document:

- Land Use
- Noise
- Soils
- Hydrology
- Water Quality
- Wetlands
- Biological Resources
- Protected Species
- Air Quality
- Waste Management (operations waste)
- Hazardous Materials
- Transportation
- Socioeconomic Factors (wood supply)
- Aesthetics

## 1.5 Public Scoping and Agency Consultation

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment will be available for public review and comment for at least 15 days. DOE will send a Notice of Availability to the distribution list from the initial Environmental Assessment and publish a notice in the local paper. DOE will take into account any comments received by agencies and interested parties and modify the Supplemental EA, if warranted.

## 1.6 Document Organization

This SEA follows the organization established by the CEQ regulations (40 CFR, Parts 1500-1508) and includes the following sections:

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Description of Changes to Proposed Facility Design and Operation
- 3.0 Environmental Consequences
- 4.0 References
- Appendices

## 2.0 Description of Changes to Proposed Facility Design and Operation

This SEA addresses the possible environmental impacts of the modifications to the proposed cellulosic ethanol facility in Treutlen County, Georgia. Section 2.1 describes the modifications to the activities that would occur if DOE provides up to \$76 million for construction and operation of the cellulosic ethanol plant.

### 2.1 Modifications to Facility Components From the October 2007 Proposed Action

Changes to the facility components from the description presented in the October 2007 EA are identified in Table 2-1. In addition to the planned design and operation changes, Table 2-1 also captures after the fact impacts to wetlands that occurred during the initial site preparation activities.

Currently, construction activity has been limited to site clearing and grading and construction of the warehouse, which is not complete. Procurement of equipment has been initiated, however, none has been delivered to the site at this time. The reported incursions into the wetlands occurred during early stages of sitework.

TABLE 2-1  
Components of Proposed Facility  
*RF Soperton EA*

Component	Change from 2007 EA
Chipper	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Chip Storage Piles	Storage capacity increased by 1,500 tons of wet feedstock (total capacity of 20,000 tons). Added a chipped feedstock storage area to hold 4,000 tons.
Feedstock Dryers	6 dryers added to process to dry up to 2,625 tpd of feedstock. No feedstock dryers in original design. Added as emission source in Phase 1, to be controlled in subsequent phases Noise impacts have been evaluated.
Log Debarker	Added this emission source. Noise impacts have been evaluated.
Hammer Mill	Two units to process up to 2,625 tpd of dry feedstock. Not included in original design. Added this emission source. Noise impacts have been evaluated.
Conveyors	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Biomass Conversion Units	At final construction, capacity of 2500 tpd (five conversion modules at 500 tpd per module; each module consisting of four 125 tpd units) has been revised to a capacity of 2625 tpd (Phase 1 - one 125 tpd unit, Phase 2 - addition of five 125 tpd units, and Phase 3 - addition of fifteen 125 tpd units).



TABLE 2-1  
Components of Proposed Facility  
*RF Soperton EA*

Component	Change from 2007 EA
Water Requirements	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Natural Gas Demand	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Electricity	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Product and Conversion Storage Tanks	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Loadout Racks	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Wastewater Treatment	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Fire Water Pond, Spray Pond, and Stormwater Detention Pond	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Roads	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Railroads	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Other improved surfaces	No change from previously evaluated condition.
Parking and walkways	No change from previously evaluated condition.

In addition to the component modifications that would be implemented by RF Soperton, other changes from the proposed project analyzed in the October 2007 EA include:

- Change in the planned construction of the project from five construction phases to three construction phases, Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3.
- Change in capacity to process 2,625 dry tons per day (dtpd) of feedstock, an increase of 125 dtpd (5 percent feedstock consumption increase).
- Georgia Power has completed construction of the electric transmission line and the onsite substation.
- Placement of fill along the edge of a wetland during construction of a stormwater basin.
- Clearing of a narrow strip of a forested wetland during site preparation.
- Monitoring and relocation of gopher tortoises.

These actions are considered in this analysis as part of the modified Proposed Action.

## 2.2 Modifications to Proposed Facility Layout

The changes to the proposed site layout from that described in the October 2007 EA are:

- Increased capacity of wet feedstock storage by 1,500 tons.
- Added chipped feedstock storage of 4,000 tons.
- Added six feedstock dryers with total capacity of 2,625 dtpd.
- Increased disturbed area by 9.488 acres (7 acres forested, 2.488 acres previously cleared).
- Modified spatial arrangement of components to better fit site (Figure 2-1).



The change in the spatial arrangement of the facility components is for overall operations efficiency and does not alter any impact analyses completed in the October 2007 EA. Therefore, the changes in spatial layout of the facility are not further considered in this SEA. The remaining changes to the proposed facility layout are discussed in Section 3, as appropriate, for resource areas in which these changes may result in a change from the initial analysis.

## 2.3 Modifications to Proposed Construction

The changes to the proposed construction from that described in the October 2007 EA are:

- Construction schedule revised.
- Construction changed from five phases to three.
- Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan wetland buffers not entirely maintained due to two incursions.
- Gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) relocation complete.

The RF Soperton construction schedule has changed. Site preparation began in November 2007 and RF Soperton proposes to begin installation of process equipment and supporting utilities and structures in 2009. Construction would proceed in three phases, with each phase brought on-line for production as it is completed. Phase 1 would be completed in spring 2010, Phase 2 would be completed approximately 14 to 18 months after Phase 1, and Phase 3 would follow completion of Phase 2. At completion of Phase 3, the plant would begin operating at full capacity. The change in construction schedule and phasing resulted in a shift in start of operations of approximately 18 months, but does not result in any changes to potential impacts analysis. The changes to construction schedule and phasing are not discussed further.

