Air Quality Permitting
Response to Public Comments
Received During the Second Public Comment Period

November 17, 2009

Tier I Operating Permit No. T1-2007.0106

Clearwater Paper Corporation – Pulp Mill
Lewiston, Idaho

Facility ID No. 069-00001

Prepared by:
Dan Pitman, P.E., Permit Writer
AIR QUALITY DIVISION

Final

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

1. BACKGROUND 3

2. PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSES 4

APPENDIX A COMMENTS RECEIVED 16

APPENDIX B LETTER REGARDING EXCESS EMISISONS REPORTING 28

1. BACKGROUND

In accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.364.0, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided for public comment between January 26, 2009 and February 25, 2009 on the proposed renewal to the Tier I Operating Permit (T1-2007.0106) for Clearwater Paper Pulp Mill Division located in Lewiston, Idaho. On July 16, 2009 DEQ responded to comments received during that comment permit. A second draft permit was also prepared based on those comments.

A second public comment was held on the updated draft permit from July 28, 2009 through August 27, 2009. On August 25, 2009 DEQ received a request to extend this comment period for 30 days. The request was granted and the comment period was extended to September 28, 2009.

Comments were provided via email. Each comment and DEQ's response is provided in the following section. All comments submitted in response to DEQ's proposed action are included within Appendix A of this document.

Clearwater Paper Corporation consists of three Divisions: the Pulp Mill, Consumer Products, and Wood Products. The Pulp Mill Division and the Consumers Products Division are considered one facility for Tier I permitting purposes. The Wood Products Division is issued its own Tier I permit. Since the Pulp Mill Division and Consumer Products Division are considered one facility for Tier I permitting purposes the facility is issued one permit, though the permit is issued in two parts (one part for the Pulp Mill and one for Consumer Products). This response to comments is for the Pulp Mill Division only. There were no comments provided on the Consumer Products section of the permit during the second comment period. This document only addresses the comments received during the second comment period.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSES

Public comments regarding the permit analysis and air quality aspects of the proposed permit are summarized below. Following each comment is DEQ response to the comment.

Comment 1:

> **General Comment. Inconsistently, throughout the permit regulatory citations are provided and followed by a date (see for example Condition 3.1 showing [40 CFR 60.42(a)(1), 6/14/74]). The meaning of these dates is unclear and confusing. What is intended by the regulatory date references? Why do some citations (see for example Section 13 of the permit omit these dates for regulatory citations? Clearwater recommends that the Department use dates to define permit when these documents are the source of requirements, but not use dates for regulations and rules.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 1:

The permit has been changed as requested. The regulatory citations now only include a date when referencing an underlying permit.

Result: The dates have been removed from all state rule or federal regulation citations.

Comment 2:

> **Permit Condition 1.9**
>
> **Clearwater will continue to work with the Department to reach agreement on excess emissions reporting requirements. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)**

Response 2:

The purpose of the Tier I permit is to consolidate all existing applicable requirements into one document and to add monitoring where necessary to assure compliance with those requirements. That task has been accomplished and Tier I Permit Condition 1.9 includes the excess emissions requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01.130-136 because it is an applicable requirement.

Excess emission reporting requirement of the Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho (Rules), New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) each have their own independent definition of what constitutes excess emissions and each has their own independent reporting requirements. Since the excess emissions reporting requirements of the Rules, NSPS, and NESHAP have their own discrete requirements all of them must be followed. Refer to the November 14, 2008 letter from DEQ to Clearwater regarding excess emissions reporting requirements (See Appendix B of this document). This letter includes a summary of the reporting requirements for non-condensable gases. This letter also describes that Clearwater must follow all excess emissions reporting requirements included in the Rules, NSPS, and NESHAP.

Result: No changes to Permit or Statement of Basis.

Comment 3:

> **Condition 1.9.5 - first bullet**
>
> **Clearwater requests that the Department accepts the use of an electronic file directory to meet the requirement of "log book" in this condition. It is requested that the statement of basis reflect this**

definition. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 3:

Clearwater's request has been granted.

Result: Permit Condition 1.9.5 and the statement of basis have been updated to make clear that electronic files are acceptable means of keeping records. The phrase "or electronic file" has been added after "log book".

Comment 4:

Condition 1.10

Please insert "Except for the optional approval of a longer time period for test report submittal provided above," should there be a conflict between this permit condition and IDAPA 58.01.01.157, IDAPA 58.01.01.157 shall govern.

(Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 4:

DEQ has made the requested change. The reporting requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01.157 apply unless specified otherwise in a permit or other legal document. The intent of Permit Condition 1.10 is, in part, to specify within the Tier I permit the option for DEQ to grant an extension to the 30 day reporting period. The suggested language change serves to reinforce that intent.

Result: The phrase "Except for the optional approval of a longer time period for test report submittal provided above," was added to the last sentence of permit condition 1.10 as requested. The Statement of Basis was also updated to make clear that it is DEQ's intent for Permit Condition 1.10 to specify that DEQ may grant a longer time period.

Comment 5:

Table 1.1 Condition

1.13. Please specify that this limit is for PM. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 5:

DEQ has added "PM" to Table 1.1 where limits are summarized for Permit Condition 1.13.

Result: Table 1.1 of the permit has been updated to include PM in the summary of emissions limits for Permit Condition 1.13.

Comment 6:

Condition 1.19

Please delete the last sentence in this condition. This information is not required in the permit. Also the cited link may change during the life of the permit. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 6:

DEQ has deleted the last sentence as requested.

Result: The following sentence has been deleted from Permit Condition 1.19 - "The CFRs are available on-line at: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html."

Comment 7:

Table 2.2, condition 2.2.

Please add condition 2.10 as a monitoring requirement for this condition. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 7:

DEQ has updated the Tier I permit to include condition 2.10 as a monitoring requirement for Permit Condition 2.2.

Result: Table 2.2 has been updated as requested.

Comment 8:

Condition 2.5.

Please correct the cite condition in the third bullet to 52.21(b)(33)(iii). The (iii) portion of the citation was omitted. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 8:

DEQ has added the (iii) portion of the citation which had been omitted.

Result: Permit Condition 2.5 has been updated as requested.

Comment 9:

Section 3.

Please refer to the covered emissions unit as No. 4 Power Boiler, not Power Boiler No.4. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 9:

Result: The Tier I permit has been updated to refer to the number four power boiler as "No. 4 Power Boiler" instead of "Power Boiler No. 4".

Comment 10:

Table 3.2 Condition 3.6.

Please correct the Applicable requirement for this condition to 40 CFR 60.44(a)(1) & (2). The (2) was omitted. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 10:

Result: Summary Table 3.2 has been updated as requested.

