



Jim_Roller@ncair.net

10/27/1999 11:10 AM

To: Johnson.Brenda

cc: Laura_Butler@ncair.net, Cathy_Wilson@ncair.net,
emhaynes@duke-energy.com

Subject: FW: FW: ISC-Prime

Brenda,

Eldewins has submitted the attached document (his e-mail to me) to support his request to use ISC-PRIME in lieu of ISCST3 for the Dan River modeling compliance demonstration. I have reviewed the document and believe he has addressed your comments for providing justification. I am under the impression ISC-PRIME was developed to address concerns associated with the way ISCST3 handles plume rise and building downwash, particularly for tall, buoyant plumes associated with power plants. Based on the conclusions of the ISC-PRIME evaluation, ISC-PRIME would appear to be the more appropriate model to use for the Dan River modeling scenario. Please review and provide comments at your convenience. Thanks!

Jim Roller
Supervisor, Air Quality Analysis Branch
(919) 715-6262
email: jim_roller@aq.enr.state.nc.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Eldewins M Haynes [mailto:emhaynes@duke-energy.com]
<mailto:[mailto:emhaynes@duke-energy.com]>
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 1999 9:49 AM
To: Roller Jim
Cc: Marsha C Kinley; Robert A Mc Murry
Subject: Re: FW: ISC-Prime

<<Mac Word 3.0>>

Jim,

Based on Brenda's letter, I have formulated responses which I believe provide sufficient justification to use ISC-PRIME in place of ISCST3. The response itself is in the attached document. My understanding is that you will forward my responses to EPA Region 4 for their review and approval. If you have any additional questions, or cannot read the document, feel free to contact me.

(See attached file: Prime justification.doc)

Roller Jim <Jim_Roller@ncair.net <mailto:Jim_Roller@ncair.net> > on 09/28/99
09:15:14 AM

To: Eldewins M Haynes/Corp/DukePower@DukePower
<mailto:Haynes/Corp/DukePower@DukePower>