

Chris E Shoop 07/12/2001 01:17 PM

To: Robert F Pinchot/DEV/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Debbie J Mulroney/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: David M Rurak/AE/DuPont@DuPont, H David Ramsey/SE/DuPont@DuPont, Stephen J Gissy/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Robert L Ritchey/CL/DuPont@DuPont, John J Mentink/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Bernard J Reilly/AE/DuPont@DuPont, John R Bowman/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Andrea V Malinowski/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Oscar T Garza/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Maurice Astorga/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Catherine A Barton/AE/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: Re: Air dispersion modeling strategy 

Rob / Debbie,

Here's a table of the data requested. I cited flow rather than velocity.

I suggest we refer to the different vent points by their Reg 29 ID's which are a three-digit number.

Note that point 699 now consists of 18 1-ft dia. vents. But I think Tai Wei's plans call for a single point or at least smaller number of larger diameter vents. Note also that Trini said the current target recovery is 85% across both the scrubber and the filters. But the device (T6IZC) was described as bringing the overall recovery up to 90%.

Last note - Point 658 is grandfathered. Points 652 and 216 have limits on total particulate (and production) because the calculations did not address C-8 separately. Consequently there are no actual permit limits for these points. Please let me know if you need to have an estimate of an "implied" limit for 652 & 658, but consider that these are small contributors to the overall emissions.

Chris Shoop



Stacks & Surfactant Emissions.xls

EDD0074383