Comment 11:

Condition 3.3.

Please add PTC dated 9/20/78 as a citation source for this limitation. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 11:

Result: Permit Condition 3.3 has been updated tot include a citation to the PTC issued 9/20/78 as requested.

Comment 12:

Condition 3.11

The NOx monitor is not required by NSPS. Therefore, reference to the NSPS as an applicable requirement is incorrect. The NOx monitor is only required by the PSD permit issued by EPA in 1980. This source is not subject to monitoring for 0_2 or $C0_2$ under NSPS, the therefore the reference to the NSPS is incorrect.

IDEQ's response to comments (response 17) indicates that "Clearwater has not demonstrated that a NOx CEM is not required..." Attached is another copy of the test results submitted on September 11, 1981, along with the cover letter to Mr. Lynn McKee, EPA Idaho Operations Office. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 12:

Clearwater has not demonstrated that a NOx CEM is not required per 40 CFR 60.45(a) and (b). According to the CFR a NOx CEM and associated oxygen or carbon monoxide monitoring is not required if it can be demonstrated that the initial performance test was less than 70% of the applicable standards of 40 CFR 60.44.

The test results submitted on September 11, 1981, that are referenced by Clearwater to be the initial test results, are for a test that was conducted on July 29, 1981. In accordance with NSPS Subpart D, an initial source test is required not later than 180 days after initial startup unless a waiver is been granted by EPA.

Clearwater has not provided the date of initial startup to DEQ. However, DEQ did find a February 27, 1981 letter from Potlatch to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare which included a statement that the boiler "first came on wood fuel on September 30, 1980"[1]. From this information it can be concluded that the boiler initial startup date was on or before September 30, 1980.

NSPS Subpart D requires initial source testing no later than 180 days after startup. If the date that the boiler initially fired on wood fuel (September 30, 1980) is used as the date of initial startup, then in accordance with NSPS the initial test would have to be conducted not later with 180 days of September 30, 1980. The July 29, 1981 test data provided by Clearwater is well in excess of 180 days of initial startup. Clearwater has not provided, nor could DEQ find in the source files, documentation of an EPA approved extension to the NSPS testing schedule. Therefore, the July 19, 1981 test data provided by Clearwater does not meet the criteria to qualify as the initial source test for NSPS purposes and can not be used to justify that emission were less than 70% of the standard during the initial test.

The content of Potlatch's February 27, 1981 letter (referenced above) includes a summary of NOx test conducted on a February 5, 1981. It is noted that this test predates the July 29, 1981 test that has been asserted by Clearwater to be the initial test. Additionally, this test was conducted within 180 days of the boiler firing on wood fuel and therefore *may* qualify[2] as the initial source test for NSPS purposes. However, this letter states that NOx test results were greater than 70% of the standard. The letter states that, "The level of nitrogen oxides is the only parameter that is presently right at or over the permit condition. Proper air distribution for NOx

[1] February 27, 1981 letter from Jack Anderson, Potlatch Corporation to William Damworth, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.
[2] In order to qualify as the initial source test for NSPS purposes the test would have to be conducted within 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate at which the affected facility will be operated, but not later than 180 days after initial startup. Clearwater has provided neither the date of startup nor the date of achieving maximum production.

control is not possible At (sic) this time". It should be noted that none of the emissions data presented with this letter are documented sufficiently to determine if the tests were conducted using the appropriate test methods, procedures, and fuel types to qualify as a valid NSPS test.

In summary, Clearwater has not provided initial source test data proving that NOx emissions were less than 70% of the standards. In absence of this demonstration a CEM is required in accordance with 40 CFR 60.45(a) and (b).

Result: No changes to the permit have been made. The statement of basis has been updated to include this response as part of the regulatory analysis for NSPS Subpart D.

Comment 13:

> **Condition 3.12**
>
> **The S02 monitored installed on this source currently provides data in concentration only. It is requested that this monitoring requirement become effective within 6 months of permit issuance to allow time for programming and troubleshooting.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 13: The draft permit has been changed to require operation of the system within 180 days of permit issuance. This is consistent with CEM monitoring requirements associated with NSPS affected facilities that require operation of a CEM.

Result: Permit Condition 3.12 now includes the following phrase "Within 180 days of permit issuance the permittee shall operate…". The statement of basis has also been updated to discuss the 180 day "shake-down" period.

Comment 14:

> **Condition 3.16**
>
> **The NOX monitor is not required by NSPS. Also, this condition is redundant with condition 1.11 and 1.19 and should be deleted.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 14:

Regarding the applicability of the NOx CEM per the NSPS see the response to Comment 12. DEQ agrees that phrase "except that the records shall be retained for at least five years from the date of the record" included the draft permit is redundant with Permit Condition 1.11.

Result: The phrase "except that the records shall be retained for at least five years from the date of the record" has been deleted from Permit Condition 3.16.

Comment 15:

> **Condition 5.1. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63.862(a)(l)(i)(A).**
>
> **Condition 5.2. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63. 862(a)(l)(i)(B).**
>
> **Condition 5.3. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63. 862(a)(l)(i)(C).**
>
> **Condition 5.12. Please correct the citation in the first sentence to 40 CFR 63.866(a).** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 15:

Result: The permit has been updated to include the requested citations.

Comment 16:

Condition 5.16.
Please delete the last 2 sentences in this condition. This information is not required in the permit. Also the cited link may change during the life of the permit. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 16:

The last two sentences of this draft permit condition have been deleted as requested. They are not required to be included in the permit.

Result: The following two sentences have been deleted from the permit – "The permittee is encouraged to review Table 1 in 40 CFR Subpart MM and Subpart A. The CFRs are available on-line at: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html."

Comment 17:

Condition 6.2.

Please add (as H2S) after the 15 ppm to avoid future confusion regarding the IDAPA requirements and to be consistent with federal requirements. This State Only enforceable condition is based on the following;

819. RECOVERY FURNACE TRS STANDARDS. The emission of TRS from all recovery furnace stacks shall be further reduced so as not to exceed one-half (1/2) pound of sulfur per equivalent ton of air-dried kraft pulp, or from each recovery furnace stack seventeen and one-half (17 1/2) ppm, expressed as hydrogen sulfide on a dry gas basis, whichever is the more restrictive, or such other limit of TRS that proves to be reasonably attainable utilizing the latest in design of recovery furnace equipment, controls, and procedures. Compliance shall be achieved by not later than July, 1975. (5-1-94)

It is requested that the Department, using their authority contained in this regulation, allow for a TRS limit of 15 ppm only, as being reasonably attainable. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 17:

Hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) has been added to the permit condition as requested.

