

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY
(ADEQ's response to source comments)
ABITIBI CONSOLIDATED SALES CORPORATION
DRAFT TITLE V PERMIT #M170424P1-99

Comment #1: Page 1 of 50, Maximum Capacity Table

The #3 Power Boiler Fuel Oil #2 maximum MMBtu is listed as 332. The maximum hourly rate is listed as 337 MMBtu in the technical review document. The maximum hourly rate in the permit should be listed as 337 MMBtu per hour.

ADEQ's response

The maximum hourly rate has been modified to 337 MMBtu/hr.

ATTACHMENT A: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Comment #2: Page 4 of 50, II. A.

This paragraph states that any permit noncompliance “constitutes a violation of the Arizona Revised Statutes . . .” The regulation cited in support of this provision does not provide a basis for the quoted language. Inclusion of the language in the permit for the Snowflake Mill preclude Abitibi from taking a contrary position in an enforcement action. Should an enforcement proceeding arise, it is ADEQ's burden to prove that the permit noncompliance is also a violation of the Arizona Revised Statutes. Moreover, in a number of other Class I permits ADEQ deleted this language when requested to do so by the permittee. For ADEQ to refuse to do so in this case would create a discrimination issue. The sentence should be revised to be consistent with the regulation to state: “Any permit noncompliance is grounds for enforcement action; . . .”

ADEQ's response

ADEQ will be amending this permit language to track rule language.

Comment #3: Page 6 of 50, VIII.

The regulation cited for this provision, A.A.C. R18-2-304.H, deals with permit applications. A more suitable regulation would be A.A.C. R18-2-309(3), which deals with contents of permits.

ADEQ's response

As pointed out in Abitibi's comment, A.A.C.R18-2-304 deals with permit application processing procedure. However, A.A.C.R18-2-304.H requires certificate of truth and accuracy for all documents relating to the permit. Therefore, ADEQ maintains the current permit language.

Comment 4: Page 15 of 50, XVIII. B. Operational Conditions During Testing

This condition requires that performance tests be conducted during operation “at the maximum possible capacity of each unit under representative operational conditions unless other conditions are required . . .” This language is inconsistent with A.A.C. R18-2-312, which requires that such tests be conducted under “representative” conditions. The condition should be revised to require performance tests to be conducted under representative operational conditions.

ADEQ's response

It is ADEQ's consistent practice to require testing at maximum possible load to ensure that the facility can demonstrate compliance with applicable emission limitation at its worst case operating scenario. Therefore, condition XVIII.B has been retained with no change.

Comment 5: Page 16 of 50, XVIII. E. 2. Eliminate the requirement for a test platform on Power Boiler #1.

It is estimated a sampling test platform for Power Boiler #1 would cost in excess of \$50,000. This is a very large amount of money to spend on a platform that would only be used once per permit term. Power Boiler #1 is limited to firing natural gas or Fuel Oil #2. Worst case particulate emissions estimates based on EPA AP-42 emission factors would be less than ten percent of the limit; estimated particulate emissions of 11.13 pounds per hour with a calculated State limit of 115.58 pounds per hour. This is an existing source with no NSPS particulate limit. Our ADEQ compliance engineer agrees this is not an environmentally productive way to spend this amount of money considering the minimal emissions compared to the limit.

ADEQ's response

It is ADEQ's understanding that only two of the six burners associated with the Power Boiler #1 are capable of combusting fuel oil #2 and fuel oil #2 is typically combusted during periods of natural gas curtailment. As a result, the department believes that the possibility of fuel oil providing more than 50% of heat input to the boiler is unlikely. In the case of increased fuel oil usage, ADEQ continues to believe that a performance test will be necessary to measure particulate matter emissions from Power Boiler #1. Therefore, no changes are made to the permit language in regard to this condition.

ATTACHMENT "B": SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

Comment 6: Page 19 of 50, I.C.1. Monitoring and Recordkeeping

This permit condition cites the current operating permit (Permit #0388-95) and A.A.C. R18-2-306.A.3.c as the regulatory authority for the permit condition. Conditions in operating permits do not represent applicable requirements that are to be included in a Title V permit unless they constitute applicable requirements under A.A.C. R18-2-101.14. In a number of other Class I permits ADEQ deleted the use of operating permit conditions as regulatory authority when requested to do so by the permittee. For ADEQ to refuse to do so in this case would create a discrimination issue. Accordingly, the citation should be deleted.

A.A.C. R18.2.306.A.3.c authorizes the permitting authority to include periodic monitoring if the applicable requirement does not require monitoring. Before this regulation is cited as authority for this permit condition, ADEQ should identify the underlying applicable requirement which necessitates the maintenance of records of the total amount of paper produced.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit. However, since annual emission for emission inventory purposes will be derived from the amount of paper produced annually, ADEQ continues to believe that it is necessary for Abitibi to maintain a record of the amount of paper produced.