## 2.4 Modifications to Proposed Operations

Modifications to the proposed facility operations that differ from those described in the October 2007 EA are:

- Proposed plant operation would be characterized as 24 hours a day for up to 365 days per year, with an assumed 90 percent availability (approximately 330 actual operating days per year), rather than 24 hours a day for 350 days per year, reflecting an availability of approximately 96%. The original projected availability was unrealistically high as determined by reliability analysis and comparison with historical availabilities for similar industrial installations.
- Proposed minor decrease in annual feedstock consumption from 875,500 tpy to 862,000 tpy (1.6 percent decrease) due to projected loss of operating days with 90% facility availability.
- Proposed daily feedstock demand has been increased by 125 dtpd, from 2,500 dtpd to 2,650 dtpd. To achieve an annual throughput of 862,000 tpy in a reduced number of operating days, the daily throughput must increase slightly, from 2,500 dtpd to 2,650 dtpd.

- Proposed annual production has decreased from 120,000,000 gallons total product (100,000,000 gallons ethanol, 20,000,000 gallons methanol) to 84,000,000 gallons total product, assuming a 90% capacity factor and a 50% ethanol, 50% methanol mix. The mix of ethanol and methanol may change based on market factors.
- The denaturant for ethanol production has been switched from methanol to natural gasoline.
- The number of trucks delivering feedstock to the facility daily has increased from 254 to 267 trucks per day, an increase of 13 trucks per day, to accommodate the increase in daily throughput from 2,500 dtpd to 2,650 dtpd maintaining annual production levels with fewer operating days.
- Air emissions controls have changed by the addition of 6 baghouses for particulate matter (PM) control, selective catalytic reduction using urea for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) control, and 3 additional flares for VOC and HAP control.

A revised process flow diagram is shown in Figure 2-2. A revised water balance for the production process is shown in Figure 2-3.




Figure 2-2 - Process Flow Diagram  
Range Fuels Biofuels Facility  
Treutlen County, GA




Figure 2-3  
 Water and Wastewater Balance  
 Range Fuels Environmental Asses

## 3.0 Environmental Consequences Resulting From Modifications to Proposed Design and Operation

---

The following sections discuss the changes in potential impacts that may result from implementing the proposed modifications to the design and operation of the cellulosic ethanol facility.

### 3.1 Land Use

An additional 7.0 acres of planted pine forest and 2.488 acres of previously cleared undeveloped Industrial Park land would be converted to facility grounds to accommodate the modifications to the feedstock handling. The total conversion of forested land to industrial facility would increase from approximately 13 acres to 20.0 acres, which would remain a negligible impact on forestland in Treutlen County. As noted in the October 2007 EA, forestry (mostly pine tree plantations) accounts for almost 80 percent of all land use in the County, which has an area of 201 square miles (128,640 acres). The additional 7.0 acres will reduce planted pine forest by about 0.01% in the County, which represents a negligible long-term impact.

### 3.2 Soils

An additional 9.488 acres of soils would be disturbed through the use of heavy equipment for clearing and grading. Disturbance to soils would occur from compaction and from exposure through removal of vegetation. The total disturbed area would be kept to the minimum necessary to complete the work and would be confined to the final site boundaries.

Soil disturbance could result in increased erosion potential from loss of ground cover and exposure of bare soils to precipitation and runoff. Potential temporary impacts to water quality that could result are discussed in Section 3.3. Potential impacts would be controlled or avoided through the use of appropriate best management practices (BMPs) and soil stabilization/revegetation techniques following construction. Appropriate BMPs would be selected based on site-specific conditions and could include, but would not be limited to, sediment barriers (silt fence or straw bales), a detention pond, and establishment of improved construction entrances. Following construction, exposed surfaces would be revegetated and final site grading would direct runoff to a stormwater detention pond that would be located in the western portion of the feedstock area.

Additional soil impacts from construction would be minor and temporary. The use of construction BMPs and post-construction stormwater BMPs would reduce potential impacts from erosion and stormwater runoff. Any long-term impacts would be negligible.

### 3.3 Water Quality

Clearing of the additional 7.0 acres of land would have minor additional impacts to water quality. As discussed in the October 2007 EA, impacts on water quality could result from construction activities that lead to soil disturbance and exposed soil, which can create the possibility of transport of sediment and soil-bound pollutants into streams. Transport could occur downslope or into immediately adjacent waters. Any potential water quality impacts would be temporary and limited to the areas downslope from construction footprints. Implementation and maintenance of BMPs as described in Section 2.1.3 of the original EA would minimize the potential for such impacts and prevent significant construction-related impacts. Turbidity monitoring at stormwater discharge locations would be performed as a condition of the NPDES construction general permit, obtained in 2007, to confirm that no significant adverse impacts to water quality would result.

Post-construction, the additional 7.0 acres of the site would have vegetation removed and be subject to increased runoff rates. Following construction, exposed surfaces would be re-vegetated and final site grading would direct runoff to a stormwater detention pond that would be located in the western portion of the feedstock area. These onsite post-construction stormwater controls would be sufficient to prevent any downstream impacts to water quality.

