



OH Sub No. 7

Recd From: Dublin City Council

Expanded Brief for Applicants Objections – April 12, 2008

Condition 2.1.1 Ten Years of Power Plant Experience versus Incinerator Experience

The proposed condition requires the facility manager to have a minimum of 10 years of incineration experience. We have proposed that this condition is unnecessarily prescriptive and may unintentionally prevent qualified candidates from the immediate vicinity from having an opportunity to have employment at the WTE facility because of this condition. As a general matter, it is relevant to note that this condition is more stringent than the Waste Incineration Directive where Article 3.11 does not require any specific resume for a facility manager.

Covanta Energy Corporation would prefer to have a license condition that requires 10 years of power plant experience instead of incineration experience for several reasons.

The first reason is that an incinerator is a power plant and these facilities use many of the same processes and equipment. Experience at power plant is equivalent to experience at an incinerator and the proposed condition unnecessarily removes applicants from this opportunity.

The 2nd reason is that Covanta will provide a rigorous training program regardless of where an applicant has gained experience. We have experience in training many professionals from various power plants and can state with confidence that an experienced power plant facility manager can become a highly qualified and successful incinerator facility manager. Training will include various in-house topics such as environmental, health and safety procedures; vendor equipment training and hands on training at a Covanta WTE facility.

The 3rd reason is that Covanta prefers to employ local personnel instead of bringing in personnel from distant areas. It is highly unlikely that there is a local citizen with 10 years of incinerator experience and there is a stronger likelihood that there is a capable local citizen with 10 years of power plant experience.

In any case, Covanta is responsible for employing personnel that are able to maintain a facility in compliance with all required regulatory requirements however we would prefer to have the ability to hire a facility manager from the best pool of candidates and not one that unnecessary disadvantages local citizens.

Condition 3.5.3 - Waste Water Management in the Waste Tipping Hall

Section D.1.k of the Solid Waste Application Form identified that all surface water from inside operations would be recycled in a closed process system and used in the flue gas cleaning system. Sources of water included washdown of the waste reception hall, drainage water from boiler and turbine, bottom ash cooling water and water from washing in bottom ash storage.

CONFIDENTIAL
EPA 815-101

The purpose of this clarification is to amend the scope of facility operations that will be a source of inside water. Specifically we propose to remove water from the washdown of the waste reception hall and bottom ash storage from being re-used as process water.

The waste reception hall is completely enclosed including permanent walls, a roof and door(s). The entrance road and tipping hall floor are designed to keep stormwater out of the tipping hall and to keep any cleaning water inside of the hall. Therefore the waste water from the tipping floor is self-contained.

Standard operation and maintenance procedures require both dry and wet cleaning methods of the tipping hall. When water is used and there is some residual waste remaining on the tipping floor. The resulting waste water contains a large amount of solid debris and suspended solids. There are several reasons why this waste water is not a practical source of process water.

The first reason is that the cleaning frequency is not constant and both the amount and quality of water is variable. In general it could be described as low quantity and low quality. Neither of which makes it a practical source of process water.

The second reason is that storing and pumping this waste water creates unique water handling problems because of its inherent characteristics but also because there are very limited re-use opportunities in a WTE Facility. Covanta has never installed or operated a system like this at 34 facilities and is not aware of a successful precedent.

Bottom ash has limited areas where it would warrant cleanup including sites where the trucks are loaded and there are conveyor intersections, neither of which should have large amounts of residue and what does exist will be moist and not prone to creating a fugitive emission. The preferred cleanup technique is a dry broom. If wash down water is required periodically, the amount will be small and infrequent.

In closing, the proposal to collect and re-use waste water from waste reception hall and bottom ash areas is not in the pit is not practical for aforementioned technical reasons. The proposed solution is to dispose of tipping hall water in the MSW bunker. There is a small amount of water that by itself will not adversely impact waste characteristics and the requirement to mix waste in the pit will avoid any possible negative impact on the facility. Any water from bottom ash cleanup should be cleaned up by manual and mechanical means when necessary.

Condition 3.15.2 - Hours of Operation

The clarification originally described in the applicant's letter of December 18, 2007 focused on clarifying the hours for removing incinerator residue from the WTE facility. The purpose of this testimony is to expand the scope of that clarification to also address the hours for removing waste from the facility.

