Commonwealth of Kentucky
Division for Air Quality

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

ON THE CONDITIONAL MAJOR DRAFT PERMIT F-05-027 Revision 1
Interplastic Manufacturing Company
3535 Latonia Avenue
Fort Wright, KY 41015
November 30, 2006
Joshua J. Higgins, Reviewer

SOURCE ID:	21-117-00086
AGENCY INTEREST #:	2466
ACTIVITY ID:	APE20050001

SOURCE DESCRIPTION:

Interplastic Manufacturing Company (Interplastic) operates a synthetic resin manufacturing facility in Kenton County, Kentucky. Raw materials, either charged from powder handling systems or from various raw material storage tanks (SEU 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 36, 40, 41, and 43), are processed in three reactor vessels, or Process Kettles (PK#1 (SEU 57), PK#2 (SEU 58), and PK#3 (SEU 101)), to produce an alkyd. The reactions can take place at both atmospheric and/or elevated pressures, and can take from 12 to 48 hours. The reactors can be heated with hot oil from any one of three sources (SEU 10, 33, and 102, as required), and are typically supplied with inert gas from the Inert Gas Generator (SEU 109). While still hot, the alkyd is transferred into one of six Thinning Kettles (TK#1 or #2 for PK#1, TK#3 or #4 for PK#2, and TK#5 or #6 for PK#3), and thinned with styrene (one product is thinned with acetone, but acetone is neither a VOC or a HAP). Once thinned, the product is considered a "base resin" which is either sold "as is" or further blended to customer specifications. Approximately 30% of the resin is sold "as is," while the remaining 70% is either stored on site in Resin Storage Tanks (SEU 4, 5, 19, 45, 106, and 107) or further blended in one of numerous blend tanks (SEU 11, 12, 17, 18, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 48, 55, 104, 105, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, or 116). Finally, the resin is packaged in one of two tank truck loading areas (SEU 39 or 119), one of two Automatic Drumming Stations (SEU 117 or 118), or one of three dual-purpose small loading areas (SEU 44, 115, or 116).

Although numerous construction and operating permits and "no permit required" letters were issued in the past, the source has never received a source-wide operating permit. Interplastic was initially on the Division's original list of Title V sources, and submitted a Title V application on December 16, 1998. After numerous Notices of Deficiency (NOD's) issued based on the Title V application, and as a result of a court-ordered consent decree, Interplastic submitted a completely revised and updated application on February 15, 2005. The revised application requested operating and emission limits, and Conditional Major source status covered under 401 KAR 52:030. A draft determination (F-05-027), based on the February 15, 2005 application, was issued December 16, 2005.

Revision 1:

The permit was redrafted (and renamed F-05-027 Revision 1 to prevent confusion with the previous draft) in order to incorporate the following changes:

1. A significant revision was received March 9, 2006, prior to issuance of the final permit, with additional information received April 17, 2006 as a result of a NOD, to install a third 4-drum hot box. The application and additional information indicated that all hot boxes vent to the thermal oxidizers, and incorporated the destruction efficiency into the potential to emit calculations, therefore requiring significant revision procedures.

2. Thirty-two resin pumps are excluded from the **Compliance Demonstration** requirements based on 40 CFR 60 Subpart VV as a result of revised pipeline equipment fugitive emission calculations received May 5, 2006, and July 20, 2006.
3. As a result of increased pipeline fugitive emissions depicted by the May 5 and July 20, 2006 submittals, the required destruction efficiency for the thermal oxidizers was revised.

PUBLIC AND U.S. EPA REVIEW:

On September 20, 2006, the public notice on availability of the draft permit and supporting material for comments by persons affected by the plant was published in *The Enquirer* in Covington, Kentucky (the notice was originally supposed to run on August 16, 2006, but there was either a communication error between the KY Press Association and *The Enquirer*, or simply a mistake by *The Enquirer*). In addition, notification of the issuance of the draft permit was sent to the U.S. EPA and affected states, Ohio and Indiana, on August 7, 2006 via e-mail. The public comment period expired 30 days from the date of publication.

