



# ***Facts About...***

## ***Proposed Energy Answers International Waste-to-Energy Facility***

---

**Project Description:** Energy Answers International (EA) has proposed a 4,400 ton-per-day waste-to-energy facility. This facility is designed to accept processed refuse fuel (PRF) and other combustible fuels to produce steam to drive two turbine generators with a nominal capacity of 145 megawatts.

**Site Location:** The facility will be located on the Fairfield Peninsula in Baltimore City at the site of the former FMC chemical manufacturing plant. The site is currently inactive with most of the FMC buildings and equipment dismantled and removed. Some of the existing buildings and tanks will be reused by EA as part of its facility.

The project will be constructed on 15.35 acres of the site, while the remainder of the 90-acre site is planned for an Eco-Industrial Park development. The Eco-Industrial Park will consist of the Energy Answers proposed facility and several satellite facilities that will maximize the recovery of materials processed at the plant.

**Refuse Disposal:** EA is intending to burn solid waste that is processed to create a refuse derived fuel at this facility. MDE and the Office of the Attorney General determined this project needs a refuse disposal permit, and MDE recommended that the Public Service Commission not grant a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity permit until the facility obtains a refuse disposal permit. The refuse disposal permit process includes a public hearing/comment period.

On May 26, 2010, the Public Service Commission conducted a hearing on MDE's proposed limitations for this permit. On July 8, 2010, the Public Service Commission Hearing Examiner proposed a decision that a refuse disposal permit is not required at this facility. On July 23, 2010, the Department entered into a settlement agreement requiring Energy Answers to comply with the substantive requirements of a refuse disposal permit, thereby imposing the same important requirements that would have been required by a permit. These include: ash testing and handling requirements to determine appropriate disposal or re-use; solid waste handling procedures; posting financial security to cover closure costs; and miscellaneous requirements such as fire suppression and waste handling.

**Air Pollutants and Control:** The proposed project has the potential to emit a number of pollutants: PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and lead, acid gases, metals (including mercury), sulfuric acid mist and several hazardous air pollutants. The facility will be required to install numerous and significant pollution control technologies to ensure emissions from the facility meet, and in some cases, exceed federal and state air quality control requirements. The following pollution control equipment will be installed:

**NO<sub>x</sub>** control - regenerative selective catalytic reduction (RSCR) system

**Mercury and dioxin/furan** control - activated carbon injection (ACI) system

**Acid gas** control - Turbosorp© dry circulating bed scrubber with dry lime injection

**Particulate matter** control - fabric filters (baghouses).



In addition to installing technology, the facility will be required to undertake several measures to limit the amount of mercury-containing products that are transported to the facility and to partially mitigate the effects of the facility's mercury emissions on Maryland water bodies. The facility will also be required to evaluate means to minimize its greenhouse gas footprint.

### **Highlighted Mercury Conditions**

MDE's recommendations require EA to meet an emission rate for mercury that will be the lowest in the Nation. These recommendations include the following:

- EA would be required to implement mercury mitigation measures, such as stream bank restoration, to offset direct mercury deposition to water bodies as a result of EA's emissions. Further deposition mitigation measures, as well as other actions related to reducing mercury emissions, would be required of EA if their yearly mercury emission levels exceed a specified amount.
- EA would be required to implement a Mercury Diversion Plan for all service areas of the facility to minimize the amount of mercury in the material to be burned at the EA facility.
- EA would be required to install, calibrate, maintain, and operate a continuous emission monitoring system for mercury on each unit so that there is a more accurate picture of the amount of mercury emitted from the facility.
- EA would be required to conduct quarterly stack testing for mercury emissions from each unit to demonstrate compliance with the applicable emission limit.

