

John Zink Company Comments

To

2010 TECQ Flare Study Project (Draft Report)

1. Page 18, 1st paragraph, 5th line; Steam tests S4 and S6 are referenced, the reference should be air tests A4 and A6.
2. Page 48, 2nd paragraph, 4th line; This line infers that the maximum capability of the JZ test facility was reached during these tests, which is not the case. The JZ test facility can provide much greater steam and air flows than supplied during the TCEQ tests. The tests were conducted on a low flow test set up. We would rather have the sentence read: "In practice, the snuff point was never attained during this study before the maximum design rates for this project were reached."
3. Page 101, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence; Should this sentence read: "The vent gas composition nominally set by separately controlling the flow of propylene, TNG, and nitrogen."?
4. Page 120, 2nd paragraph; This paragraph begins by stating there are three parameters that indicate the quality of the data. In the following sentence, it states that there are four parameters. In the subsequent sub-sections, there are five major parameters discussed. The discrepancy in the quantity of parameters should be resolved.
5. Page 121, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence; Similar issue raised in comment 2. Suggest the sentence read: "In practice, it was learned that the flame could never be extinguished, i.e., snuff the flame, with the maximum flow of steam or air assist designed for this project."
6. Page I-25 of appendices; The graph on this page needs to have the axis labels made legible.
7. Additional detail of particulate size, composition, and quantity would be interesting as well as information on concentrations of minor products of combustion such as formaldehyde, acetylene, etc.