

**Neighborhood Advisory Committee**  
**July 16, 2015**

**NAC Members Present:** NEDC: Aubrey Baldwin; NCA: Tom Giese, John Krallman, Mary Peveto; NWDA: Sharon Genasci

**Not Present:** Bob Amundson, Bob Holmstrom (NWDA)

**ESCO Representatives:** Austin Peterson, Travis Quarles

**Other Attendees:** ESCO: Rob Cornilles, Kat Robinson; neighbors: Bob Lubben

Meeting called to order at 5:08 PM.

**Welcome and Introductions**

**Project Update: Project 14 AOD process neighbor observation**

Travis Quarles explained that the AOD process is used to purify the metal and make a premium product. At the last NAC meeting, ESCO presented the work that was done for this project. In June, Sharon Genasci, Bob Holmstrom, and John Krallman visited ESCO to watch a video of the process and discuss the new standardized operating procedure. Based on the video, neighbors were concerned about the ladle sitting in the AOD pit after tap and releasing emissions that weren't well captured. After the meeting, operations clarified that it's normal for the ladle to sit in the pit for 10-15 minutes at the end of each heat. Another comment from the neighbors was that the AOD hood could have been pushed farther forward at several points in the process. Quarles also noted there was no standard to leave the dust collector on until the ladle left the area; sometimes the collector was turned off after the vessel was tapped. The new standard is for the hood to be pushed as far forward as possible after tap, and for the dust collector to remain on during the entire process.

Krallman said he saw good emissions capture during most of the AOD process, but capture was less effective while tapping into the ladle and when the ladle sat in the pit, estimating 30-40% capture at the end of the process. This raises concerns, especially if the ladle sits in the pit every time, since the non-captured emissions go into ceiling fans. Austin Peterson explained that the ladle sits in the pit until it reaches a very narrow temperature range, but operators aim to minimize the time spent in the pit as long holding times hurt the metal quality. Genasci disagreed with Krallman's estimate of 30-40% capture, and was concerned by what she saw. Although she saw the dust collector worked well during normal circumstances, Genasci was disturbed to see the emissions at the end of the process, adding that the emissions that went out of the ceiling fans are what neighbors have always been concerned about.

Genasci said she immediately called Aubrey Baldwin and suggested the entire NAC watch the same video, and Baldwin discussed that with Shannon Huggins at ESCO. Quarles explained that the video is pulled from security footage and is lost after a certain period of time, so the video from June is not available. Genasci was unhappy the video was deleted, and Peterson continued to explain that the footage wasn't deleted intentionally. Genasci reiterated that the entire NAC should see the video. Quarles showed more recent video, explaining that the process is the same as what was observed in June. Neighbors commented on the bright light and flare in the video, and Peterson explained that much like photographing a solar eclipse, normal cameras can't properly capture the brightness of molten metal. When viewed in person, the light is less bright and it's easier to view the process and emissions. Quarles pointed out that the AOD hood is now fully extended as often as possible, and operators frequently adjust the hood position for better capture. Quarles pointed out the end of the process, and Genasci said it looked much better than what she saw in June. Krallman suggested the capture efficiency

was 60% or better with the hood fully extended. Genasci again urged Quarles to show the original video from June, and Quarles repeated that it's unavailable.

Quarles then showed a video of the AOD process without the change to extend the hood as often as possible. Krallman said the plume was similar to the video in June, but still smaller. Quarles noted the June video was a larger heat, and Krallman agreed that could explain the greater emissions. Genasci again asked about the original video, and Quarles explained that it no longer exists. After watching both videos, Baldwin commented that a significant amount of emissions were not being captured, but the addition of the hood and the extended position captured comparatively more than before.

The group discussed suggestions made by Holmstrom in June. One suggestion was a push-pull dust collector, but Krallman didn't see space for that setup. Another idea was to add another hood above the AOD. Quarles explained another hood would only draw from the side, which might not effectively capture emissions rising vertically. Krallman suggested routing the ceiling fans to a dust collector, thinking the low flow rate wouldn't overwhelm an existing collector. Peterson complimented the ideas, and suggested discussing possible improvements with the AOD operators. Krallman encouraged ESCO to bring in an evaluator similar to ERM to perform an alternative analysis for future projects.