The encroachment into two wetlands totaling 0.61 acres resulted in a temporary minor impact to water quality from soil disturbance. These impacts ceased after the unauthorized work in wetlands was halted. During construction of the stormwater retention pond, 0.54 acres of one wetland were filled and the associated buffer eliminated. Because this pond prevents runoff into the wetland, the loss of buffer does not impact water quality. A line was cleared through 0.07 acres of another area of the wetland during site preparation. This buffer was replanted to native vegetation and no long-term impacts to water quality will result. Neither encroachment resulted in more than negligible temporary impacts to hydrology.

### 3.4 Wetlands

During site preparation activities, two wetland areas were impacted (Figure 3-1). Upon discovery of these unauthorized encroachments into wetlands, RF Soperton self-reported the infraction to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Savannah Regulatory District and initiated after-the-fact permitting for the infractions. The Clean Water Act Section 404 Individual Permit was issued on December 2, 2008 and contains the following Special Conditions:

- All work will be performed in accordance with the terms of the permit that shall be maintained at the work site whenever work is being performed. The permittee shall assure that all contractors, subcontractors, and other personnel performing the permitted work are fully aware of the permit's terms and conditions.
- The permittee shall comply with all conditions included in the Section 401 Water Quality Certification issued by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, for the subject project.




- The permittee shall obtain fill material from a borrow area that is free of contaminants and pollutants.
- All work conducted shall be located, outlined, designed, constructed, and operated with the minimal requirements as contained in the Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Control Act of 1975, as amended. Utilization of plans and specifications as contained in the "Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control, Latest Edition", published by the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission or their equivalent will aid in achieving compliance with the aforementioned minimal requirements.
- The permittee shall use appropriate erosion and siltation controls and maintain them in effective operating condition during construction. All exposed soil and other fills shall be permanently stabilized at the earliest practicable date.
- The permittee shall insure that this project complies with all applicable rules, requirements, and/or regulations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency with regard to any activities in designated flood plains.
- The permittee shall purchase 10.39 mitigation credits from Wilkinson-Oconee Mitigation Bank and provide the USACE with proof of purchase.
- Exclusion fencing will be placed around the proposed construction area prior to construction. In the event that a gopher tortoise burrow may be impacted, the Gopher Tortoise Burrow Excavation and Translocation Protocol will be followed.
- In the event the eastern indigo snake is found, United States Fish and Wildlife Services would be notified and an informal consultation would be initiated to avoid impacts and to resolve any concerns.
- The informational pamphlets about the eastern indigo snake, included with permit, will be disseminated to workers prior to construction activities.

There has been a change from the Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) as a result of the encroachment into two wetlands during site preparation. That encroachment failed to meet ESPSP requirement for a 25-foot undisturbed buffer zone around all wetlands, both during and after construction. This change is discussed in Section 3.3. One encroached wetland and its associated buffer has been restored. Appropriate mitigation, as determined by the USACE and the Georgia Standard Operating Procedures for wetland mitigation, has been implemented by RF Soperton through purchase of mitigation credits from a commercial mitigation bank (see Appendix A). With the implemented mitigation, the encroachments are considered to have no net impacts on the wetland.

## 3.5 Biological Resources

There would be no additional impacts to biological resources from operation of the modified facility. However, there would be additional impacts to biological resources



- Impacted Wetland
- ▨ Existing Wetland Boundary



Wetlands Incursions  
Range Fuels Biofuels Facility  
Soperton, Treutlen County, Georgia

(plants and animals) and habitat quality (foraging and nesting) resulting from the additional land clearing to accommodate the modifications. Disturbance from construction would directly alter the plant communities occurring in the 7.0 acres of planted loblolly pine that would be cleared. The additional 7.0 acres that would be cleared, when combined with the 2.488 acres of previously cleared, undeveloped land and clearing for the original design would represent a minor, but long term impact to vegetation.

It is expected that wildlife would be displaced from the 9.488-acre area and immediately adjacent lands during clearing and construction. The number of animals displaced would not be large, as the planted pine provides limited habitat quality. There are extensive forested lands and other natural habitats adjacent to the facility site. All portions of the facility site are connected to off-site habitats through the preserved riparian corridors and forest habitat. In natural environments, terrestrial animal populations typically are below the level that the habitat can sustain (the theoretical carrying capacity). This results from disease and parasites, predation, competition, imperfect distribution within the environment, and episodic extrinsic perturbations including wildfire, flood and drought (Hedrick, 1984; Ricklefs, 1990; Robinson and Bolen, 1984). Because populations typically are below the theoretical carrying capacity, displaced animals are able to relocate to other suitable sites and assimilate without negative population consequences. Direct observations of vegetation in the areas that would be preserved around the facility indicate that browsers and grazers are below the level that could be sustained at present, as there is no evidence of limiting herbivory pressure and there are unconsumed plant resources available. Because the area is currently within a severe drought (EPD, 2007), wildlife population numbers are likely further depressed below normal levels. Animal populations respond to reduced water in the environment with direct mortality from water stress and also through induced reproductive depression in response to environmental cues (Robinson and Bolen, 1984). As a result of the drought, it is likely that there is more unoccupied habitat than would be expected under normal conditions, which would enhance the ability of any displaced animals to assimilate into new locations. At the RF Soperton site, the ability of displaced animals to relocate to suitable habitat would be enhanced because of the ability to travel along the preserved riparian corridors and forested areas to locate new suitable habitat. Because current conditions are such that ample habitat is expected to be available for assimilation of displaced animals, any secondary impacts to animal populations in the area surrounding the RF Soperton facility would be expected to be negligible. Any impacts to wildlife would be expected to be negligible.