Clearwater has not provided any information that would justify removing the ½ pound of sulfur per equivalent ton of air dried pulp emission standard. It is not known if the 17.5 ppm standard or the ½ pound of sulfur per equivalent ton of air dried pulp is more restrictive. Additionally, no information has been provided regarding the level of emissions attainable utilizing the latest design of recovery furnaces, controls, and procedures. Therefore the ½ pound of sulfur per equivalent ton of air dried pulp remains in the permit.

Result: Permit Condition 6.2 has been updated to include "(as H2S on dry basis)" immediately after 15 ppm.

Comment 18:

Condition 7.3

Please describe this IDAPA provision as "State Only" enforceable. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 18:

Permit Condition 7.3 originates from IDAPA 58.01.01.821, which is a PM emission standard of 4 pounds per ton of air dried pulp for recovery furnaces. IDAPA 58.01.01.821 is included in Idaho's federally approved State Implementation Plan (see 68 FR 2217, 1/16/03) and is both state and federally enforceable.

Result: No change has been made to the permit.

Comment 19:

Condition 7.8.

This condition is obsolete and it's removal from the Tier 1 permit is supported by the EPA Part 70 white paper 1 Section I1.B.7. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 19:

Permit Condition 7.8 is a quote from a PSD permit to Clearwater **[PSD permit X-84-01, 12/3/84]:**

> **Permit Condition 7.8 -** "With exception of NO_x, CO, and SO_2 increases in potential emission of any pollutant regulated under the Clean Air Act resulting from construction of the No. 5 Recovery Boiler will be less than the significant levels [Section 52.21(b)(23)(i)]".

This is a PSD permit condition issued by EPA. Enforcement of the condition is subject to the November 14, 1986 Memorandum of Understanding regarding the PSD Program Delegation between the Department and EPA. This agreement includes that "EPA will retain primary enforcement authority over EPA-issued PSD permits until State operating permits, containing limits at least as stringent as those in the PSD permits, become part of the Idaho SIP." Under the terms of this agreement it would be inappropriate for DEQ to act on Clearwater's request.

Result: No change has been made to the permit.

Condition 7.10

Please add (as H2S) after the 15 ppm to avoid future confusion regarding the IDAPA requirements and to be consistent with federal requirements. In addition, it is requested that the Department, using their authority contained in this regulation, allows for a TRS limit of 15ppm only, as being reasonably attainable. See comment for condition 6.2. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 20:

Hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) has been added to the permit condition as requested.

Regarding the request for DEQ to determine that the 15 ppm TRS limit is the only reasonably attainable limit see the Departments response to Comment 17.

Result: Condition 7.10 has been updated to include "(as H2S on dry basis)" immediately after 15 ppm

Comment 21:

Condition 7.15

The Last sentence of this condition is redundant and should be deleted. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 21:

The last sentence specifies that "The permittee shall also comply with the excess emission reporting requirements included in Facility-Wide Permit Condition 1.9." DEQ agrees that this is redundant with Facility-Wide permit condition 1.9, therefore it has been deleted from the permit.

Result: The sentence "The permittee shall also comply with the excess emission reporting requirements included in Facility-Wide Permit Condition 1.9." has been deleted from Permit Condition 7.15.

Comment 22:

Table 8.2, condition 8.2

The table correctly lists 0.20 lb/T black liquor solids as the requirement for both part 60 and part 63. However the cited monitoring requirement 8.5 is the monitoring requirement for part 60 only. Clearwater has approval for an alternative for pressure drop for Part 63. Clearwater requests that a notation be added to the table after 8.5 that indicates "for 40 CFR 60.282(a)(2) only" (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 22:

The summary provided in Table 8.2 has been updated as requested. The monitoring requirement of Permit Condition 8.5 is solely for NSPS purposes.

Result: Table 8.2 has been updated to include "for 40 CFR 60.282(a)(2) only" immediately after the citation to the monitoring requirement of Permit Condition 8.5.

Comment 23:

Condition 8.6

This condition requires opacity monitoring during testing. This is incorrect, the CAM indicators are flow and fan load. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 23:

Opacity monitoring has been removed from Permit Condition 8.6. In part, the intent of Permit Condition 8.6 is to require monitoring of CAM indicator data during the source tests, and opacity is not a CAM indicator.

Result: The opacity monitoring requirement included in Permit Condition 8.6 has been deleted.

Comment 24:

Condition 11.5.4

The Response to comments indicates that this condition has been deleted, however it remains in the permit. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 24:

Clearwater is correct, the intent of the Department was to delete this permit condition. DEQ agrees that the particulate matter emissions standard of 1 pound per ton of equivalent air-dried kraft pulp of IDAPA 58.01.01.822 is not applicable to the No. 2 Lime Kiln when processing lime rock.

Result: Tier I Permit 11.5.4 has been deleted from the Tier I permit and has been noted in the Statement of Basis.

Comment 25:

Condition 13

The last sentence of this condition is redundant with condition 1.19 and should be deleted. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 25:

DEQ agrees that the following statement in Permit Condition 13 is redundant with Section 1.19 of the permit:

"Emissions from the incinerator are also subject the compliance assurance monitoring (CAM) requirements included in Section 19 of this permit."

Result: The statement, "Emissions from the incinerator are also subject the compliance assurance monitoring (CAM) requirements included in Section 19 of this permit" has been removed from Permit Condition 13.

Comment 26:

Table 13.2, Condition 13.2

The monitoring provisions cited are incomplete, Monitoring [sic] as permit required except where the provisions of 60.283(a)(1)(iii)or (iv) apply.

Due to confusion regarding the applicable limits and standards required by subpart BB Clearwater request that the standards and monitoring requirements be more specifically addressed as follows

Permit Conditions	Parameter	Permit Limit/ Standard Summary	Applicable Requirements Reference	Monitoring and Recordkeeping Requirements
13.2.1 (unless condition 13.2.2 is met)	TRS	TRS - 5 ppm;	40 CFR 60.283(a)(1)	13.3, 40 CFR 60.284(a)(2) (TRS CEMS)
13.2.2	TRS	Combust gases in lime kiln; or combust in an incinerator at 1200 °F for 0.5 seconds	40 CFR 60.283(a)(1)(iii)	13.3, 40 CFR 60.284(b)(1)

The Department has recently alleged that the 5 ppm TRS limit applies when normal variations in the gas collection system cause venting. It would appear that if this were the correct interpretation of NSPS Subpart BB, EPA would have required installation of TRS monitors under 60.284(a)(2) for the NSPS sources. DEQ's interpretation of the applicability of the 5 ppm standard to venting during normal operation is not be consistent with other states and creates an arbitrary burden on the Lewiston mill. Clearwater will continue to work with the Department to reach agreement on excess emissions reporting requirements for these events. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 26:

Summary Table 13.2 has been updated as requested. The monitoring requirements of Permit Condition 13.3 (40 CFR 60.284(a)(2) – TRS CEM) only apply if Clearwater has not met the requirements of 60.283(a)(1)(iii) or (iv) (i.e. combust gases in a lime kiln or in an incinerator at 1200 °F for 0.5 seconds; or for a new, modified, or reconstructed brown stock washer systems if it is demonstrated that incineration is technically or economically infeasible).