Comments were received from Jack C. Bender of Greenbaum Doll & McDonald PLLC on behalf of Interplastic Manufacturing Company on October 20, 2006 (the comment submittal is stamped "Received October 23, 2006", but the Permit Support Section supervisor ensured the reviewer that the comments were here at the Division on the 20th). Appendix A to this document includes the comments received and the Division's response to the comments. Appendix B includes copies of the attachments included in the comment letter. Minor changes were made to the permit as a result of the comments received, however, in no case were any emissions standards, or any monitoring, recordkeeping or reporting requirements relaxed. Additionally, the Division transferred the permit to the latest template in use. Please see Attachment A for a detailed explanation of the changes made to the permit. The permit is now being issued final.

Appendix A

Comment Letter and Division's Response

Comments on Interplastic Manufacturing Company's Draft Conditional Major Air Quality Permit submitted by Jack C. Bender of Greenbaum Doll & McDonald PLLC and received on October 20, 2006.

Paragraph 1: On behalf of Interplastic Manufacturing Company ("Interplastic" or "Company"), I am providing you with Interplastic's comments and requested revisions to the Draft Federally Enforceable/Conditional Major Construction/Operating Permit for Interplastic's facility in Kenton County, Kentucky ("Facility"). These comments are submitted in response to the Public Notice published September 20, 2006. The comments replace those of Interplastic submitted under my letter of September 14, 2006, which are withdrawn. Interplastic appreciates the effort that the Kentucky Division for Air Quality ("DAQ") has made in developing the Permit and exempting resin pumps from the leak detection and repair ("LDAR") provisions of the Permit. Those revisions were made following meetings between Interplastic and DAQ on March 9, 2006.

Division's Response to Paragraph 1: *None required.*

Paragraph 2: Interplastic requests through these comments that equipment (connectors, valves, and pumps) that only contains glycols and resins, which are by their nature low vapor pressure chemicals in liquid form, also be exempt from the pipeline fugitives LDAR program in Section B of the Permit. The basis for Interplastic's request was initially set forth in the attached letter [See Appendix B, Attachment 1 to this response to comments document] dated July 6, 2006, from Interplastic Corporation to Mr. Joshua J. Higgins, Permit Reviewer with DAQ. As explained in that letter, the additional cost associated with complying with the pipeline fugitive emissions provisions of the Permit for equipment containing low vapor pressure chemicals (hereinafter "Level 2 Equipment" or "Level 2") would substantially increase the cost of the program with virtually no additional environmental benefit. In addition to the reasons previously provided to DAQ for not subjecting that Level 2 Equipment to an expensive LDAR program, we are providing the following supplemental information.

Division's Response to Paragraph 2: *The Division believes that the permit provisions regarding equipment handling Heavy Liquids, in essence, already provides for the requested "2-tier approach" as described in the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1. Testing Requirement 3.e. on page 26 and 27 of 50 outlines the difference between a Light Liquid and a Heavy Liquid. Equipment that would qualify for Heavy Liquid service appears to be the same as what the source proposal is referring to as "Level 2 Equipment" (i.e.: from the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1 to this response to comments document, "low vapor pressure chemicals" and "material that remains in liquid form"), except for resins which appear as if they would meet the criteria for classification as a Light Liquid. Compliance Demonstration Method requirements 1.w. – 1.z. on page 24 and 25 of 50 list the monitoring requirements for pumps and valves in Heavy Liquid service and connectors. From Compliance Demonstration Method requirement 1.w., "…visual, audible, olfactory, or any other detection method at pumps and valves in heavy liquid service, pressure relief devices in light liquid or heavy liquid service, and connectors…" may be used. This is essentially the same as the*

source's request from the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1 to "…conduct a visual inspection of all the system components which contain lower vapor pressure chemicals…." Therefore, the Division does not believe that any permit modifications are required regarding conducting a visual (or audible, olfactory, etc.) inspection of the equipment that may qualify for the Heavy Liquid monitoring requirements.

The permit already addresses the source's request from the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1 regarding conducting visual inspections of the pipeline equipment handling acetone. Please review Testing Requirement 3.d. on page 26 of 50 and Specific Recordkeeping Requirement 5.f. on page 28 of 50, and the definition of "Volatile organic compound" from 401 KAR 52:001.

Paragraph 3: The Statement of Basis that is dated July 28, 2006, dismisses the information submitted on July 6, 2006 by Interplastic.[1] The rationale provided by DAQ in the Statement of Basis for requiring an LDAR program for pipeline fugitives does not apply to the Level 2 components. As demonstrated herein, with respect to the Level 2 Equipment, there is no realistic possibility that undiagnosed and unrepaired leaks could lead to compliance issues with the source-wide emission limits, the source-wide RACT requirement to reduce fugitive emissions, and 401 KAR 63:020. As set forth in Attachments 1 and 2, the Level 2 components do not pose a fugitive emission leak concern with respect to those compliance issues.