Incidental wildlife mortality, both onsite and in the surrounding area, could result from construction-related traffic. However, any such losses would not threaten local populations with extinction.

Once operational, the constant activity at the facility could prevent some animals from returning, but others would be expected to acclimate to the disturbance and resume use of the adjacent areas. Incidental wildlife mortality could result from operational vehicle traffic resulting from worker commutes and deliveries and shipments. However, any such losses would not threaten local populations with extinction and would be negligible in the regional setting. No other impacts to wildlife would be expected from operation of the facility.

Because logging residues and unmerchantable timber are removed from harvest sites during site preparation for replanting, this material is not available as part of the ecological community and does not provide habitat for nearby animals. Therefore, no impacts to wildlife habitat are expected from RF Soperton purchase of additional feedstock materials.

## 3.6 Protected Species

There has been no change in the procedure should additional gopher tortoises need to be relocated. The reader is directed to the October 2007 EA for a description of the procedures for dealing with any new gopher tortoise activity.

The gopher tortoise is a state-threatened species that occurs in the vicinity of the proposed facility. With the extreme drought in southeast Georgia, the forested wetland to the north of the proposed facility has experienced extended dry conditions. The wetland is normally impassable to gopher tortoises due to the presence of permanent standing water. Gopher tortoises apparently moved into the proposed facility area from the north and west through the temporary travel corridor created by the drought.

RF Soperton coordinated with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to develop and implement a gopher tortoise relocation plan (Appendix GT). The Georgia DNR supervised tortoise relocation activities during summer 2008 and additional tortoise exclusion fencing was placed around the modified construction area. Burrow locations and tortoise relocation areas are shown in Figure 3-2.


RF Soperton continues to monitor the area for new gopher tortoise activity. The tortoise relocation area is suitable habitat for gopher tortoises and any impacts to the species would be expected to be minor and temporary. Once the drought ends, it is expected that gopher tortoises would be much less likely to move onto the facility site and no long-term impacts would be expected.

Additional informal consultation with USFWS in December 2008 confirmed that there are no known occurrences of federally protected species in Treutlen County (Bill Wikoff, personal communication, 2008). There is potentially suitable habitat for the federally endangered red-cockaded woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*) and the federally threatened eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais*) elsewhere in Treutlen County and known occurrences in adjacent counties. Neither of these species or any other federally listed species are known to occur at the project site. Noise

There would be a 5 percent increase in the average daily quantity of feedstock delivered to the facility, resulting in a 5 percent average daily increase in truck traffic, from 254 trucks to 267 trucks per day, although the total number of annual deliveries would decrease by 1.6 percent as a result of fewer projected days of facility operation. The impacts of such small increases would be negligible and would not change the conclusions reached in the October 2007 EA.

Additional facility processing equipment not included in the October 2007 EA includes feedstock dryers, a log debarker, and two hammer mills. The hammer mills contribute minimal additional noise beyond that discussed previously.





- Gopher Tortoise Burrows
- Gopher Tortoise Burrows Excavated and Collapsed
- Gopher Tortoise Exclusion Fence
- Gopher Tortoise Relocation Area



0 100 200 Feet

Gopher Tortoise Relocation Area Detail  
 Range Fuels Biofuels Facility  
 Soperton, Treutlen County, Georgia

The projected noise levels originally described in the October 2007 EA included a log debarker, as this equipment is included in the typical installations producing the sound levels cited. Operations of the chipper and debarker would be limited to 16 to 18 hours per day and mitigation actions described for the chipper installation apply to the debarker as well. The October 2007 EA concluded that no impacts to either outdoor activity or indoor activity would result from operation of the proposed facility.

The two hammer mills would be fully enclosed and additional sound deadening material would be added if needed to minimize noise from their operations. Hammer mill operation with the woody materials planned as feedstocks for the facility would produce noise at levels lower than typical ambient facility operating noise levels.

The dryer installation contributes no significant noise and operates at a much lower noise level than other cited potential noise sources.

General sound level mitigation measures for the facility would include maintaining the surrounding forest acreage as a noise buffer for all operations. This buffer would remain as originally discussed in the October 2007 EA and provide significant noise attenuation beyond those mitigation measures previously discussed.

### 3.7 Air Quality

Proposed modifications to the process system would result in an increased potential to generate air emissions. Proposed new components include a log debarker and six chip dryers added to the process. In addition, the heat duty required of the conversion units has increased. All of these factors contribute to an increase in the potential to emit (PTE) for criteria pollutants and HAPs. RF Soperton proposes to maintain minor source status by augmenting the type and quantity of air pollution control equipment installed to control emissions.

There will be 6 new process baghouses for PM control, 9 selective catalytic reduction (SCR) units, utilizing urea, to control NO<sub>x</sub>, and 3 additional flares to control VOCs and HAPs. Catalytic oxidation has always been included for carbon monoxide (CO) control. The baghouses utilize polyester filter bags to filter or remove particulate matter suspended/carried in a gas stream. SCR control devices inject a urea solution into the gas stream to allow urea to react with the NO<sub>x</sub> in the gas stream. The urea and NO<sub>x</sub> chemically react at elevated temperatures to convert/reduce the NO<sub>x</sub> to nitrogen and water. The resulting emissions for Phases 1, 2, and 3 are below the 100 tpy threshold value for triggering Prevention of Significant Determination (PSD). The initial permit issued by the Georgia EPD (Permit No. 2869-283-0005-S-01-0) and effective June 27, 2007 is being modified to reflect these process changes. The modification application was submitted to EPD November 19, 2008, and the permit is expected to be issued in February 2009. Any impacts from increases in the criteria pollutants would be negligible.

