

[REDACTED] /jph/fi/p  
05.03.2006 22:11  
To [REDACTED] jpap/sg poyry@ poyry  
cc [REDACTED] jppa/au poyry@ poyry, [REDACTED] jph/fi poyry@ poyry,  
[REDACTED] jph/fi poyry@ poyry  
Sub NOx issues  
ject

Greetings

I have worked with the NOx paper. There is still work to be done, but I'm sending what I have now so [REDACTED] discuss it with Gunns.

[attachment "16B0104-E0035\_15\_E0014\_No x issues\_rev\_ESV.doc" deleted by [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] /jph/fi/poyry]

I still don't know how to convey the message that this issue is real and not something cooked up. We know from Metsä-Botnia that they have been reporting erroneously and all their mills are now above 1.5 (i.e. Rauma, Joutseno, Kaskinen and Äänekoski). We know that in Wisaforest Andritz couldn't keep their NOx guarantee and Wisaförst is above 1.5 kg NO<sub>2</sub>/ADt. All this will become public when last years data is publicized (June?).

I'm employed with Mikko Hupa to write a rebuttal to Finnish environmental authorities that 1.5 is not attainable by AMT. But that is not public yet. I 'know' that many of the 'low' mills measure NOx only twice a year. I 'know' that Mönsterås is running 2000 ppm of CO to keep NOx low. I 'know' that Skoghall is much higher in NOx now with new boilers (and continuous measurement).

How can we convey our non public knowledge to the environmental authorities?

The second thing is I seem to read that DPWIE needs more detailed knowledge. Should we do appendix of the kind attached?

[attachment "NOxvsCO.tif" [REDACTED] /jph/fi/poyry] [attachment "Nemissions.pdf" deleted by [REDACTED] /jph/fi/poyry]

Could you look at what has been done and return with directions?

[REDACTED]  
Jaakko Pöyry OY  
Jaakonkatu 3, P.O.Box 4  
FIN-01621 Vantaa, Finland  
Mobile +358-40-837 [REDACTED]  
Office +358-9-8947 [REDACTED]