Regarding the 5 ppm TRS limit, DEQ has included the applicable requirements of 40 CFR 60.283 in Permit Condition 13.2 without change. DEQ has made clear that if there is a conflict between Permit Condition 13.2 and 40 CFR 60.283, 40 CFR 60.283 shall govern (see Permit Condition 13.1). In short, DEQ has simply included the TRS emissions standards of 40 CFR 60.283 and is not asserting that any other NSPS Subpart BB TRS standards are applicable.

Result: Table 13.2 of the permit has been updated as requested.

Comment 27:

Condition 13.2(v)

Please correct typo in last line from "dose" to "does." (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 27:

Result: Permit Condition 13.2(v) has been corrected as requested.

Comment 28:

Condition 13.9

Please correct this condition to refer to S02 rather than particulate. (2 places).

Continuous emission monitoring data from this source indicates that the S02 emissions are well below the 4.7 Ib/hr limit, at 0.01-0.02Ibs, considering this data, the 5/25/07 permit required testing every 5 years. This new condition requires testing, at least every three years. The 2007 performance test resulted in S02 emissions of 0.01 Ib/hr. Clearwater is requesting that the next test be conducted prior to September of 2012 and future testing follows the schedule in condition 6.7. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 28:

Permit Condition 13.9 has been corrected to reference SO_2 emissions standards instead of PM emission standards as requested.

Permit Condition 13.9 has also been changed as requested to require the initial test by September 2012 and to include the testing schedule that is in Permit Condition 6.7. This change in the testing schedule is warranted because: the source is subject to CAM requirements included in Section 19 of the permit; 2007 emission data shows emissions to be well below the standard; and in accordance with the existing testing schedule the next test would be required in 2012.

Result: Permit Condition 13.9 has been changed as requested. The initial test is required before September 2012 and subsequent testing will be required in accordance with the schedule that is in Permit Condition 6.7.

Comment 29:

> **Table 1.9.1 should reflect alternate parameter approval #5 Smelt Dissolving tank. The row for Lime Handling /PM should be deleted.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 29:

DEQ believes the comment is in reference to Table 19.1. Table 19.1 has been updated as requested.

Result: The row for the Lime Handling system has been deleted from Table 19.1, it was intended to be deleted after the initial comment period because CAM is not applicable to the Lime Handling system. The parameters that indicate compliance for the #5 Smelt Tank are included in Table 5.2 of the permit and reference has been added to it in Table 19.1. Additionally, continuous parameter monitoring (CPM) required by 40 CFR 63.864(e)(10) was referenced to Permit Condition 5.11 it has now been corrected to reference Permit Condition 5.8.

Comment 30:

> **The initial response to comments indicated that Clearwater only consisted of the Pulp and Paper Board Division and the Consumer Products Division. Clearwater actually consists of three divisions: the Pulp and Paperboard Division, Consumer Products Division, and the Wood Products division.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 30:

The statement of basis and the response to comments received during the second comment period have been updated as requested.

Result: The statement of basis and the responses to comments received during the second comment period have been updated.

Comment 31:

> **In DEQ's response to Comment 2 received during the initial comment period, the word "my" should be replaced with "may" in the response.**(Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 31:

DEQ's responses to comments received during the initial comment period are published in the final document: Air Quality Permitting, Response to Public Comments, During the First Public Comment Period, July 16, 2009.

Result: No changes were made to the initial response to comments that was published as a final document on July 16, 2009.

Comment 32:

> **Response to Comment 37**
>
> **Please remove the last sentence because no testing is required or necessary to establish the ratio. Data from historic production records and industry standard conversions are adequate.** (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 32:

DEQ's response to this comment provided during the initial comment period does not state that the permit condition requires that "testing" be conducted to "establish a ratio". The response simply is a recommendation that Clearwater submit a testing protocol for approval prior to conducting any testing to demonstrate compliance.

Result: No changes were made to the initial response to comments that was published as a final document on July 16, 2009.

Comment 33:

Response to Comment 47

Please delete the last sentence because it is inconsistent with the Response to Comment 48. (Clearwater Paper Corporation)

Response 33:

Comment 47 (received during the initial comment period) and DEQ response to Comment 47 is in regards to an existing underlying permit condition. The underlying permit condition did not include a requirement that applied to Clearwater; it was therefore removed from the permit.

Reponses to Comment 48 received during the initial comment period is in regards to redundant excess emissions reporting requirement. As a result of Comment 48 the redundant excess emissions reporting requirements were removed from the permit. (See DEQ's response to Comment 48 in the July 16, 2009 response to comment document).

DEQ's responses to Comment 47 and 48 are not related to each other in any way. The response to both of the comments resulted in the subject permit conditions being removed from the Tier I permit.

Result: No changes were made to the initial response to comments that was published as a final document on July 16, 2009.

Appendix A Public Comments

Submitted for

Tier I Operating Permit No. T1-2007.0106

CLEARWATER PAPER | Pulp + Paperboard Division

Clearwater Paper Corporation
Idaho Pulp & Paperboard
803 Mill Road, P.O. Box 1126
Lewiston, ID 83501-1126

September 28, 2009

Faye Weber
Air Quality Division
DEQ State Office
1410 North Hilton
Boise, Idaho 83706

Dear Ms. Weber.

This letter is in response to a request for comments on the proposed Tier I air quality permit renewal for Clearwater Paper Corp., Lewiston, Idaho, Pulp and Paper Paperboard.

Responsible Official. Frank Radle will retire effective October 1, 2009. His successor is not known at this time. The name of the responsible official will be provided to the Department at a later date.

General Comment. Inconsistently, throughout the permit regulatory citations are provided and followed by a date (see for example Condition 3.1 showing [40 CFR 60.42(a)(1), 6/14/74]). The meaning of these dates is unclear and confusing. What is intended by the regulatory date references? Why do some citations (see for example Section 13 of the permit omit these dates for regulatory citations? Clearwater recommends that the Department use dates to define permit when these documents are the source of requirements, but not use dates for regulations and rules.

Condition 1.9. Clearwater will continue to work with the Department to reach agreement on excess emissions reporting requirements.