[1] The Statement of Basis indicates that the July 6, 2006 letter was received on July 20, 2006.

Division's Response to Paragraph 3: *A correction to the footnote is provided first for clarity's sake. Page 9 of 42 of the Statement of Basis indicates that the "2-tier approach very briefly described in a letter [dated July 6, 2006] [was] received July 7, 2006." References in the Statement of Basis to information received July 20, 2006 pertain to a NOD response received on the 20th correcting errors in the revised fugitive emission calculations received May 5, 2006.*

The Statement of Basis indicates that the information presented in the "2-tier approach" letter received July 7, 2006 was not incorporated into the review because it was beyond the scope of the agreement reached in the meeting on March 9, 2006 with representatives from the Division and Interplastic. That agreement specifically pertained to authorizing Interplastic more time to recalculate and submit pipeline fugitive equipment emissions in order to show that the resin pumps could be excluded from the Compliance Demonstration Method provisions. Additionally, the proposal was too vague to be considered seriously as an alternative to the already drafted requirements. Specifically, the proposal indicates that Interplastic would "Monitor 100% of all components that contain higher vapor pressure chemicals," but does not indicate at what frequency or by what techniques. Additionally, it does not provide a specific vapor pressure cut off for differentiating "High Vapor Pressure Chemicals" from "Low Vapor Pressure Chemicals." Finally, it does not address any recordkeeping or reporting provisions, nor does it address repair activities if leaking equipment is found.

See the Division's Response to Paragraph 6, below. The LDAR Compliance Demonstration Method provisions are still required for all equipment in order to validate use of the non-leaking screening emission factors and ensure compliance with the source-wide limits.

Paragraph 4: Attachment 2 [See Appendix B, Attachment 2 to this response to comments document] is a series of charts delineating the potential controlled and uncontrolled VOC and HAP emissions from the facility. The charts show that total uncontrolled VOC and HAP emissions from the Level 2 Equipment is conservatively estimated at 2.48 tons per year and 1.27 tons per year, respectively, using U.S. EPA uncontrolled SOCMI emission factors. These are indeed very conservative estimates of potential worst-case emissions for the following reasons:

1. Glycols are low vapor pressure materials and potential emission rates are overestimated by using SOCMI factors for high vapor pressure monomers.
2. Resins also have a low potential for fugitive emissions due to their nature as resins. See attached analysis of Dr. Ross, of Interplastic. (Attachment 3). [See Appendix B, Attachment 3 to this response to comments document]

Division's Response to Paragraph 4: *See the Division's Response to Paragraph 6, below. The emissions from pipeline fugitive equipment depicted in the series of charts are based on unsubstantiated non-leaking screening emission factors. Although accepted to continue the permit review and issuance process, the emissions are not a very conservative estimate because of the lack of on-site data supporting the emission factors used. In the absence of supporting data, a truly conservative estimate would have relied upon the average emission factors. As the Statement of Basis explains, the permit was conditioned to validate the non-leaking screening emission factors used by requiring "preparation and submittal of revised fugitive emission calculations after a year's worth of on-site LDAR data has been collected."*

The first chart in Attachment 2, "Controlled and Uncontrolled VOC and HAP Emissions," contains Note 1, which indicates that "a conservative 40% control factor" was applied to the "Tier 1 Equipment Subject to LDAR." However, it is not justifiable to add the 40% control factor on top of the emissions calculated using the non-leaking screening emission factors. Use of the screening factors already assumes some type of LDAR program is in place, and therefore already provides a controlled estimate of emissions. This chart contains another note marked by an "" that references a "SECOR attachment [that] explains…the California SCAQMD assumes zero emissions from those Glycols." This attachment was not included in the comment submittal, and, therefore, it is impossible to provide it any consideration. In order to analyze this claim, however, the Division again turned to published U.S. EPA guidance pertaining to fugitive pipeline emissions: EPA-453/R-95-017, "Protocol for Equipment Leak Emission Estimates," November 1995. This document provides different emission factors for "Light Liquids" and "Heavy Liquids." Checking NSPS and NESHAP regulations, one will find that the main distinction between a Light and Heavy Liquid is the vapor pressure: generally, a compound with a vapor pressure greater than 0.3 kPa is considered a light liquid, and 0.3 kPa and below a heavy liquid (Note: there are other qualifiers for determining if a liquid is light or heavy. The point being made here focuses on vapor pressure since that was a key point of the source comments). The "Protocol for Equipment Leak Emission Estimates" does not provide for sub-categories of Light and Heavy liquids and corresponding emission factors – just the single distinction between Light and Heavy and a corresponding emission factor for each. Therefore, the Division does not believe it is appropriate to consider that the equipment processing Glycols would have zero emissions. If Glycols can be shown to qualify for "Heavy Liquid" status, the Division would consider it appropriate to apply the Heavy Liquid emission factors to the equipment handling them.*