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 (below) show the new maximum PTE for both criteria pollutant and HAPs emissions, and Table 3-3 (below) shows the modeled AAC impacts from air toxics.

TABLE 3-1

MAXIMUM ANNUAL PTE CRITERIA POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (MAXIMUM OPERATION) FOR PHASE 1

RF SOPERTON EA

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Annual Emissions (tpy)</b>
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	15.4
PM	29.1
NO <sub>x</sub>	21.5
SO <sub>x</sub>	3.8
CO	10.6
VOC	88.6
HAPs (total)	16.3
HAPs (individual)	all <10

TABLE 3-2

Maximum Annual (PTE) Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum operation) at Plant Completion

RF Soperton EA

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Annual Emissions (tpy)</b>
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	64.2
PM	98.4
NO <sub>x</sub>	95.5
SO <sub>x</sub>	12.5
CO	91.6
OC	80.0
HAPs (total)	18.1
HAPs (individual)	all <10

<b>TABLE 3-3</b>									
<b>Air Toxics Impact Analysis</b>									
<b>RF Soperton EA.</b>									
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Emission Rate</b>					<b>Total Emissions (lb/hr)</b>	<b>Averaging Period</b>	<b>Maximum Predicted Concentration (ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	<b>AAC* (ug/m<sup>3</sup>)</b>
	<b>Conversion Unit No. 1 (lb/hr)</b>	<b>Conversion Units No. 2 - 5 (lb/hr)</b>	<b>Flares No. 1 - 4 (lb/hr)</b>	<b>Utility Boilers No. 1 - 5 (lb/hr)</b>	<b>Tank Farm (lb/hr)</b>				
Benzene	1.73E-04	3.24E-03	9.71E-04	1.87E-03	0.00E+00	6.25E-03	Annual 15-minute	4.33E-04 7.14E-03	1.30E-01 1.60E+03
1,4 Dichlorobenzene	9.88E-05	1.85E-03	5.55E-04	1.07E-03	0.00E+00	3.57E-03	Annual	2.47E-04	8.00E+02
Formaldehyde	6.18E-03	1.16E-01	3.47E-02	6.69E-02	0.00E+00	2.23E-01	Annual 15-minute	1.55E-02 2.55E-01	8.00E-01 2.45E+02
n-Hexane	1.89E-02	3.54E-01	8.33E-01	2.05E-01	0.00E+00	1.41E+00	Annual 15-minute	1.20E-01 1.99E+00	7.00E+02 1.80E+05
Methanol	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.75E-01	0.00E+00	1.63E+00	1.90E+00	24-hour 15-minute	4.71E+01 1.56E+02	2.62E+03 3.28E+04
Naphthalene	5.02E-05	9.40E-04	2.82E-04	5.44E-04	0.00E+00	1.82E-03	Annual 15-minute	1.26E-04 2.07E-03	3.00E+00 7.50E+03
Toluene	2.80E-04	5.24E-03	1.57E-03	3.03E-03	0.00E+00	1.01E-02	Annual 15-minute	7.01E-04 1.16E-02	5.00E+03 5.60E+04
Maximum Predicted Concentration from SCREEN3 Model (ug/m <sup>3</sup> ) (based on 1 gram/sec)	6.00	6.00	9.97	6.83	572.2				

\*AAC for annual averaging period obtained from US EPA's Integrated Risk Information System Web Site. AAC for 24-hour and 15-minute averaging periods obtained from OSHA/NIOSH STELs (or ceiling limits).

µg/m<sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter

hr = hour



## 3.8 Waste Management and Hazardous Materials

The denaturant used for ethanol production would shift from methanol to natural gasoline. The denaturant system at the proposed facility consists of a storage tank for the denaturant and metering equipment to add the denaturant to the ethanol product as it is being pumped into the product trucks. No changes would be made to this system due to a change in denaturant from methanol to natural gasoline. There would be no change in the handling of toxic or hazardous materials at the facility.

The natural gasoline would be obtained directly from production wells and would not be obtained as a refined petroleum product. This would not result in a change to the denaturant storage or handling system at the proposed facility, although there would be reduced flare-off of potential greenhouse gases at the production wells, thereby reducing an environmental waste.

The amount of ash and char generated during Phase 1 would decrease by approximately 10 tpd, resulting in a decrease in annual production from 17,500 tpy to 13,140 tpy. Rather than landfilling, the char and ash produced during Phase 1 would be sold as fuel. After completion of Phases 2 and 3, char would be combusted on-site, leaving approximately 123 tpd of ash (40,400 tpy), which would be sold for land application or other beneficial uses. This would require 6 to 7 trucks per day, an increase of 4 trucks per day over the amount reported in the October 2007 EA, and would have no impact on solid waste services in the area.

There would be no change in production of sludge at the wastewater treatment plant. This material and any char/ash that could not be sold would be disposed of in the Toombs County Landfill. The Toombs County Landfill has informed RF Soperton that their facilities can accommodate in excess of 20,000 tpy of solid wastes from RF Soperton without impacting their current operations or landfill life expectancy of 20 years (James Thompson, personal communication, 2007). Solid waste from char, ash, and wastewater sludge would not impact solid waste services in the area.