Condition 1.9.5 - first bullet
Clearwater requests that the Department accepts the use of an electronic file directory to meet the requirement of "log book" in this condition. It is requested that the statement of basis reflect this definition.

Condition 1.10. Please insert "Except for the optional approval of a longer time period for test report submittal provided above," should there be a conflict between this permit condition and IDAPA 58.01.01.157, IDAPA 58.01.01.157 shall govern.

Table 1.1 Condition 1.13. Please specify that this limit is for PM.

Condition 1.19. Please delete the last sentence in this condition. This information is not required in the permit. Also the cited link may change during the life of the permit.

Table 2.2, condition 2.2. Please add condition 2.10 as a monitoring requirement for this condition.

Condition 2.5. Please correct the cite condition in the third bullet to 52.21(b)(33)(iii). The (iii) portion of the citation was omitted.

Section 3. Please refer to the covered emissions unit as No. 4 Power Boiler, not Power Boiler No. 4.

Table 3.2 Condition 3.6. Please correct the Applicable requirement for this condition to 40 CFR 60.44(a)(1) & (2). The (2) was omitted.

Condition 3.3. Please add PTC dated 9/20/78 as a citation source for this limitation.

Condition 3.11
The NOx monitor is not required by NSPS. Therefore, reference to the NSPS as an applicable requirement is incorrect. The NOx monitor is only required by the PSD permit issued by EPA in 1980. This source is not subject to monitoring for O2 or CO2 under NSPS, the therefore the reference to the NSPS is incorrect.
IDEQ's response to comments (response 17) indicates that "Clearwater has not demonstrated that a NOx CEM is not required..." Attached is another copy of the test results submitted on September 11, 1981, along with the cover letter to Mr. Lynn McKee, EPA Idaho Operations Office.

Condition 3.12. The SO2 monitored installed on this source currently provides data in concentration only. It is requested that this monitoring requirement become effective within 6 months of permit issuance to allow time for programming and troubleshooting.

Condition 3.16 The NOX monitor is not required by NSPS. Also, this condition is redundant with condition 1.11 and 1.19 and should be deleted.

Condition 5.1. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63.862(a)(1)(i)(A).

Condition 5.2. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63. 862(a)(1)(i)(B).

Condition 5.3. Please correct the citation to 40 CFR 63. 862(a)(1)(i)(C).

Condition 5.12. Please correct the citation in the first sentence to 40 CFR 63.866(a).

Condition 5.16. Please delete the last 2 sentences in this condition. This information is not required in the permit. Also the cited link may change during the life of the permit.

Condition 6.2. Please add (as H2S) after the 15 ppm to avoid future confusion regarding the IDAPA requirements and to be consistent with federal requirements. This State Only enforceable condition is based on the following:

819. RECOVERY FURNACE TRS STANDARDS. The emission of TRS from all recovery furnace stacks shall be further reduced so as not to exceed one-half (1/2) pound of sulfur per equivalent ton of air-dried kraft pulp, or from each recovery furnace stack seventeen and one-half (17 1/2) ppm, expressed as hydrogen sulfide on a dry gas basis, whichever is the more restrictive, <u>or such other limit of TRS that proves to be reasonably attainable utilizing the latest in design of recovery furnace equipment, controls, and procedures.</u> Compliance shall be achieved by not later than July, 1975. (5-1-94)

It is requested that the Department, using their authority contained in this regulation, allow for a TRS limit of 15ppm only, as being reasonably attainable.

Condition 7.3. Please describe this IDAPA provision as "State Only" enforceable.

Condition 7.8. This condition is obsolete and it's removal is supported by its removal from the Tier I permit is supported by the EPA Part 70 white paper I Section II.B.7.

Condition 7.10. Please add (as H2S) after the 15 ppm to avoid future confusion regarding the IDAPA requirements and to be consistent with federal requirements. In addition, it is requested that the Department, using their authority contained in this regulation, allows for a TRS limit of 5ppm only, as being reasonably attainable. See comment for condition 6.2.

Condition 7.15. The Last sentence of this condition is redundant and should be deleted.

Table 8.2 , condition 8.2
The table correctly lists 0.20 lb/T black liquor solids as the requirement for both Part 60 and part 63. However the cited monitoring requirement 8.5 is the monitoring requirement for Part 60 only. Clearwater has approval for an alternative for pressure drop for Part 63. Clearwater requests that a notation be added to the table after 8.5 that indicates "for 40 CFR 60.282(a)(2) only"

Condition 8.6
This condition requires opacity monitoring during testing. This is incorrect, the CAM indicators are flow and fan load.

Condition 11.5.4
The Response to comments indicates that this condition has been deleted, however it remains in the permit.

Condition 13. The last sentence of this condition is redundant with condition 1.19 and should be deleted.

Table 13.2 Condition 13.2
The monitoring provisions cited are incomplete, Monitoring as permit required except where the provisions of 60.283(a)(1)(iii)or (iv) apply.
Due to confusion regarding the applicable limits and standards required by subpart BB Clearwater request that the standards and monitoring requirements be more specifically addressed as follows

Conditions	Parameter	Permit Limit/ Standard Summary	Applicable Requirements Reference	Monitoring and Recordkeeping Requirements
13.2 .1 (unless condition 13.2.2 is met	TRS	TRS - 5 ppm	40 CFR 60.283(a)(1)	60.284(a)(2) (TRS CEMS)
13.2.2	TRS	combust gases in lime kiln; or combust in an incinerator at 1200 °F for 0.5 seconds	40 CFR 60.283(a)(1)(iii)	60.284(b)(1) (for incinerator only)

The Department has recently alleged that the 5 ppm TRS limit applies when normal variations in the gas collection system cause venting. _It would appear that if this were the correct interpretation of NSPS Subpart BB, EPA would have required installation of TRS monitors under 60.284(a)(2) for the NSPS sources. DEQ's interpretation of the applicability of the 5 ppm standard to venting during normal operation is not be consistent with other states and creates an arbitrary burden on the Lewiston mill. Clearwater will continue to work with the Department to reach agreement on excess emissions reporting requirements for these events.

Condition 13.2(v). Please correct typo in last line from "dose" to "does."

Condition 13.9. Please correct this condition to refer to SO2 rather than particulate. (2 places). Continuous emission monitoring data form this source indicates that the SO2 emissions are well below the 4.7 lb/hr limit, at 0.01-0.02 lbs. considering this data, the 5/25/07 permit required testing every 5 years. This new condition requires testing, at least every three years. The 2007 performance test resulted in SO2 emissions of 0.01 lb/hr. Clearwater is requesting that the next test be conducted prior to September of 2012 and future testing follows the schedule in condition 6.7.

