

Message

From: Rashid G. Hallaway [rhallaway@hhqventures.com]
Sent: 8/1/2017 5:18:16 PM
To: Bennett, Tate [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=1fa92542f7ca4d01973b18b2f11b9141-Bennett, El]; Hupp, Millan [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=92cac7b684b64f90953b753a01bee0d5-Hupp, Milla]
Subject: Re: Alcoa Issue

Correct. The Power Plant is not on site but Alcoa may raise it.

From: Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2017 11:33:13 AM
To: Rashid G. Hallaway; Hupp, Millan
Subject: RE: Alcoa Issue

So this will come up but it is not where we are visiting?

From: Rashid G. Hallaway [mailto:rhallaway@hhqventures.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2017 12:10 PM
To: Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>; Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>
Subject: Alcoa Issue

Tate/Millan,

Sorry for the multiple notes but I just got information from Alcoa regarding their Warrick Power Plant. Below is a brief summary of the issue involving Region V.

Warrick Generating Station:

- Alcoa's Warrick Operations had installed four sulfur dioxide monitors prior to the closure of the Warrick smelter in order to show compliance with the 2010 S02 National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 75 ppb.
- The monitors were being used to validate an alternative model, and operated for 8 months prior to the smelter's closure, showing compliance with the standard.
- EPA Region V has not accepted the alternative modeling and the data output derived from it, and are intending to designate Warrick County as non-attainment, using the results from an older outdated model.
- We are asking EPA to accept the alternative model derived from real data from Alcoa's field study.