The EIS application proposed a schedule for waste deliveries from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM Monday thru Saturday to recognize the local hauling conditions in Dublin area. The EIS application did not specify the hours for removing waste, largely under the assumption that the hours would be the same for each. The presumption was that if a delivery contains waste that is not acceptable for any reason, upon determination that this unacceptable waste must be removed, the most practical approach would be to have that same truck take away the waste it brought in. This approach would not be possible with the proposed condition because the hours for removing waste are different (8:00 AM to 6:30 PM Mondays to Fridays and 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM on Saturdays) and are a limiting feature. There is a 1 ½ hour on Monday thru Friday and a 8 hour period on Saturday where waste could be delivered but not removed from the WTE Facility.

We are requesting that the same hours should apply to waste acceptance and waste removal to avoid unnecessary complications. Conversely, we do not see an advantage or any specific reason for having different hours of operation for receiving and removal of MSW from the WTE facility.

In regards to the original request for clarification on the removal of incinerator residues, that request for clarification stands. The shipping and loading schedule will not be finalized until the facility is closer to finalizing agreements with carriers which will not be for several years.

We are proposing some alternative language to Condition which reads:

“Waste may be removed from the facility only between the hours of 0800 to 1830 Monday to Friday inclusive and 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays.”

The proposed alternative language is:

“Waste may be removed from the facility only between the hours of 0800 to 2200 Monday to Friday inclusive and 0800 to 1830 on Saturdays. **Incinerator residues which are transported by ship from Poolbeg peninsula may be removed at all times.**”

Condition 3.19 - Shutdown of Facility Instead of Shutdown of One Line

The clarification originally described in the applicant's letter of December 18, 2007 focused on clarifying that abnormal operating conditions should only impact the operations of the unit with abnormal operation(s) and that there was not a technical reason for shutting down the entire facility. Upon further review of the situation, we can imagine where the proposed language would apply to a facility with one process line and as a result the term “process line” and “incineration plant” are interchangeable. That is not the case for the Dublin WTE facility where there are two process lines.

We have therefore concluded that the alternative language proposed in the December 18, 2007 letter is appropriate for the Dublin WTE facility, however we believe that an

additional clarification is warranted to address the language requiring Agency agreement before the incinerator can resume operations after a shutdown initiated by an abnormal operating event.

The licensee is seeking clarification that Agency agreement to startup a unit after an abnormal shutdown is intended to mean that the Agency will establish a protocol that identifies the sequence of events that the licensee must follow upon shutdown caused by an abnormal event. This would require as a minimum the licensee contacting the Agency as soon as practicable, identification of the cause and the remedy thereof, all of which will be submitted to the Agency in a written report. This interpretation would enable facility operation but only when the licensee has fully complied with all other conditions of the license.

The reason for this clarification is to enable the affected line to resume operations in a timely manner after a shutdown due to abnormal operations. This clarification would avoid unnecessary unit downtime that could result when Agency personnel are not immediately available during periods such as evenings, weekends, holidays or vacations.

With this thought in mind, the licensee is proposing the following revised condition.

“In the case of an abnormal operating condition as **defined in Council Directive 2000/76**, the licensee shall, as soon as practicable,

- a) shut down incinerator plant operations **if the abnormal operating condition adversely affects both process lines; and or**
- b) shut down the process line **with the abnormal operating condition.**

The licensee shall not resume incineration operations without the agreement of the Agency.

Condition 9.4.1 – Facility Shutdown Means Evacuation Of The Pit

The clarification originally described in the applicant’s letter of December 18, 2007 focused on clarifying that there was not a reason to evacuate all MSW from the bunker because of a breakdown of a process line or if the facility is shutdown for three days. Upon a review of the situation, we can imagine how the proposed language would apply to a facility with one process line and as a result the term “process line” and “incineration plant” are interchangeable. That is not the case for the Dublin WTE facility where there are two process lines.

We have therefore concluded that the alternative proposed language is appropriate for the Dublin WTE facility. That language is provided below for convenience.

“In the event of a complete breakdown of equipment or any other occurrence which results in the shutdown of the incineration plant, any waste:

- (a) arriving at the facility shall be transferred directly to an appropriate facility:

(b) stored or awaiting processing at the facility shall, subject to the agreement of the Agency, be transferred to an appropriate facility within seven days of the shutdown.”

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.