Table 1.9.1 should reflect alternate parameter approval #5 Smelt Dissolving tank. The row for Lime Handling /PM should be deleted.

It is requested that the response to comments background section be edited to reflect he following language for clarification.

1. BACKGROUND

In accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.364., the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided for public comment between January 26, 2009 and February 25, 2009 on the proposed renewal to the Tier I Operating Permit (T1-2007.0106) for Clearwater Paper Corporation – Idaho Pulp and Paperboard I Division located in Lewiston Idaho. The Lewiston location of Clearwater Paper Corporation consists of three Divisions; the Pulp and Paperboard Division, the Consumers Products Division, and the Wood Products Division (which is issued a separate Tier I operating permit). The sources operated by the Pulp and Paperboard and by the Consumer Products Division of Clearwater Paper Corporation are considered one facility for Tier I permitting purposes, although the permit is issued in two parts (one for the Pulp and Paperboard Division and one for the Consumer Products Division) for effective implementation of the applicable requirements. This response to comments is for the Pulp and Paperboard Division portion of the Tier I permit. The Response to Comments on the Consumer Products Division portion of the permit were provided in a separate document in response to comments on Tier I Permit No. T1-2007.0105.

Comments were provided via email. Each comment and DEQ's response is provided in the following section. All comments submitted in response to DEQ's proposed action are included within Appendix A of this document.

A second public comment period is being held because significant changes to the draft permit have been made based on comments received during the first comment period.

Response to Comment 2. Please revise typos in the last sentence to replace "my" with "may."

Response to Comment 37. Please remove the last sentence because no testing is required or necessary to establish the ratio. Data from historic production records and industry standard conversions are adequate.

Response to Comment 47. Please delete the last sentence because it is inconsistent with the Response to Comment 48.

Response to Comment 55. Clearwater disagrees with the Department's interpretation of the applicable regulations, as summarized in the last paragraph of this response. Clearwater will continue to work with the Department to reach agreement on excess emissions reporting requirements for these events.

Please contact me if there are any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Sue Somers
Environmental, Health, and Safety Manager

cc: Mike Simon
Dan Pitman

6421

FILE

Potlatch

Potlatch Corporation
Pulp, Paperboard & Packaging Group
Idaho Division

P.O. Box 1016
Lewiston, Idaho 83501
Telephone (208) 799-0123

September 11, 1981

Mr. Lynn McKee
EPA Idaho Operations Office
422 West Washington
Boise, Idaho 83702

Dear Mr. McKee:

On July 29, 1981, Potlatch Corporation conducted a compliance evaluation on its #4 Power Boiler in accordance with the terms of the permit to construct. Four tests were conducted for particulates and oxides of nitrogen. An EPA employee, Dave Tedda, observed the test procedure.

Enclosed are the results of the tests which show the boiler to be in compliance with permit limitations for particulates and oxides of nitrogen. Steam load averaged 550,000 lb/hour during the entire testing procedure. Leak checks were performed on the sampling train for each test, and they indicated that the sample train was gas tight for each test.

The first test was discarded because the 200 ml of water was not added to the impingers in accordance with Method 5. The results from that test are included for your information, however, and that test is in agreement with the other three tests.

We are enclosing the mill process information and oil usage figures requested by Mr. Tedda. Mr. Tedda also requested some information on our stack testing procedures and our quarterly reports.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from the State of Idaho approving the use of our in-stack filter method, which is basically the same as the ASME method. For testing stacks with scrubbers, we use the wet impingement method, which is essentially the same method developed by the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District and which has been certified as equivalent to Method 5 in California.

With respect to our quarterly reports, opacity values are not reported as they were not required by the State of Idaho. We do include a report on equipment failures and upset conditions.

We trust that these compliance tests meet the requirements specified in our permit to construct, and that the information supplied satisfies your needs. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

POTLATCH CORPORATION
PULP, PAPERBOARD & PACKAGING GROUP

Joseph R. Rippee

Joseph R. Rippee
Environmental Engineer
North Idaho Units

djd

Enclosures

cc:	L.E. Rolig	With Enclosures
	R.E. Zipse	"
	L.G. Ritter	"
	C.R. Pottenger	"
	C.W. Rasmussen	"
	F.H. Rider	"
	R.A. Zielinski	"
	R.M. DeBorde	"
	T.W. Kamps	"

6424

Date : August 5, 1981

Test Date: July 29, 1981

Test Time: 11:35-1:45

To: Frank Rider

From: Paul Hart

Subject: STACK TEST - No. 4 Power Boiler

Comments:

Compliance Test #1

Particulate - RAC train - EPA Method 5
NOx - Individual flasks - EPA Method 7 lb/NO_2/BTU 10^6

1	.110
2	.086
3	.086
4	.086
	.092 Average

STATE STANDARD

Particulate - .015 gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2
120 T/Year max.

Opacity - 20%

NO_x - 0.2 lb/10^6 Btu (gas)
(gas/wood)
0.3 lb/10^6 Btu (oil)
(oil/wood)
842 T/year Max.

	CURRENT TEST	PREVIOUS TEST
Opacity	3	5
Dust Loss (gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2)	.003	.006
NO_x (lb/10^6 Btu)	.09	.16
Actual Stack O_2 (%)	7.5	9.8
Gas Flow (ACFM) (Stack)	362,760	374,600
Temperature (^oF)	387	374
Moisture (%)	17.6	20.3
Steam Flow (lb/hr)	550,000	470,000

cc: L. E. Rolig
R. E. Zipse
L. G. Ritter
C. R. Pottenger
J. R. Rippee

M. P. Hart

MPH:jb
2/81

Date : August 10, 1981

Test Date: July 29, 1981

Test Time: 2:35 - 4:50

To: Frank Rider

From: Paul Hart

Subject: STACK TEST - No. 4 Power Boiler

Comments:

Compliance Test #2

Particulate - RAC Train - EPA Method 5

NOx Individual Flasks - EPA Method 7

1	.098
2	.110
3	.123
4	.123
	.114 lb NO_2/BTU 10^6

STATE STANDARD

Particulate - .015 gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2
120 T/Year max.

Opacity - 20%

NO_x - 0.2 lb/10^6 Btu (gas)
(gas/wood)
0.3 lb/10^6 Btu (oil)
(oil/wood)
842 T/year Max.

