

Chris E Shoop 11/29/2001 09:06 AM

To: Debbie J Mulrooney/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc:
Subject: Re: Revised Spreadsheet []

Debbie,

The semiworks facility has been operating since long before the permitting regulations were in place. The estimate for actual emissions is a bit rough but is for material that was actually emitted.

The sheet looks better being split as you did it.

I suspect the DAQ will be dissatisfied if you exclude the column for Reg 29 ID's. That is the link they use to check this table against what we have submitted in the Reg 29 Air Emissions Inventory. On the other hand, Jesse already has copies of the earlier versions so he could transpose those ID's fairly easily. But if I were making the submittal I would just provide them. The State has developed several ID numbering systems and I would rather not motivate them to try to standardize into a single system.

Debbie J Mulrooney

 Debbie J Mulrooney
11/29/2001 08:41 AM

To: Chris E Shoop/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc:
Subject: Revised Spreadsheet

Chris,

One more question for you. It is my understanding that you submitted the permit application for the semiworks, and don't have a permit yet. If that's the case, are the year 2000 actual emissions for the semiworks that are shown really actual emissions? Or are they just estimates of what the actual emissions would have been if the semiworks had been running?

This is the what I plan to send to Rob. I split the info into 2 different spreadsheets, one for stack parameters and one for emission information, since it was a little crowded with it all in one.

You will notice that I didn't add the Reg 29 vent IDs yet. I plan to ask Rob (and the lawyers) whether they should be included, since the consent order doesn't specifically ask for them. It says that each emission point should be listed according to its Stack I.D. and corresponding permit number. I have a hunch the lawyers will only want to provide exactly what they asked for.

Debbie

EID387387