Regarding the memorandum in Attachment 3, the Division acknowledges Dr. Ross', experience and credentials, but his "analysis," as described above, is really just an opinion in that no quantitative information is provided, and no comparison to the actual equipment operating conditions is given. For example, the memorandum indicates that Dr. Ross "… expect[s] that if the leak is very small and the pressure of the line is low, the leak would be able to plug itself due to the film that forms with evaporation." This leaves one wondering what leak rate is "very small," what line pressure is considered "low," and what other data (i.e.: how long does it take for a leak to plug itself, etc.) was used in generating that expectation? Additionally, would the equipment in question at Interplastic's Fort Wright facility meet those operating conditions? Dr. Ross' final sentence indicates that, "You should not assume complete evaporation of all of the styrene when there is a leak in a [resin] pipe." This leaves one wondering: how much should be assumed to evaporate and

why? Without answering those basic questions, the most conservative approach is to assume that resin leaks are not sealing themselves, and that all of the volatile material does evaporate.

Paragraph 5: Using the conservative emission estimates in Attachment 2, it is readily apparent that it is not reasonable or necessary to apply an LDAR program to Level 2 Equipment to ensure compliance with all permit limits. Total VOC controls are 94% compared to the RACT limit of 90%. Total source-wide potential HAPs and styrene emissions are 57.8% and 18.6%, respectively, below the source-wide annual limits[2], even based upon the conservative emission estimates for fugitive emission leaks for both Level 1 and Level 2 Equipment. Finally, the additional cost for applying the LDAR program for the Level 2 Equipment would be in excess of $30,000 per ton per year assuming conservatively that it would control 50% of the 2.48 tons of conservatively estimated uncontrolled VOC emissions from Level 2 Equipment.[3] (As stated previously, Interplastic believes that based upon the vapor pressure and nature of the glycols and resins, uncontrolled emissions from Level 2 Equipment is in reality already below 1 ton per year.) Accordingly, the LDAR program for Level 2 Equipment cannot be justified, and is certainly unnecessary to provide assurance of compliance with permit limits.

[2] The source-wide limits are also set 10% below the major source thresholds as a safety factor.

[3] This is based upon LDAR program cost estimates in Attachment 1 for each year after initial startup. The cost per ton of VOCs controlled in year one would be even higher.

Division's Response to Paragraph 5: *See the Division's Response to Paragraph 6. Without verifying whether or not pipeline equipment is leaking through executing the Compliance Demonstration Method LDAR monitoring provisions, the Division can not accept the above analysis and argument to indicate that the LDAR requirements for "Level 2 Equipment" is not necessary.*

*Additionally, the Division disagrees with some of the figures presented above. Based on emissions from the POC table issued with the draft permit, total HAP emissions are only 49.41% below the source-wide limit ((1-(11.342 tpy total HAP / 22.5 tpy total HAP limit)) * 100% = 49.41%), and styrene emissions are only 5.61% below the source-wide limit ((1-(8.495 tpy styrene / 9.0 tpy single HAP limit)) * 100% = 5.61%). The fact that source-wide emissions of styrene, even when calculated using the unsubstantiated non-leaking screening emission factors for all pipeline equipment, are extremely close to the single HAP emission limit provides additional proof that use of those emission factors must be verified through the monitoring requirements provided in the LDAR provisions of the permit, and not accepted as depicting the true operating condition of the equipment without verification.*

Finally, the basis for the $30,000 per ton per year cost estimate for monitoring the "Level 2 Equipment" is not established anywhere. The footnote associated with this figure references the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1 to this document, but nowhere does that letter reference a cost estimate for the "Level 2 Equipment" alone. It includes figures that solely represent the cost of the entire program, and "$30,000" is not included anywhere in that letter.