	CURRENT TEST	PREVIOUS TEST
Opacity	3	3
Dust Loss (gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2)	.004	.003
NO_x (lb/10^6 Btu)	.11	.09
Actual Stack O_2 (%)	7.3	8.3
Gas Flow (ACFM) (Stack)	368,900	362,800
Temperature (^oF)	388	387
Moisture (%)	18.0	17.6
Steam Flow (lb/hr)	550,000	550,000

cc: L. E. Rolig
R. E. Zipse
L. G. Ritter
C. R. Pottenger
J. R. Rippee

Mr. P. Hart

MPH:jb
2/81

Date : August 10, 1981

Test Date: July 29, 1981

Test Time: 5:40 - 8:00

To: Frank Rider

From: Paul Hart

Subject: STACK TEST - No. 4 Power Boiler

Comments:

Compliance Test #3

Particulate - RAC Train - EPA Method 5

NOx - Individual Flasks - EPA Method 7

1	.112
2	.112
3	.112
4	.100

.112 lb NO_2/BTU 10^6

STATE STANDARD

Particulate - .015 gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2
120 T/Year max.

Opacity - 20%

NO_x - 0.2 lb/10^6 Btu (gas)
(gas/wood)
0.3 lb/10^6 Btu (oil)
(oil/wood)
842 T/year Max.

	CURRENT TEST	PREVIOUS TEST
Opacity	3	3
Dust Loss (gr/DSCF @ 12% CO_2)	.003	.004
NO_x (lb/10^6 Btu)	.11	.11
Actual Stack O_2 (%)	7.7	7.3
Gas Flow (ACFM) (Stack)	372,400	368,900
Temperature (^oF)	385	388
Moisture (%)	19.2	18.0
Steam Flow (lb/hr)	550,000	550,000

cc: L. E. Rolig
R. E. Zipse
L. G. Ritter
C. R. Pottenger
J. R. Rippee

M. P. Hart

MPH:jb
2/81

6421

STATE OF IDAHO

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND WELFARE

DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENT
Statehouse
Boise, Idaho 83720

FILE

March 2, 1981

A. A.

CC: LER
REZ
LGR
CRP
LWF
MPH 3/5/81 [illegible]

Mr. Jack Anderson
Potlatch
P. O. Box 1016
Lewiston, Idaho 83501

Dear Jack:

In response to your letter of February 27, 1981, we are aware that a new operation such as your #4 power boiler can experience difficulty with startup. Since you have already conducted emission tests on the boiler which show it to be in compliance at present steam production rates, it is not critical to conduct final compliance tests at this time.

Since modifications to the boiler will be necessary before maximum production can be achieved, the date for final compliance demonstration can be put off until those modifications are made. Also, in order to meet the NOx values, such firing parameters as overfire air will have to be adjusted, possibly by trial and error.

Therefore, please consider this letter your authorization to delay final compliance testing until all modifications and adjustments are made, but no later than August, 1981. Meanwhile, quarterly stack tests should still be performed.

If you have any questions or if any other problems arise, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Bill

William O. Dameworth
Manager
Engineering and Planning Section

WOD/bf
cc: Murray Michael
Mike Christie
Ed Tulloch
Mike Johnston, EPA, Seattle
John Pfander

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Appendix B

November 14, 2008 Letter from DEQ to Clearwater Regarding Excess Emissions Reporting Requirements

STATE OF IDAHO
DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1410 North Hilton • Boise, Idaho 83706 • (208) 373-0502

C.L. "Butch" Otter, Governor
Toni Hardesty, Director

November 14, 2008

Certified Mail No. 7190 0596 0014 0000 4165

Sue Somers, Engineering Manager
Potlatch Forest Products Corporation
P.O. Box 1126
Lewiston, Idaho 83501

RE: Facility ID No. 069-00001, Potlatch Forest Products Corporation, Lewiston
Excess Emissions Reporting Clarification

Dear Ms. Somers:

On May 21, 2008, DEQ initiated communications with Potlatch Forest Products Corporation (Potlatch) regarding excess emissions reporting requirements for the Pulp and Paper Mill. At issue is the January 28, 2000[1] letter from DEQ to Potlatch regarding excess emissions reporting for the Non-condensible Gas (NCG) system. This letter included a statement that Potlatch need not follow the 15-day excess emissions reporting requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01.135 for the NCG system and that semiannual reporting would suffice. As indicated during our recent discussions, DEQ has determined that the *Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho* (Rules) do not allow for this deviation as was once believed.

On July 25, 2008, DEQ received a letter from Potlatch suggesting a means by which to address future NCG reporting. In that letter Potlatch acknowledged that the Rules do require a written report within 15 days of each excess emissions event in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.135. Additionally, Potlatch implied that DEQ has the discretion to allow deviation from the Rules, and there is not a change in circumstance or regulation that warrants revision of the current semi-annual reporting, as stated in DEQ's January 28, 2000 letter, to within 15 days of each excess emissions event.

Upon review of Potlatch's proposal and state and federal rules and regulations, DEQ finds it cannot support the January 28, 2000 letter issued to Potlatch. The Rules do not allow for deviation from the excess emissions reporting requirements.

As you are aware, Potlatch is subject to excess emissions reporting requirements that are included in the Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho (Rules), the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP/MACT), and the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). Each of these rules includes definitions of what constitutes an excess

[1] January 28, 2000 Letter to Alan L. Prouty, Environmental Engineering Manager, Potlatch Corporation from Orville D. Green, Program Administrator Idaho DEQ

Printed on Recycled Paper

emissions event as well as the requirements for reporting any such event. The January 28, 2000, letter issued to Potlatch attempted to provide clarification of excess emissions reporting requirements as they pertain to the Noncondensible Gas (NCG) system. As we have discussed, this letter included statements regarding excess emissions reporting requirements and statements regarding when excess emissions are considered a violation that need to be readdressed. Following is an excerpt from the January 28, 2000 letter:

> "In summary, NCGs must be controlled. So long as the gases are treated 99% of the time, under both the MACT and NSPS standard, a release of gases at or under 1% of the operating time is not indicative of an excess emissions violation. Under the MACT and NSPS standard all excess emissions events must be reported semi-annually. So long as Potlatch stays at or below the 1% threshold, Potlatch need not submit a report for each venting event pursuant to IDAPA 16.01.01.135; semi-annual reporting of excess emissions will suffice. Exceedance of the 1% threshold requires Potlatch to submit a report in accordance with IDAPA 16.01.01.135 as well as the semi-annual reports required under the MACT and NSPS."