## 3.9 Transportation

No additional truck or rail traffic would result from the decreased production. The October 2007 EA evaluated a transport scenario sufficient to move the output projected at that time, which would be more than adequate to handle the reduced output. There would be no significant transportation impacts from the decreased level of production.

Minimal impacts to traffic would occur during operation of the RF Soperton Facility as a result of increased truck traffic to deliver feedstock. Truck traffic on State Route (SR) 15 would increase by 13 trucks in each direction per day, but decrease by 520 total truck deliveries over the course of the year due to lower plant availability and the resulting fewer total operating days per year.

Feedstock deliveries would be made to the Plant from 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and for half a day on Saturday. Truck traffic due to feedstock deliveries

would increase from 31.8 trucks per hour to 33.4 trucks per hour (1 truck every 1.8 minutes) during operation.

SR 15 is a lightly used roadway and the increase in traffic associated with the originally proposed RF Soperton facility would have brought road traffic from 7.97 percent up to 10.23 percent of its capacity. With the increased truck traffic proposed in this SEA (including increased feedstock deliveries and char/ash removal), the roadway would be operating at 10.36 percent of its capacity, an increase of 0.13 percent over that calculated in the October 2007 EA (Table 3-4). SR 15 is well below existing capacity and the projected increase in traffic from the increased feedstock deliveries would remain well below the capacity of this road. The October 2007 EA concluded that increasing the traffic from 7.97 percent of capacity to 10.23 percent of capacity would have negligible impacts to traffic. Increasing truck traffic by an additional 0.13 percent (from 10.23 to 10.36 percent) would not introduce additional impacts to traffic. Any impacts to traffic would be negligible and would have no effect on traffic hazards and/or accidents.

TABLE 3-4  
Analyses for Construction and Production Traffic at RF Soperton Facility  
*RF Soperton EA*

Traffic Source	Production Traffic (Vehicles Per Day) on SR 15
Background (AADT)	2,040
Increase in Feedstock Delivery Trucks	26
Increase in Char and Ash Trucks	4
Percent Change	1.67%
Percent of Capacity Without Increased Feedstock Consumption	10.23%
Percent of Capacity With Increased Feedstock Consumption	10.36%

### 3.10 Aesthetics

There would be increased visibility of the chipper and the storage areas in the northeast portion of the facility with the additional land clearing. Persons traveling on Old Dairy Road would be able to see these components. However, traffic on the road is minimal and the number of potential viewers is small. No residential or recreational areas are within line-of-sight from any part of the facility. Any impacts to aesthetics from the additional clearing would be expected to be minor.

Georgia Power has completed construction of new 115 kV transmission lines and a new substation to supply energy to the RF Soperton facility. The substation is south of the proposed location of the cellulosic ethanol plant. The substation is visually compatible with the surrounding industrial park and any negative impacts in aesthetics are negligible. The

new transmission right-of-way (ROW) is adjacent to and parallels an older transmission ROW for much of its length, resulting in negligible change to viewers of the transmission line. The portion where forest was cleared for the right-of-way is immediately south of the industrial park where there are limited potential viewers. The impact of the new ROW on aesthetics in the area is minor.

### **3.12 Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action**

The proposed changes in construction and operation would not result in a change to the Cumulative Impacts of the proposed action as described in the original EA. Please refer to the original EA for the discussion and analysis of cumulative impacts.

### **3.15 Short-Term Uses and Commitment of Resources**

Federal agencies are required by NEPA to describe the relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity. The NEPA evaluation should also characterize any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources as a result of the implementation of the modified Proposed Action.

The two resources that will be utilized by the Proposed Action are planted pine forested land and groundwater. The modified Proposed Action would not significantly change the annual amount of planted pine forested land required to provide feedstock to the plant. Water consumption needed for plant operations will not change from the amount proposed in the October 2007 EA.

---

## 4.0 References

---

General\*Bioenergy. 2005. Biomass Wood Resource Assessment on a County-by-County Basis for the State of Georgia. Prepared for the Georgia Forestry Commission Macon, Georgia and the Southern States Energy Board Norcross, Georgia.

Hedrick, P.W. 1984. Population Biology. Jones and Bartlett Publishers. 445pp.

Ricklefs, R.E. 1990. Ecology, third edition. W.H. Freeman and Company. 896pp.

Robinson, W.L. and E.G. Bolen. 1984. Wildlife Ecology and Management. MacMillan Publishing Company. 478pp.

Thompson, James. 2007. Personal Communication. August 29, 2007.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1974. Information Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. USEPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004. March 1974.

Wickoff, Bill. 2008. Personal Communication. December 4, 2008.

---

## **Appendix A**

### **Confirmation and Transfer of Mitigation Credits**

**Wilkinson Oconee, LLC**

1305 Lakes Parkway  
Suite 129  
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043

October 14, 2008

Range Fuels  
926 Commerce Drive, Suite 101  
Soperton, Georgia 30457

Subject: Reservation of Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Credits for a Project  
Located in Treutlen County, GA.  
**USACE Project #200800279**

Dear Mr. Sir(s):

Wilkinson-Oconee Mitigation Bank (WOMB) has reserved 10.39 wetland credits for use as compensatory mitigation for a project located in Treutlen County, Georgia. The project is located within Hydrologic Unit Code 03070102. Your compensatory mitigation credits have been reserved at the price of \$2,500.00 per wetland credit. The WOMB operates under U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit Number 200209480.

