

Archived: Thursday, May 31, 2012 3:40:21 PM
From: [Albert Yockey](#)
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 10:55:29 AM
To: [Bill Blackburn](#)
Subject: FW: Trona Injection
Response requested: No
Importance: Normal

FYI.

From: Mark Bailey
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 10:52 AM
To: Bob Berry
Cc: Albert Yockey; Tom Shaw
Subject: RE: Trona Injection

Thanks Bob....

Sent from my Samsung Jack™, a Windows Mobile® smartphone from AT&T

From: Bob Berry <Bob.Berry@bigrivers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 11:49 AM
To: Mark Bailey <Mark.Bailey@bigrivers.com>
Cc: Eric M. Robeson <Eric.Robeson@bigrivers.com>
Subject: Trona Injection

Mark, FYI,

I received a response from Duane Highley from AECl and he referred me to his Environmental manager (Brent Ross). They have tested the Trona injection at their Thomas Hill plant to reduce HCL and other acid gases. Their units are equipped with an SCR but no FGD. They did experience a 50% reduction in SO2 but that is deceiving because they are utilizing PRB fuel with a SO2 content of .25 - .37 lbs/mmbtu. The SO2 content of our fuel is significantly higher, 5.4 to 6.5 lbs/mmbtu. They actually have to inject sulfur into the gas stream to improve the resistivity to improve their precipitator performance. He did say that the Trona product was almost a monopoly which made it very expensive and that we would need rail access for units as large as ours. He also agreed that Trona would not help us reduce SO2 due to us having wet FGD's. We also discussed other technologies that each utility is using and he was very interested in our experience with the continuous particulate monitors that we are using at HMPL. If you have any further questions please let me know.

Bob