Emissions Changes October 2000 to April 2001

The first application by Enterprise Energy Ireland for planning permission [November 2000] for this project was withdrawn when it became obvious that some of the public recognised what a health and environmental catastrophe it was. The same project was re-applied for in almost the exact same spot using the same technology in April 2001, but the supposed emissions to the atmosphere were drastically reduced. No one knows how. [Figures taken from EIS for Onshore Terminal that accompanied application for plannin permission.]

Summary of Predicted Maximum Annual Emissions for Typical Operating Conditions

	N ov. 2000: Table 8.18	April 2001: Table 10.10	Difference	% Difference
Fuel Use: Gas/Diesel	3,398	3,398	None	None
[Kg/hr] Condensate	262	255	7	-2.7%
		Kg/yr		
CO2	64,755,715	47,158,022	17,597,693	-27%
CO	84,632	112,412	27,780	+33%
NOx	100,898	77,045	23,853	-23.6%
SO2	14,764	25	14,739	-99.8%
CH4	224,946	70,606	154,340	-68.6%
VOC	47,781	25,450	22,331	-46.7%
PM	744	726	18	-2.4%
PAH	1.2	1.2	None	0%.
benzene	0.08	0.1	0.02	+25%
toluene	2.3	2.3	None	0%.
xylene	0.04	0.0	0.04	-100%
Hg	0.13	0.07	0.06	-46%.

Global Warming Potential Emissions from Terminal

	CO2	CH4	Tonne of CO2/yr Equivalent	
Nov. 2000 Table 8.11	64,755,715	224,947	69,480	[27,000 cows]
Apr.2001 Table13.1	47,158,022	70,606	48,641	[18,700 cows]
	-27%	-68.6%	-30%	

It is hard to Comprehend how the same consumption of fuel could give rise to such a huge reduction in emissions calculations in a couple of months: especially if one considers that the October 2000 EIS was still before Mayo Co. Co. for consideration until February 2001. It is a magical act to reduce global warming emissions by 30% without any sacrifice whatsoever!. The purveyors of this kind of slight of hand are not in any