Final transfer of the credits will be made upon approval by the USACE and full receipt of your payment of \$25,975.00 to Wilkinson Oconee, LLC, at which time a credit certification letter verifying your credit purchase will be issued to both you and the USACE. **Please send payment directly to Wilkinson Oconee, LLC at the letterhead address.** An invoice for this transaction has been attached for your convenience.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist you for your compensatory mitigation requirements. Please feel free to call me at 770-682-9731 if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Gregory P. Smith  
For Wilkinson Oconee, LLC

cc: Ms. Shruti Shah, CH2MHILL via Electronic Mail

Attachment

**Invoice**

*Paid 10/17/08  
check #1262*

Date	Invoice #
10/14/08	0060a

Bill To
Range Fuels 926 Commerce Drive, Suite 101 Soperton, GA 30457

Payable To
Wilkinson-Oconee, LLC 1305 Lakes Parkway Suite 129 Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043

P.O. No.	Terms	Wildlands Project
USACE #200800279	Reserved - Price Valid for 15 Days	2052-03 Wilkinson-Oconee Mitigation Bank

Line Item	Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Amount
01	Wetland Mitigation Credits	10.39	2,500	25,975.00
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$25,975.00</b>

*10-16-08*

*PER BEN GARDNER*

*CHARGE:*

*WBS: GA5P0801.92.921.027A  
RANGE FUELS SOPERTON PLANT, LLC*

*\$25,975.00*

*See attached sheet for approvals*

*A. Holt*

---

## **Appendix B**

### **Gopher Tortoise Correspondence**



## Gopher Tortoise Onsite Relocation Protocol – Range Fuels, Soperton, GA Site

PREPARED FOR: CH2M HILL - CM Team  
PREPARED BY: Andrew T. Champagne  
COPIES: CH2M HILL - CM Sub Contractors  
Range Fuels  
DATE: March 21, 2008

If a gopher tortoise is found on the construction site within the disturbed area silt fence or anywhere else on the construction site:

- Protect the tortoise from ongoing construction activity.
- Place the tortoise, with gloves on, carefully into a bucket or box for transport.
- Take tortoise to relocation area, See Attached Map (try to determine the area the tortoise most likely came from, and return to that area).
- Place tortoise anywhere within designated relocation area, again with gloves on. If it cannot be determined which burrow the tortoise belongs in (tortoise burrows match the size of the tortoise) attempt to find an unused burrow and place the tortoise in that burrow so that it will be afforded protection from weather and predators.
- Monitor the tortoise. It probably will not stay in the burrow in which it was placed if it is just a substitute burrow and will attempt to return to its own burrow.
- Try to determine where the tortoise got through the silt fence barrier and repair any breaches.

**Any questions, please call Drew Champagne-CH2M HILL @ 678.530.4068**



CH2M HILL  
Northpark 400  
1000 Abernathy Road  
Suite 1600  
Atlanta, GA  
30328  
Tel 770.604.9095  
Fax 770.604.9183

October 3, 2008

John Jensen  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources  
Nongame & Endangered Wildlife Program  
116 Rum Creek Drive  
Forsyth, GA 31029

**Re: Range Fuels Gopher Tortoise Relocation Summary Report**

Dear Mr. Jensen:

CH2M HILL has concluded its relocation efforts of state threatened gopher tortoises (*Gopherus polyphemus*) at the Range Fuels Soperton Plant, located at 721 Commerce Drive, Soperton Georgia. A total of ten gopher tortoise burrows were identified during surveys as potentially being inhabited by tortoises. CH2M HILL biologists documented these burrow locations using GPS technology and examined each for signs of tortoise activity. Prior to capture and relocation of the tortoises, Range Fuels erected a silt fence exclusion barrier around its construction area to prevent return of relocated tortoises to their original burrow locations. Pitfall traps were set at the entrances of each potentially active adult burrow, and three adult tortoises were captured in these traps. One hatchling age tortoise was captured by hand digging its burrow, and four others were hand captured outside their burrows. Several viable eggs were located at the site and removed to the north end of the Range Fuels property, without rotation, and buried in a suitable alternative site. Three hatchling age tortoises were discovered dead during the relocation process. After an extended period of non-activity, the traps were removed from the burrows on September 30th, each burrow was examined with an infrared camera, dug to its terminus to confirm that it was unoccupied, and then collapsed. A summary report, map showing original burrow locations, and photos of captured tortoises are provided as attachments to this correspondence. Range Fuels will continue to monitor its Soperton Plant site throughout the construction process to prevent harm to gopher tortoises and other protected wildlife species. If you have any questions about these activities, please feel free to contact me at (678) 530-4350 or at dthomas9@ch2m.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Thomas".

CH2M HILL

## Range Fuels Gopher Tortoise Summary

Burrow Site ID	Burrow Entrance Direction (Degrees)	Trapping/Relocation Required (Y/N)	Comment	Final Result
<b>Burrows Requiring Trapping/Relocation</b>				
GB03	303	Yes	Possibly abandoned-inconclusive.	Burrow showed signs of activity during subsequent field visit. Nest found at burrow apron with 6 eggs - hatchlings emerging. Eggs relocated. Trap set/burrow monitored through Sept. 30, then dug to terminus and collapsed. No tortoise captured. **Additional eggs (2) discovered during monitoring in apron mound (possibly exposed by rainwater) and relocated. Three hatchlings discovered dead in pit adjacent to pitfall trap.
GB3A		Yes	Juvenile burrow - tortoise relocated	Burrow hand dug.
GB3B		N/A	No burrow. Juvenile tortoise found wandering - relocated.	No further action.
GB05	N/A	Yes	Active Adult Burrow - GT captured 8/27/08	Trap set. Burrow monitored through Sept. 30, then dug to terminus and collapsed.
GB5A		Yes	Juvenile GT captured and relocated but will still require monitoring and possible trapping in case it returns or another juvenile utilizes it.	Burrow area monitored through trapping effort. Second juvenile excavated from burrow on 9/8/08 and relocated.