Paragraph 6: The Statement of Basis indicates that DAQ "has conditioned the Permit to include preparation and submittal of revised fugitive emission calculations after a year's worth of on-site LDAR data has been collected. The on-site data will either justify the use of the non-leaking emission factors for every component, or require recalculating emissions to also incorporate leaking component counts and leaking emission factors." It should not be necessary to conduct LDAR monitoring over the course of the year for the Level 2 Equipment. The reason is the conservative uncontrolled emission estimates for this equipment is only 2.48 tons of VOCs per year as shown in

Attachment 2. Both the RACT and HAP limits are readily met even through LDAR is not applied to this equipment.

Division's Response to Paragraph 6: *The 2.48 tpy of VOC cited above from the "Level 2 Equipment" is based on unsubstantiated non-leaking screening emission factors. In order to determine the appropriate screening emission factor, equipment monitoring must be done to determine if the leaking or non-leaking screening emission factor should be used for the piece of equipment. If the equipment is not monitored, or "screened," the source, in order to obtain truly conservative emission factors, will have to rely upon average emission factors for calculating fugitive emissions from the equipment in question. If average emission factors were applied to the "Level 2 Equipment," VOC emissions would be 37.34 tpy from just this equipment alone, which would result in a violation of the source-wide RACT limit. Styrene emissions from just this equipment alone would be 19.35 tpy, which would result in a violation of the source-wide HAP emission limits, and could possibly lead to a violation of the source-wide air toxics limit. Therefore, the monitoring contained in the LDAR provisions of the Compliance Demonstration Method is required and necessary in order to validate the presently unsubstantiated emission factors that the source has chosen to use, and in order to ensure compliance with all of the source-wide limits. (Note: There may be minor differences in the equipment that Interplastic deems "Level 2 Equipment" and the equipment included in the Division's attempt to calculate emissions from what Interplastic wants to declare as "Level 2 Equipment." The source comment submittal does not specify exactly what equipment they categorized as "Level 2 Equipment." It broadly categorizes "Level 2 Equipment" as that equipment handling glycols and resins. The emissions cited above by the Division that are the result of using average emission factors (including Heavy Liquid emission factors for the glycols) are calculated by summing emissions from the equipment in the May 5, 2006 submittal that clearly indicate they process glycols and resins. Regardless, minor differences in the exact equipment included in the "Level 2 Equipment" emission calculations are not expected to significantly change the end result: that unmonitored equipment, and therefore required to use average emission factors, would lead to violations of the source-wide limits.)*

Paragraph 7: As written, the Permit's pipeline fugitive emission monitoring program is arbitrary and overly stringent. Interplastic has shown that the cost of the program per ton of VOC emissions controlled will far exceed RACT cost thresholds with respect to the low vapor pressure (Level 2) chemicals. (See Attachments 1 and 2). Therefore, the Company requests that DAQ reconsider the pipeline fugitive emission LDAR program in the Permit, and revise the Permit to require only visual inspection of Level 2 Equipment.

Division's Response to Paragraph 7: *The Statement of Basis issued with the draft permit already provided justification indicating that the LDAR provisions included as the Compliance Demonstration Method for the regulations applicable to pipeline fugitive emissions are not arbitrary or overly stringent, but necessary for demonstrating compliance with source-wide emission limits, the source-wide RACT limit, and the source-wide air toxics limitation. See the Statement of Basis, Appendix C, p. 20 of 42, and Appendix D, p. 28-31 of 42.*

Interplastic has not "shown that the cost of the program per ton of VOC emissions controlled will far exceed RACT cost thresholds with respect to the low vapor pressure (Level 2) chemicals." Interplastic has never presented a complete cost-effectiveness analysis for pipeline fugitive emissions taking into account both of the primary control options provided in EPA-453/R-95-017, "Protocol for Equipment Leak Emission Estimates," November 1995, p. 5-1 (i.e.: modifying or replacing existing equipment, or implementing a leak detection and repair (LDAR) program).

