Allen, Pam, NMENV

From: Maestas, Ricardo, NMENV
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 3:09 PM
To: Allen, Pam, NMENV
Subject: FW: Louvers

March

From: Kliphuis, Trais, NMENV
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:03 AM
To: Kendall, Jeff, NMENV; Flynn, Ryan, NMENV
Cc: Tongate, Butch, NMENV; Blaine, Tom, NMENV; Winchester, Jim, NMENV; Schwender, Erika, NMENV; Skibitski, Thomas, NMENV; LucasKamat, Susan, NMENV; Maestas, Ricardo, NMENV; Smith, Coleman, NMENV; Holmes, Steve, NMENV; Kieling, John, NMENV
Subject: Louvers

I just had a brief conversation with Rick Chavez. He clarified that the louvers were not "designed to lead" but they were given a design basis that specified "they can't leak any more than 1000 acfm at 210,000 acfm" (on design spec sheet). This means the designed efficiency is 99.5%. (210,000-1000/210,000).

He also mentioned that there are two in series. So I asked wouldn't it then make sense to apply that control efficiency to the second louver to get the total/final released value. He wasn't sure so I just did the calculation myself. (1-.995)*1000 = 5 acfm. This is how much uncontrolled contaminated air is getting released assuming they are operating at the designed specifications. I am a bit baffled that this was ever considered to be acceptable. It could be that the second louver would have an even better efficiency as the forces (flow rates) are much weaker. Apparently, this system was designed by the Army Corp of Engineers in 1985. My group and I continue to "pull the string" and will research those documents (if/when we can get copies of them) as well as the DSA and EIS's.

Trais Kliphuis
WIPP Staff Manager
Hazardous Waste Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
2905 Rodeo Park Drive E, Building 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Office: 505-476-6051
Front Desk: 505-476-6000