#### **Quarterly Complaint Trending Report**

Baldwin transitioned to odor complaints, noting that none of the recent complaints were associated with the Main Plant. Peterson explained that the Main Plant now melts and pours during graveyard shift, using the AOD about once a day. Genasci interjected, again asking about the availability of the original AOD video. Quarles reiterated that it's no longer accessible. The video came from security footage, which writes over itself regularly. Bob Lubben asked about the different types of binders and where they are poured. Peterson explained that the Main Plant processes generally contain less organic material than Plant 3, which has a stronger odor. Peterson reviewed the trend report, reiterating that no complaints in the second quarter were attributed to the Main Plant. Krallman noted that summer weather will possibly bring more complaints, and Baldwin and Quarles agreed. Peterson explained that Plant 3 pours almost 20 hours out of the day, which was surprising to Baldwin.

#### **Project Update: Project 17**

Baldwin explained that Project 17 is an engineering study of capture in the Slinger Bay, noting that the GNA allows ESCO to implement another project if approved by the NAC. Baldwin asked the group to consider what it makes sense to study during the waning days of the GNA. Quarles shared a chart ranking Main Plant and Plant 3 sources of organic Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs). Krallman suggested the chart described odor as well, and Quarles agreed that odor and organic HAPs are related. Peterson continued the discussion from previous meetings, noting that Plant 3 might be a focus area instead of the Main Plant. Plant 3 binder has a stronger odor than the Main Plant, and a project at Plant 3 for odor could have huge returns. Peterson also suggested projects around pouring operations from the Main Plant Chain Room and Plant 3 Pug Mill.

Genasci suggested that neighbors were more concerned about HAPs than odor, and that reducing odor is just for public relations. Tom Giese offered that metals were a top concern, and Krallman asked for a chart showing metals, organic HAPs, and total HAPs. Peterson acknowledged the comments and noted that emissions and odor generally follow each other, meaning reducing emissions usually reduces odor. Giese suggested moving beyond odor-causing binder systems and focusing on small metal particles that can reach the neighborhood. Krallman agreed, adding that metal emissions are often tied to public health issues. Quarles noted that metal HAPs will be tied to production levels.

Krallman also asked to see Main Plant emissions based on current reduced production and maximum potential emissions. Peterson continued discussing the Main Plant's reduced production, suggesting a focus on Plant 3 where metal emissions and odor could both be covered. Baldwin summarized that ESCO would provide an updated chart, and the group discussed specific trends they wish to see. Quarles agreed to provide updated charts for discussion. Mary Peveto agreed with the request for current and potential emissions, saying NCA would be taking a leap of faith to assume the Main Plant production remains low. Genasci reiterated that she couldn't believe the Slinger Bay's uncontrolled emissions.

Baldwin noted Project 17 is due in April 2017 and suggested a small working group discuss the study. Quarles agreed to prepare the new charts, and Peterson liked the idea of a small group to discuss and make decisions quickly. Baldwin suggested Genasci be part of the working group, and Genasci expressed interest in discussing plans for the Slinger Bay. Genasci understood Project 17 to be a study spanning over five years that would plan emission controls for the Slinger Bay, reiterating her disbelief about the emissions. Giese and Krallman also asked to join the working group, and suggested Bob Amundson and Holmstrom also get involved. Quarles agreed to reach out to the interested NAC members to schedule a meeting. Baldwin asked the working group to report back at the October NAC meeting.

#### **Chapman Monitoring Update**

Krallman explained that lab results through the end of June are available and being reviewed by a data interpretation expert from Global Community Monitoring (GCM). Krallman suspects the average values for metals are near or below the Ambient Benchmark Concentrations (ABC). GCM suggested a town hall meeting to discuss preliminary results with neighbors because the lab reports can be difficult to interpret. NAC members will also be invited to a separate meeting to discuss the data. Quarles was hesitant about sharing data publicly, since the results are meant to be interpreted over a one-year period. He cautioned against publishing data for open interpretation and suggested it only be reviewed for quality. Krallman agreed with the concerns and said there would be a caveat about not directly comparing the available results to annual averages. Baldwin summarized that a small working group of NAC members would develop a communication to the public.

#### **Review ESCO and DEQ communications since last meeting**

Quarles reviewed three communications. One was ESCO's request that DEQ approve the air permit operating plan, and the third was DEQ's response approving the plan. The second communication was DEQ's approval of the test plan for the Thermal Sand Reclaimer at Plant 3. Quarles will organize a meeting for the working group to discuss analytical results once they have returned from the lab. Quarles added that the status of Attachment A projects was updated, although not much has changed since most projects are complete or in progress.

#### **Public Comment: none**

Meeting adjourned at 6:26 PM.