

Archived: Thursday, May 31, 2012 3:41:15 PM
From: [Eric M. Robeson](#)
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 3:34:00 PM
To: [Adam Landry \(adam.c.landry@sargentlundy.com\)](#)
Subject: FW: Coleman FGD Removal Efficiency
Response requested: No
Importance: Normal
Attachments: [Copy of Coleman FGD Removal 06-11 \(2\).xlsx](#) ;

For your review since we were talking about Coleman FGD upgrade

From: Bob Berry
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2011 11:35 AM
To: Eric M. Robeson
Cc: Bill Blackburn; Albert Yockey; Tom Shaw
Subject: Coleman FGD Removal Efficiency

Eric, Per our conversation yesterday regarding the Coleman FGD removal efficiency, please see attached a spreadsheet representing the annual removal efficiencies from 2006 through the present. A few things to note is:

1. 2006 was a partial year of operation for the FGD
2. The row labeled FGD Removal % is the removal efficiency of the flue gas going through the FGD
3. The row labeled FGD Plant Removal % is the removal efficiency of all flue gas which includes the flue gas that was passed through the by-pass stack.
4. The removal efficiency in 2010 was lower than normal due to the additional time on by-pass caused by booster fan problems and lower quality limestone.
5. The limestone quality for 2012 meets the original design specification.

With all of this said the Coleman FGD is averaging 97.5 % removal efficiency of what is actually going through the scrubber; therefore I am not convinced we can improve the efficiency enough to gain a significant reduction in SO₂, unless we shut all Coleman units down when the FGD is out for an outage.

Thanks

Bob