

## Exhibit A

### Region 1's Support for Mirant Canal's Finding of Feasibility/Practicability

| Page of Response to Comments | Statements by EPA Region 1  | Citation to Mirant Canal or Alden Documents  |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| IX-20                        | "closed-cycle cooling has been deemed by both EPA and Mirant/Alden to be technologically feasible at Canal Station"   | None, though the Alden Report must be what Region 1 had in mind  |
| IX-21                        | This does not appear to refer to any Mirant Canal or Alden Lab acceptance of cooling towers for the Canal Station. It does cite an Alden Lab report on California power plants.   | None. Region 1 cites an Alden Research Laboratory report to support a statement about the capabilities of technologies <i>other than cooling towers</i> .  |
| IX-27                        | "Mirant/Alden and EPA both concluded that closed-cycle cooling was a practicable (or "available") technology for Canal Station ...."  | No citation to any Mirant Canal or Alden document  |
| IX-29                        | Nothing about Mirant Canal's or Alden's views   | No citation to a Mirant Canal or Alden document  |
| IX-34                        | Retrofitting "would, according to Mirant/Alden, require a 6-month shutdown"   | Reference to Mirant Canal/Alden report on costs of wedgewire and Ristroph screens  |
| IX-36                        | Mirant Canal pointed out that EPA found that closed-cycle cooling is not economically practical for many existing Phase II facilities; Mirant Canal's comment correctly indicates that EPA did not determine that this technology would be economically impracticable for <i>all</i> large, existing power plants | The Region cites the Mirant Corporation Second Quarter 2007 Earnings Release and Mirant Canal's statement that EPA had found that closed-cycle cooling "is not economically practical for many existing Phase II facilities." The Region says that the Alden Lab Report indicates the facility had typically been operating at a 48 percent capacity factor. |

| Page of Alden Report    |  | Statement by Alden   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Alden Report 3-6        |  | [Brief general summary of capabilities, advantages, and disadvantages of closed-cycle cooling, both natural draft and mechanical draft]  |
| Alden Report 3-8        |  | [Table indicating that closed-cycle cooling has “potential” for application at Canal Station and that its biological effectiveness is proven, has advantages over other concepts, and “engineering alternative available”]   |
| Alden Report 4-11       |  | “A mechanical or natural draft cooling tower could be retrofitted to meet the cooling requirements of the plant.”  |
| Alden Report 6-1 to 6-2 |  | “Those technologies that were deemed to be commercially available, practicable from an engineering standpoint, and potentially biologically effective were further developed to a level necessary to estimate installation and O&M costs.” Cooling towers would cost “on the order of \$108,000,000 depending on the type of tower.” |