

# **MIRANT COMMUNITY MONITORING GROUP**

**June 29, 2009, 5:30 – 9:00 pm  
City Hall – City Council Work Room**

## **AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Update on Ambient PM2.5 Monitor
3. Recap of last meeting and Alternatives for consideration
4. Discussions/ Questions/ Deliberation by MCMG
5. Next Steps
6. Adjourn

**Phase 1 - Fugitive Dust Controls Study**  
**Conclusions**

**Following controls to have maximum benefit:**

**Control #4**

Install fog type dust suppression system - TIC: \$533, 242 +/- 30%

**Control #7**

Purchase one street sweeper - TIC: \$154,451 +/- 30%

**Control #17A**

Addition of Wind Screen on three sides - TIC:\$540,000 +/- 30%

**If funds are still available, following should be implemented:**

**Control #8**

Install drip pans and drain piping - TIC:\$325,838 +/- 30%

**Control #1**

New Fly Ash Loader - TIC:\$497,464 +/- 30% \*\*\*

\*\*\* The last of the four original fly ash loaders may be replaced with a new more efficient unit in the in Fly ash Silo A. City is in discussions with Mirant considering the installation of Ash Loader. There is possibility of implementing remaining portion of Control #1 subject to an agreement with Mirant without waiting for completion of # 17A and #8.

Alternatives for Consideration

**OPTION A**

<p><b>Proceed immediately with the following actions:</b></p> <p>a. Install Control #4 and #7 (fog type dust suppression system and purchase street sweeper)</p> <p>b. Get additional public input from Community for Control #17A (wind screen), and proceed accordingly</p> <p>c. If funds are still available, install Control # 8 (drip pans) and #1 (Fly Ash Loader***)</p> <p>d. Develop a position on # 17A for City Council's consideration this Fall.</p>	
Pros	Cons
<p>-Immediate progress on fugitive ash controls # 4 and #7</p> <p>-Allows for immediate public input on wind screen #17A which will have visual impacts on the community.</p>	<p>- Potential for aesthetic impacts from installation of 17A</p> <p>- Progress on windscreen can not begin simultaneously along with # 4 and #7</p> <p>- Control #8 can be installed only if funds remain after implementation of #4, #7, and # 17A and potentially #1</p>

**OPTION B**

<p><b>Proceed immediately with the following actions:</b></p> <p>a. Install Control #4 and #7 (fog type dust suppression system and purchase street sweeper)</p> <p>b. Defer Control # 17A(wind screen), and Control # 8 (drip pans) until the completion of Phase II (Stack controls)</p> <p>c. If funds are still available, consider # 17A (wind screen), Control # 8 (drip pans) and #1 (Fly Ash Loader***) as part of Supplemental Projects</p> <p>d. Develop a position on # 17A for City Council's consideration, after completion of Phase II.</p>	
Pros	Cons
<p>-Immediate progress on fugitive ash controls #4 and # 7</p> <p>- May provide additional funding for stack controls</p> <p>- Enables staff to focus only on Phase II</p>	<p>-Defers wind screen to after completion of Phase II (stack control)</p> <p>- Possibility that no funds remain after Phase II gets completed</p> <p>-Windscreen #17A and #8 will be implemented subject to availability of funds after completion of Phase II</p>

\*\*\* The last of the four original fly ash loaders may be replaced with a new more efficient unit in the in Fly ash Silo A. City is in discussions with Mirant considering the installation of Ash Loader. There is possibility of implementing remaining portion of Control #1 subject to an agreement with Mirant without waiting for completion of # 17A and #8

## COAL PILE HEIGHT EVALUATION (BASED ON HISTORIC DATA)

In response to question raised at the MCMG meeting with respect to amount of time the coal height is expected to be higher than 30 feet, following information was provided:

"As you requested, I have reviewed the coal pile data that we have on file, which covers 2006-2008 operations. Using coal pile height vs. capacity calculations that Worley Parsons provided, I estimate the Potomac River pile exceeded 30 ft in height approximately 3.5% of the time in the past three years.

This figure is purely a historical calculation, and does not represent a commitment as to how the plant will manage the coal pile in the future. I do believe, however, that the 3.5% is fairly representative.

I also feel obliged to point out that if the coal pile fence project is set aside, then this calculation is not pertinent to the rest of the Phase I discussions. Thanks.

Dave C."