Comment 7: Page 19 of 50, I. E. Monitoring and Recordkeeping

For the reasons discussed in Comment 6 above, reference to the current operating permit as the authority for a permit condition is inappropriate.

ADEQ's response

Reference to Operating permit has been removed from the permit shield.

Comment 8) Page 20 of 50, II.B.2.a(1)-(7) Bi-Weekly Monitoring

Subparagraph (1) should be deleted for the reasons that a performance test for opacity is already required at Condition II.B.3.a and, for purposes of periodic monitoring, the only opacity level that should apply is the existing standard of 40%. Accordingly, the term baseline opacity level or baseline level appearing in subparagraphs (3), (4) and (6) should be deleted and the term opacity standard should be inserted in their place. Subparagraphs (5) and (7) should be deleted.

ADEQ's response

ADEQ believes that the bi-weekly visual survey approach identified in the preceding paragraphs reasonably assure compliance with the opacity and particulate matter standards. The permit requires a representative stack test every year plus periodically monitoring stack opacity to fulfill the periodic monitoring requirements for particulate matter emissions. Although no data is available to directly correlate opacity to particulate matter emissions, doing so would at least indicate potential problems with the air pollution control device. If corrective actions are taken to rectify the problems associated with the pollution control device, then compliance can be inferred on the basis that the source operates its pollution control equipment in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices. Opacity above the baseline level but less than 40% does not hold the source in violation of the particulate matter standard, but merely requires the source to identify and alleviate the problem by taking corrective actions to reduce the opacity to less than the baseline level. However, not taking corrective actions could potentially hold the source in violation of the permit terms.

Comment 9) Page 21 of 50, II. B.2. a. 4.

If the six-minute opacity of the plume is **equal to or less than** the baseline opacity level, the observer shall make a record of the following:

The source is in compliance with the regulatory limit if the opacity is equal to or less than the baseline level. If in compliance there should be no further action required other than the recording of the observation.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified to reflect the requested change.

Comment 10) Page 22 of 50, II. B. 3. b. Eliminate the requirement for a particulate performance test on Power Boiler #1.

It is estimated a sampling test platform for Power Boiler #1 would cost in excess of \$50,000. This is a very large amount of money to spend on a platform that would only be used once per permit term. Power Boiler #1 is limited to firing natural gas or Fuel Oil #2. Particulate estimates based on EPA AP-42 emission factors would be less than ten percent of the limit; estimated particulate emissions of 11.13 pounds per hour with a calculated State limit of 115.58 pounds per hour. This is an existing source with no NSPS particulate limit. Our ADEQ compliance engineer agrees this is not an environmentally productive way to spend this amount of money.

ADEQ's response

Refer to comment #5.

Comment 11: Page 23 of 50, III. A. 3., On-Specification Used Oil

On-Specification used oil is oil that does not exceed the limits in 40CFR60.279 Table 1. As written the permit states the amounts must be below the limit. To be consistent with the regulations, it should be stated that the amounts must be **equal to or less than** the Table 1 limits.

ADEQ's response

The term "equal" was added to the permit language.

Comment 12: Page 24 of 50, III.B.2.

See Comment 6 above regarding the use of an operating permit condition as an applicable requirement.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit.

Comment 13: Page 25 of 50, III.B.5.

See Comment 6 above regarding the use of an operating permit condition as an applicable requirement.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit shield.

Comment 14: Page 25 of 50, III. C.1.b., Power Boiler #2 Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limits

The Arizona (A.A.C. R18-2-903.1.) sulfur dioxide limit for the Power Boiler #2 while firing coal is 0.8 pounds per million Btu.

ADEQ's response

Emission limit was modified to reflect requirements of A.A.C.R18-2-903.1.

Comment 15) Page 26 of 50, III.C.2.

See Comment 6 above regarding the use of an operating permit condition as an applicable requirement.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit.

Comment 16) Page 27 of 50, III.C.5.

See Comment 6 above regarding the use of an operating permit condition as an applicable requirement.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit.

Comment 17) Page 28 of 50, IV.A.1,2.

The references to Attachment "A" of Minor Permit Revision #1001688 should be changed to Attachment "B"

ADEQ's response

Reference has been changed to Attachment "B".

Comment 18) Page 29 of 50, IV. B. 2. b. (2), Power Boiler #3 Excess Emissions Report

This requirement does not accurately reflect the requirements of 40 CFR 60.7.(d). See below. The summary report can only be used when both conditions for excess emissions and monitor down time are satisfied.

40 CFR 60.7(d)

The summary report form shall contain the information and be in the format shown in figure 1 unless otherwise specified by the Administrator. One summary report form shall be submitted for each pollutant monitored at each affected facility.