GB07	129	Yes	Inactive Adult Burrow - GT captured 8/27/08	Nest found at burrow apron with 4 eggs. Two eggs destroyed during excavation process - remaining eggs relocated. Trap set . Burrow monitored through Sept. 30, then dug to terminus and collapsed.
GB08	93	Yes	Fresh Prints.	Trap set. Burrow monitored through Sept. 30 then dug to terminus and collapsed. No tortoise captured.
GB09	244	Yes	Fresh Prints.	Trap set. Burrow monitored through Sept. 30 then dug to terminus and collapsed. No tortoise captured.
GB10	349	Yes	Active Adult Burrow - GT captured 8/27/08	Trap set. Burrow monitored through Sept. 30 then dug to terminus and collapsed.
GB10A		Yes	Juvenile burrow	Excavated 9/03. Tortoise captured and released to relocation area on north side of property.
GB18		Yes	Active burrow near hunter camp	Trap set. Burrow monitored through Sept. 30, then dug to terminus and collapsed. No tortoise captured.
<b>Burrows NOT Requiring Trapping/Relocation</b>				
New Burrow	N/A	No	Only 2-feet deep, no concerns.	No further action.
GB01	263	Yes	Not Very Active.	Sticks placed at entrance and monitored. No activity detected throughout monitoring period. Mushrooms noted growing in burrow.
GB04	N/A	No	Only 1-foot deep, no concerns.	No further action.
GB06	N/A	No	Possibly Active but will be excluded by	No further action.

			exclusion fence.	
GB02	N/A	No	Nomenclature Mistake. Artifact from original survey.	No further action.
GB11	79	Yes	Inactive Adult Burrow	No further action.
GB12	N/A	No	No Burrow identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	No further action.
GB13	N/A	No	No Burrow identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	No further action.
GB14	N/A	No	No Burrow identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	No further action.
GB15	N/A	No	No Burrow identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	No further action.
GB16	N/A	No	No Burrow identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	No further action.
GB17	N/A	No	No Burrow	No further action.

			identified or determined not to be a GT burrow during the follow-up survey.	
--	--	--	---	--

**Summary:** It was determined that 10 burrows located on site required further monitoring. All of these burrows were located along an existing dirt access road in a mixed pine-hardwood area. Pitfall traps were set at seven burrows. Three adult tortoises were captured and relocated. Five juveniles were hand captured and relocated. Three hatchlings were found dead. A total of twelve eggs were discovered, and ten were successfully relocated. To date, there is evidence that five of the relocated eggs have successfully hatched.

On September 30, after a period of daily monitoring with no further evidence of tortoise activity, the burrows were excavated using a backhoe. An attempt was made to scope each burrow to its terminus with a burrow camera prior to excavation. Most scoping efforts were only partially successful due to shallow roots and other obstructions. Soils in the area were sandy, but it was discovered during burrow excavation that a hardpan layer existed about two feet below the surface, probably making excavation difficult for tortoises. Subsequently, the burrows were relatively shallow, and meandered extensively to a terminus 4-5 feet below the surface. Toads (*Bufo terrestris*) were found in two of the burrows excavated.

---

## **Appendix C**

**State of Georgia**

**Department of Natural Resources**

**Section 401 Water Quality Certification**

# **Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, S.E., Suite 1152 East Tower, Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9000

Noel Holcomb, Commissioner

Carol A. Couch, Ph.D., Director

Environmental Protection Division

404/656-4713

November 17, 2008

Mr. Tom Levensailor  
Range Fuels Soperton Plant, LLC  
926 Commerce Drive  
Suite 101  
Soperton, Georgia 30457

Re: Water Quality Certification  
Joint Public Notice 200800279  
Cellulosic Ethanol Plant  
Oconee River Basin  
Truetlen County

Dear Mr. Levensailor:

Pursuant to Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act, the State of Georgia issues this certification to Range Fuels Ethanol Plant, LLC, an applicant for a federal permit or license to conduct an activity in, on or adjacent to the waters of the State of Georgia.

The State of Georgia certifies that there is no applicable provision of Section 301; no limitation under Section 302; no standard under Section 306; and no standard under Section 307, for the applicant's activity. The State of Georgia certifies that the applicant's activity will comply with all applicable provisions of Section 303.

This certification is contingent upon the following conditions:

1. All work performed during construction will be done in a manner so as not to violate applicable water quality standards.
2. No oils, grease, materials or other pollutants will be discharged from the construction activities which reach public waters.



This certification does not relieve the applicant of any obligation or responsibility for complying with the provisions of any other laws or regulations of other federal, state or local authorities.

It is your responsibility to submit this certification to the appropriate federal agency.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carol A. Couch". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

Carol A. Couch  
Director

CAC:kp

cc: Mr. Anthony Jernigan  
Ms. Carol Bernstein  
Mr. Bob Lord  
Mr. Strant Colwell  
Mr. Shruti Shah