Readdressing Excess Emissions Notification Requirements of Idaho Rules (Section 135)

The excess emissions reporting requirements are now included in the Rules at IDAPA 58.01.01.135 instead of IDAPA 16.01.01.135. Contrary to statements made in the January 28, 2000 letter to Potlatch, excess emissions reporting is required in writing to the Department within 15 days after the beginning of each such event in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.135.01, regardless of whether the excess emission event occurred in excess of 1% of the operating time. DEQ is not at liberty to deviate from the requirements of the Rule. In addition, excess emissions that result from upset or breakdown, or from other situations that may necessitate the implementation of safety measures which cause excess emissions, require that notification be made to the Department no later than 24 hours after the event, unless the owner or operator demonstrates to the Department's satisfaction that the longer reporting period was necessary (IDAPA 58.01.01.134.02).

For emissions units that are regulated by MACT and/or NSPS, the excess emissions requirements of those regulations must be reviewed to determine what is defined as an excess emissions event and to determine the reporting requirements for any excess emissions event.

Readdressing When Excess Emissions Are Considered a Violation

Similar to the excess emissions notification requirements discussed above, the January 28, 2000 letter must not be relied upon in determining which excess emissions are considered a violation of the applicable rule or regulation. The January 28, 2000 letter included a categorical statement that emissions in excess of NSPS standards are not a violation unless the excess emissions occurred during 1% or more of the operating time on a semiannual basis.

However, in accordance with 40 CFR 60.284(e), the 1% threshold for determining if an excess emission is a violation only applies to the recovery furnaces, and only applies, "[if] the

Administrator determines that the affected facility, including air pollution control equipment, is maintained and operated in a manner which is consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions during periods of excess emissions." Therefore, excess emissions from the recovery furnaces that occur less than 1% of the operating time may still be considered a violation if the Administrator determines that the affected facility, including air pollution control equipment, has not been maintained and operated in a manner which is consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions during periods of excess emissions.

Also, in accordance with 40 CFR 60.284(e)(2), excess emissions from the No. 9 Batch Digester, Chip PreOx Brownstock Washers, or No. 6 Multiple effect Evaporator are considered violations unless, "the Administrator determines that the affected facility, including air pollution control equipment, is maintained and operated in a manner which is consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions during periods of excess emissions." The 1% threshold is not included in the NSPS for these emissions units.

Summary

For emissions units that are affected by several standards, all of the applicable excess emissions requirements (i.e. Rules, MACT, and NSPS) must be complied with, and the January 28, 2000 letter should not be relied upon. Highlights of the applicable excess emissions requirements are attached for your reference. Please note that the attachment does not include all applicable requirements and should not be solely relied upon to assure compliance with the Rules, NSPS, or MACT. The attachment is provided to contrast statements made in the January 28, 2000 letter and to highlight some of the appropriate excess emissions requirements.

This letter is in no way intended to supersede any federal, state, or local rules and regulations that may apply.

If you have any questions regarding this letter please feel free to contact me at (208) 373-0502 or Michael.Simon@deq.idaho.gov.

Sincerely,

Michael Simon
Stationary Source Manager
Air Quality Division

MS/DP/hp

Attachment

Attachment

Table of Highlights from Applicable Excess Emissions Requirements

Units	Standards	Excess Emissions	Notification	Excess Emissions That Are Not Considered a Violation
NSPS Subpart BB – Standard of Performance for Kraft Pulp Mills				
Furnace	5 ppm TRS @ 8% O_2	All 12-hour average TRS concentrations above 5 ppm	Provide notification of excess emissions semiannually	If the percent of the total number of possible contiguous periods of excess emissions in a quarter (excluding periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction and periods when the facility is not operating) during which excess emissions occur does not exceed 1% ; and If the Administrator determines that the affected facility, including air pollution control equipment, is maintained and operated in a manner which is consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions during periods of excess emissions.
No. 9 Batch Digester Chip PreOx Brownstock Washers No. 6 Multiple effect Evaporator	5 ppm TRS @ 10% O_2; or Gases combusted in an incinerator, kiln, or furnace @ 1,200 F for 0.5 seconds; or Uncontrolled emissions are less than 0.01 lb/ton ADP	All 12-hour average TRS concentrations above 5 ppm by volume unless: The gases are combusted in an incinerator, kiln, or furnace - then excess emissions are all periods in excess of 5 minutes during which the combustion temperature at the point of incineration is less than1200 °F; or The uncontrolled exhaust gases have TRS less than 0.01 lb/ton ADP	Provide notification of excess emissions semiannually	If the Administrator determines that the affected facility, including air pollution control equipment, is maintained and operated in a manner which is consistent with good air pollution control practice for minimizing emissions during periods of excess emissions.
NESHAP/MACT Subpart S – Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from the Pulp and Paper Industry				
Digesters Multiple Effect Evaporators Turpentine Recovery	Reduce the total HAP concentration to 20 ppm in a thermal oxidizer; or Reduce total HAP emissions using a thermal oxidizer at 1,600 F for 0.75 seconds; or Reduce total HAP emissions using a boiler, lime kiln, or recovery furnace by introducing the HAP stream with the primary fuel into the flame zone	Operation below minimum operating parameter values or above maximum operating parameter values established under this Subpart or failure to perform procedures required by the Subpart (i.e. minimum incinerator temperature)	Provide notification of excess emissions semiannually; and Immediate startup, shutdown, and malfunction reports within 2 days and within 7 days as required by 40 CFR 63.10(d)(5)(ii) when taking action that is not consistent with the procedures specified in the affected source's startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan. The report shall include an explanation of the circumstances of the event, the reasons for not following the startup, shutdown, and malfunction plan, describing all excess emissions and/or parameter monitoring exceedances which are believed to have occurred (or could have occurred in the case of malfunctions)	Periods of excess emissions shall not be a violation provided that the time of excess emissions (excluding periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction) divided by the total process operating time in a semi-annual reporting period does not exceed 1% for control devices used to reduce the total HAP emissions from the LVHC system.

Units	Standards	Excess Emissions	Notification	Excess Emissions That Are Not Considered a Violation
IDAPA 58.01.01.815 – Rules for Control of Kraft Pulping Mills				
Digesters & Evaporators	Shall be treated to reduce TRS emissions equivalent to reduction achieved by thermal oxidation in a lime kiln	Periods during which non-condensable gases are not treated as required (reduction equivalent to that achieved by lime kiln)	For excess emission notification requirements, see IDAPA 58.01.01.131 & 134.	Periods of excess emissions reported shall not be a violation provided that the time of excess emissions (excluding periods of startup, shutdown, or malfunction) divided by the total process operating time in a semi-annual period does not exceed one percent.
IDAPA 58.01.01.131&134 – Excess Emissions				
All Emissions units	All standards established by statute, regulation, rule, permit, or order	Emissions that exceed an applicable standard	Written Report within 15-days of each event, and Notification within 24 hours for excess emissions that result from upset/breakdown/ safety event	As defined by rule or regulation.