1) If the total duration of excess emissions for the reporting period is less than 1 percent of the total operating time for the reporting period and CMS downtime for the reporting period is less than 5 percent of the total operating time for the reporting period, only the summary report form shall be submitted and the excess emission report described in 60.7(c) need not be submitted unless requested by the Administrator.

2) If the total duration of excess emissions for the reporting period is 1 percent or greater of the total operating time for the reporting period or the total CMS downtime for the reporting period is 5 percent or greater of the total operating time for the reporting period, the summary report form and the excess emission report described in 60.7(c) shall both be submitted.”

ADEQ’s response

Condition IV.B.2.b has been removed from the permit. This requirement is covered by Condition V.C.4 of the permit.

Comment 19: Page 30 of 50, IV.C.3.a(2)

The first regulatory citation given for this provision should be revised to 40 C.F.R. 60.44b(i).

ADEQ’s response

Citation has been modified.

Comment 20) Page 31 of 50, IV.C.3.a(5)-(13) Section Numbering

The numbering for the subparagraphs should be changed to (6)-(14), respectively.

ADEQ’s response

Numbering has been modified.

Comment 21) Page 33 of 50, V. A. 2.

The high level calibration check is performed at 25 to 35 percent of monitor full scale. This ensures a more accurate calibration of the monitor in the range where the source normally operates and at the permit limit. We request the permit language be modified to permit this procedure.

ADEQ’s response

Comment 22: Page 33 of 50, V. A. 6.

A performance evaluation of the COMS is not required during **any** performance test, it is required during **any performance test required by 40 CFR 60.8**. See 40 CFR 60.13.c. also V. B. 6. Page 34 of 50.

ADEQ’s response

Permit language was modified to reflect the fact that a performance evaluation of COMs is required during any performance test required by 40 CFR 60.8.

Comment 23: Page 34 of 50, V. B. 9.

Typo on the last line, third word from the end of the sentence, date should be data.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified.

Comment 24: Page 34 of 50, V. C. 1., Monitor Downtime Report

This requirement does not accurately reflect the requirements of 40 CFR 60.7.(d). See below. The summary report can only be used when both conditions for excess emissions and monitor down time are satisfied. (Same as Comment 18, Page 29 of 50, IV.B.2.b.(2))

40 CFR 60.7(d). The summary report form shall contain the information and be in the format shown in figure 1 unless otherwise specified by the Administrator. One summary report form shall be submitted for each pollutant monitored at each affected facility.

1)If the total duration of excess emissions for the reporting period is less than 1 percent of the total operating time for the reporting period and CMS downtime for the reporting period is less than 5 percent of the total operating time for the reporting period, only the summary report form shall be submitted and the excess emission report described in 60.7(c) need not be submitted unless requested by the Administrator.

2)If the total duration of excess emissions for the reporting period is 1 percent or greater of the total operating time for the reporting period or the total CMS downtime for the reporting period is 5 percent or greater of the total operating time for the reporting period, the summary report form and the excess emission report described in 60.7(c) shall both be submitted.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified to track NSPS language from 40 CFR 60.7.b

Comment 25) Page 35 of 50, V. C. 4.

Only opacity excess emissions should be reduced to six-minute averages. SO₂ (3 hour rolling average) and NO_x (30 day rolling average) should be reported in their respective averaging periods.

ADEQ's response

Permit condition has been modified to track NSPS language.

Comment 26: Page 35 of 50, V. C. 5.

Condition 5. states all excess emission reports must comply with 40 CFR 60.7.d. with a citation of 40 CFR 60.7.c. 40 CFR 60.7.c. has the requirements for the excess and monitoring system performance report and 40 CFR 60.7.d. has the requirements for the excess emissions and monitoring system performance summary report.

ADEQ's response

Permit condition has been modified to track NSPS requirements of 40 CFR 60.c and 40 CFR60.d.

Comment 27) Page 36 of 50, VI.A.2.

A.A.C. R18-2-331.A.3.e does not constitute regulatory authority for the requirement given in this condition. The language used in this condition is similar to that contained in 40 C.F.R. 60.11(d). The coal handling facility is not subject to NSPS.

ADEQ's response

Upon request by Abitibi representatives, the referenced language was incorporated in the draft permit to provide better clarification of the phrase "to minimize emissions". If Abitibi believes that this does not conform to the referenced rule, the Department will revert to the earlier language which reads: "Permittee shall operate and maintain water sprays to minimize emissions from the coal handling facility"

Comment 28) Page 37 of 50, VI. A.3. d. (1).

Adjust or repair the controls or equipment to reduce opacity to **the opacity standard**; There is no regulatory requirement to reduce the opacity to less than the standard.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified to reflect the noted opacity limit.

Comment 29) Page 37 of 50, VI. A. 3. e.

