

Child, Ralph

From: Voorhees.Mark@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2003 2:02 PM
To: Reynolds, John P.
Cc: Davis, Bruce; CCooper@TRCSOLUTIONS.com; Webster.David@epamail.epa.gov; Mason.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov; Papadopoulos.George@epamail.epa.gov; 'glenn.haas@state.ma.us'; Shelnutt, Howard L.; Nagle.John@epamail.epa.gov; Reynolds, John P.; 'Kristy A. Niehaus Bulleit (E-mail)'; 'ncowden@trcsolutions.com'; 'philip.weinberg@state.ma.us'; Child, Ralph; Konary, Shawn; Walshrogalski.William@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE:Mirant's request

Dear John,

I received your letter dated March 24, 2003 requesting Charles River Basin model documentation. Please consider this EMail EPA's response to your letter. I will be able to provide you with some of the information you requested. However, the remaining information is not presently available for distribution. The contractors are presently calibrating the model and some of the information that you requested is either not available at this time or is in very draft form and may change during the course of the next few weeks. Much of the information you are looking for will be provided in the model documentation reports that we anticipate will be available to the stakeholder group (previously referred to as the TAC) by April 23, 2003.

Your letter will help to ensure that the contractors include the information you desire in the model documentation reports. Because of the limited time available, the April 29 meeting will be an informational meeting only. Written comments on the modeling effort may be submitted by the stakeholder group members up until May 9. This should allow for ample time to provide written comments and, at the same time allow EPA to prepare to collect any additional data that are determined to be necessary to complete model verification.

The contractors are very busy now with calibrating the model and preparing the necessary documentation to get ready for the April 29 meeting. However, I have asked them to provide information to me that I am confident will not change as a result of the calibration process. Upon receipt of this information I will provide the following to you by April 8, 2003.

- 1) Boundary flow conditions at Watertown Dam, New Charles River Dam, all flow inputs between Watertown Dam and the Charles River Dam;
- 2) Pollutant load boundary conditions at Watertown Dam;
- 3) Meteorological data being used for the simulation periods; and

4) EFDC model documentation.

Following are other responses to your requests:

The model documentation reports provided at the last meeting are unchanged. This previous documentation of the model will be updated and replaced with the reports that will be distributed April 23, 2003.

Kendall Station inputs are the very same data you provided to EPA.

The diffuser orientation and design is consistent with the latest design that you recently provided to EPA (letter to me dated 12/31/02) and submitted to ACOE (7/01). The operating assumption will be 50% of permitted flow consistent with Mirant's desired permitting of this discharge. (we have not yet discussed whether it would be the monthly average of daily maximum permitted values.) We will run one scenario consistent with the company's desired permit conditions. If Mirant would desire to run additional scenarios that vary the design or operation, we can consider this, but Mirant will be asked pay for the runs.

Documentation for the EFDC model will provide the algorithms and the related processes included in the model. Mirant should review this document to understand the basis of the model and various relationships you mentioned in your letter.

As I indicated above, we will not run multiple scenarios for the diffuser. Our budget is dedicated to developing the TMDL which will include simulating full permitted load from all permitted discharges. It could potentially be a major diversion of time and resources to evaluate optimal diffuser designs and operational conditions using the model. EPA believes that evaluating alternatives for a proposed diffuser is the responsibility of Mirant. If Mirant desires a run that assumes less discharge flow through the diffuser such that the affect is similar to the MDC aerators (assuming you know what that might be), this may be possible provided that it does not interfere with progress on the TMDL and that EPA views this effort as providing useful information. Again, Mirant will be expected to pay for any additional runs.

I will be informing the Stakeholder group of your request and our response in case anybody else would like the available information prior to April 23, 2003.

Sincerely,

Mark Voorhees

