



**{In Archive} Re: So Why Is the Treatment System BAT ?** 

**John King** to: palmeag

09/13/2010 01:06 PM

From: John King/R1/USEPA/US  
To: palmeag@nu.com  
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

This is great!  
-----palmeag@nu.com wrote: -----

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: palmeag@nu.com  
Date: 09/11/2010 12:44AM  
Subject: Re: So Why Is the Treatment System BAT?

John, The law only had to do with the FGD technology, it doesn't dictate the WWTS. PSNH and URS are in the midst of completing a document to provide a basic description and purpose of the system, the options considered, the basis for the technology selection and why it is BAT. It will be provided for your review next week.

In the meantime, I'll have more time to discuss some of these details with you, starting Tuesday. If you'd like, I may be able to arrange a meeting for us with Rick Roy next week to tour the WWTS and provide more info. Hope this works, Allan.

From:  
king.john@epamail.epa.gov  
To:  
Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU  
Date:  
09/09/2010 12:39 PM  
Subject:  
So Why Is the  
Treatment System BAT?

Allan,

This is only a start for the explaining why PSNH considers the treatment system for the FGD discharge as BAT. Please refer to my voice mail that Linda Landis offered to provide that BAT to Mark Stein.

Thank you, John

-----palmeag@nu.com wrote: -----

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: palmeag@nu.com  
Date: 09/09/2010 10:48AM

Subject: Your skepticism is ill founded, once again Kemosabe...

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/X/125-0/125-0-11.htm>

II. The department of environmental services has determined that the best known commercially available technology is a wet flue gas desulphurization system, hereafter "scrubber technology," as it best balances the procurement, installation, operation, and plant efficiency costs with the projected reductions in mercury and other pollutants from the flue gas streams of Merrimack Units 1 and 2. Scrubber technology achieves significant emissions reduction benefits, including but not limited to, cost effective reductions in sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, small particulate matter, and improved visibility (regional haze).

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail, including any files or attachments transmitted with it, is confidential and/or proprietary and is intended for a specific purpose and for use only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or the taking of any action based on its contents, other than for its intended purpose, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are not necessarily those of Northeast Utilities, its subsidiaries and affiliates (NU). E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be error-free or secure or free from viruses, and NU disclaims all liability for any resulting damage, errors, or omissions.

\*\*\*\*\*



**{In Archive} Re: So Why Is the Treatment System BAT ?**

**palmeag** to: John King

09/11/2010 12:47 AM

From: palmeag@nu.com  
To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

John, The law only had to do with the FGD technology, it doesn't dictate the WWTS. PSNH and URS are in the midst of completing a document to provide a basic description and purpose of the system, the options considered, the basis for the technology selection and why it is BAT. It will be provided for your review next week. In the meantime, I'll have more time to discuss some of these details with you, starting Tuesday. If you'd like, I may be able to arrange a meeting for us with Rick Roy next week to tour the WWTS and provide more info. Hope this works, Allan.

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov  
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU  
Date: 09/09/2010 12:39 PM  
Subject: So Why Is the Treatment System BAT?

Allan,

This is only a start for the explaining why PSNH considers the treatment system for the FGD discharge as BAT. Please refer to my voice mail that Linda Landis offered to provide that BAT to Mark Stein.

Thank you, John  
-----palmeag@nu.com wrote: -----

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: palmeag@nu.com  
Date: 09/09/2010 10:48AM  
Subject: Your skepticism is ill founded, once again Kemosabe...

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/X/125-O/125-O-11.htm>

II. The department of environmental services has determined that the best known commercially available technology is a wet flue gas desulphurization system, hereafter "scrubber technology," as it best balances the procurement, installation, operation, and plant efficiency costs with the projected reductions in mercury and other pollutants from the flue gas streams of Merrimack Units 1 and 2. Scrubber technology achieves significant emissions reduction benefits, including but not limited to, cost effective reductions in sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, small particulate matter, and improved visibility (regional haze).

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail, including any files or attachments transmitted with it, is confidential and/or proprietary and is intended for a specific purpose and for use only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or the taking of any action based on its contents, other than for its intended purpose, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are not necessarily those of Northeast Utilities, its subsidiaries and affiliates (NU). E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be error-free or secure or free from viruses, and NU disclaims all liability for any resulting damage, errors, or omissions.

\*\*\*\*\*



**{In Archive} So Why Is the Treatment System BAT ?** 

**John King** to: palmeag

09/09/2010 12:41 PM

From: John King/R1/USEPA/US  
To: palmeag@nu.com  
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

Allan,

This is only a start for the explaining why PSNH considers the treatment system for the FGD discharge as BAT. Please refer to my voice mail that Linda Landis offered to provide that BAT to Mark Stein.

Thank you, John

-----palmeag@nu.com wrote: -----

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: palmeag@nu.com  
Date: 09/09/2010 10:48AM  
Subject: Your skepticism is ill founded, once again Kemosabe...

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/X/125-0/125-0-11.htm>

II. The department of environmental services has determined that the best known commercially available technology is a wet flue gas desulphurization system, hereafter "scrubber technology," as it best balances the procurement, installation, operation, and plant efficiency costs with the projected reductions in mercury and other pollutants from the flue gas streams of Merrimack Units 1 and 2. Scrubber technology achieves significant emissions reduction benefits, including but not limited to, cost effective reductions in sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, small particulate matter, and improved visibility (regional haze).

\*\*\*\*\*  
This e-mail, including any files or attachments transmitted with it, is confidential and/or proprietary and is intended for a specific purpose and for use only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or the taking of any action based on its contents, other than for its intended purpose, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are not necessarily those of Northeast Utilities, its subsidiaries and affiliates (NU). E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be error-free or secure or free from viruses, and NU disclaims all liability for any resulting damage, errors, or omissions.  
\*\*\*\*\*



**{In Archive} Your skepticism is illfounded , once again Kemosabe ...**

**palmeag** to: John King

09/09/2010 10:51 AM

From: palmeag@nu.com  
To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

History: This message has been replied to.  
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

<http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/X/125-O/125-O-11.htm>

II. The department of environmental services has determined that the best known commercially available technology is a wet flue gas desulphurization system, hereafter ""scrubber technology," as it best balances the procurement, installation, operation, and plant efficiency costs with the projected reductions in mercury and other pollutants from the flue gas streams of Merrimack Units 1 and 2. Scrubber technology achieves significant emissions reduction benefits, including but not limited to, cost effective reductions in sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, small particulate matter, and improved visibility (regional haze).

\*\*\*\*\* This e-mail, including any files or attachments transmitted with it, is confidential and/or proprietary and is intended for a specific purpose and for use only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or the taking of any action based on its contents, other than for its intended purpose, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are not necessarily those of Northeast Utilities, its subsidiaries and affiliates (NU). E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be error-free or secure or free from viruses, and NU disclaims all liability for any resulting damage, errors, or omissions.

\*\*\*\*\*