If the six-minute opacity of the plume is **equal to or less than** the applicable opacity standard, the observer shall make a record of the following:

The source is in compliance if the opacity is equal to or less than the standard. If in compliance there should be no further action required other than the recording of the observation.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified to reflect the noted opacity limit.

Comment 30) Page 38 of 50, VII.A.2.a.

A.A.C. R18-2-331.A.3.e does not constitute regulatory authority for the requirement given in this condition. The language used in this condition is similar to that contained in 40 C.F.R. 60.11(d). The coal handling facility is not subject to NSPS.

ADEQ's response

Upon request by Abitibi representatives, the referenced language was incorporated in the draft permit to provide better clarification of the phrase "to minimize emissions". If Abitibi believes that this does not conform to the referenced rule, the Department will revert to the earlier language which reads:

"Permittee shall operate and maintain a baghouse to minimize emissions from the soda ash silo"

Comment 30) Page 38 of 50, VII.A.2.b.

See Comment 6 above regarding the use of an operating permit condition as an applicable requirement.

ADEQ's response

Reference to operating permit has been removed from the permit.

Comment 31) Page 39 of 50, VII. A. 3. a. (4)

If the six-minute opacity of the plume is **equal to or less than** the applicable opacity standard, the observer shall make a record of the following:

The source is in compliance if the opacity is equal to or less than the standard. If in compliance there should be no further action required other than the recording of the observation.]

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been revised to reflect the above change.

Comment 32) Page 42 of 50, VIII. B. 1.

Maintaining records of the dates on which any of the activities listed in VIII. A. 1. b. were performed would be overly burdensome and time consuming with no environmental benefit. Many of these activities are done on a daily or almost daily basis. The bi-weekly visual surveys will provide documentation of opacity

compliance. The General Manager also certifies every six months as to the compliance status of all permit requirements.

ADEQ's response

The Department understands the Article 6 provisions from the A.A.C to contain two different applicable requirements. Firstly, non point sources are limited by a 40% opacity limit. Compliance with this standard is monitored by performing the bi-weekly visible emissions survey. Secondly, the facility is required to employ reasonable precautions when any non point source activity happens. To comply with this requirement, the permit requires the facility to keep records of the reasonable precautions employed. This requirement has also been applied in numerous other Title V permits in the past. Permit language is being retained.

Comment 33) Page 42 of 50, VIII. B. 2. e. (1)

Adjust or repair the controls or equipment to reduce opacity to **the opacity standard**; There is no regulatory requirement to reduce the opacity to less than the standard.

ADEQ's response

Permit language has been modified.

ATTACHMENT "C": SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

Comment 34) Page 47 of 50, Attachment "C" , Item 2, Equipment Column

What does the (PM) immediately under Power Boiler #2 mean?

ADEQ's response

PM notation has been removed.

Comment 35) Page 47 of 50, Attachment C, Item 4, Size/Capacity Column

The capacity of the coal handling facility is 300 tons per hour.

ADEQ's response

Capacity of coal handling system has been adjusted to 300 tons per hour.

Comment 36) Page 48 of 50, Attachment "C", Item 6, Equipment Column

The list of equipment for the Paper Machine #2 is duplicated.

ADEQ's response

Duplicate has been removed.

Comment 37) Page 49 of 50, Attachment "C", Item 8, Equipment Column

De-inking System #2 equipment list has screens, cleaners, clarifier, storage tanks for fiber solution and process water listed twice in the description.

ADEQ's response

Duplicates have been removed.

Comment 38) Page 49 of 50, Attachment "C", Item 9, Equipment Column

This equipment is covered in the #2 De-Inking System. The presses extract the water from the water and paper fiber solution before being sent to the next process stage. They should be included in the insignificant list in the technical review document.

ADEQ's response

Item #9 have been removed from the equipment list.

Comment 39) Page 50 of 50, #14 in Equipment List, PDM Rejects Flow Measuring Tank

This was number 160 in our insignificant list. The tank is not in service and number 160 was removed from the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #14 have been removed from the equipment list.

Comment 40) Page 50 of 50, #15 in Equipment List, Secondary Uniflow Cleaners Feed Tank

This is item number 123 A on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #15 have been removed from the list.

Comment 41) Page 50 of 50, #16 in Equipment List

This is item number 123 B on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #16 have been removed from the list.

Comment 42) Page 50 of 50, #17 in Equipment List

This is item number 123 D on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #17 have been removed from the equipment list.

Comment 43) Page 50 of 50, #18 in Equipment List

This is item number 123 E on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #18 have been removed from the equipment list.

Comment 44) Page 50 of 50, #19 in Equipment List

This is item number 160 A on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #19 have been removed from the equipment list.

Comment 45) Page 50 of 50, #20 in Equipment List

This is item number 172 on the insignificant list in the technical review document. This item should be removed from the permit equipment list.

ADEQ's response

Item #20 have been removed from the equipment list.