Additionally, the cost thresholds presented in the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1 are based on unsubstantiated emissions data. The emissions used in that document were generated by applying the non-leaking screening emission factor to each piece of equipment even though the source has no site-specific monitoring information to support the use of those factors. As explained on page 9 of 42 of the Statement of Basis, those calculations were accepted to continue the review and permit issuance process. However, without specific on-site monitoring data, average factors are typically used. Average factors applied to the revised equipment counts and hours of operation contained in the July 5 and 20, 2006 submittals results in VOC emissions of 115.7 tpy from pipeline fugitives alone. The first year cost in that case would be $959.38/ton ($111,000 (the first year cost of the program as cited in the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1) ÷ 115.7 tons = $959.38/ton), and the following years $587.73/ton ($68,000 (the cost of the program contained in the letter in Appendix B, Attachment 1for each subsequent year) ÷ 115.7 tons = $587.73/ton), which are reasonable RACT costs.

See the Division's Response to Paragraph 2 regarding revising the permit to incorporate "only visual inspection[s] of Level 2 Equipment."

Paragraph 8: Also note that page 30 of the Draft Permit, Section B.6.E.2, requires a semi-annual report to include information "for each month during the semi-annual reporting period." Since the LDAR program is to be implemented quarterly under the Permit, this should be revised to require the information for each quarter during the semi-annual reporting period.

Division's Response to Paragraph 8: *The Division concurs that Specific Reporting Requirement 6.e.(2) on page 30 of the draft F-05-027Revision 1 permit, should be changed from referencing "each month during the semi-annual reporting period" to "each quarter during the semi-annual reporting period." After submittal of comments on the first version of the draft, the frequency of detection requirements were basically extended by an order of magnitude. As page 21 of 42 of the Statement of Basis indicates, "In general, daily requirements …[were] extended to weekly, weekly requirements …[were] extended to monthly, monthly requirements … [were] extended to quarterly, and quarterly requirements … [were] extended to annually." The change to the Specific Recordkeeping Requirement was inadvertently overlooked at that time.*

This change is not considered a significant permit revision. Even though it does provide a slight relaxation in the frequency of the reported information, there is no change in the content of the information required. Additionally, as indicated above, the "quarterly" frequency should have been depicted in the draft, and as such, the change is really administrative in nature.

Interplastic is reminded, however, that the LDAR provisions are not executed quarterly across the board, as inferred by the comment above. The frequency of detection requirements were simply extended. Some monitoring requirements may still be required more often than quarterly. See the Pipeline Fugitive Compliance Demonstration Method requirements in Section B of the permit for the specific activities and their frequency.

Paragraph 9: The Company requests that the final Permit not be issued until Interplastic has an opportunity to meet with DAQ to review information with respect to Level 2 low vapor pressure chemicals and the potential for equipment leaks associated with this equipment. Your consideration of these comments and Interplastic's request for a meeting would be greatly appreciated.

Division's Response to Paragraph 9: *The Division does not believe that another meeting is*

necessary. As already discussed in the Division's Response to Paragraph 2, the Division believes that the permit provisions regarding equipment handling Heavy Liquids, in essence, already provides for the requested "2-tier approach." Additionally, the Division believes that Interplastic has had plenty of opportunities to present their ideas regarding fugitives: a courtesy copy draft permit was shared with the source in September 2005, and their resultant comments were accepted and considered during preparation of the first draft; the draft of F-05-027 was issued in December 2005, which provided another opportunity to submit comments; a special meeting was held in March 2006 to discuss pipeline fugitive issues, and 60 days were granted for the source to prepare another submittal regarding fugitives; and finally the draft of F-05-027 Revision 1was provided to the source in August 2006. As a result of a publication error regarding the public notice, Interplastic had over 60 days to prepare and submit detailed comments on this draft. Despite having much more than the typical opportunity to review the content of their draft permit, and despite having well over a year since first being presented with the LDAR provisions, none of the comments or submittals by Interplastic has proven that the requirements are not necessary. Therefore, the Division believes that holding another meeting would simply further delay the permit issuance process, without producing any significant change in permit requirements.

CREDIBLE EVIDENCE:

This permit contains provisions which require that specific test methods, monitoring or recordkeeping be used as a demonstration of compliance with permit limits. On February 24, 1997, the U.S. EPA promulgated revisions to the following federal regulations: 40 CFR Part 51, Sec. 51.212; 40 CFR Part 52, Sec. 52.12; 40 CFR Part 52, Sec. 52.30; 40 CFR Part 60, Sec. 60.11 and 40 CFR Part 61, Sec. 61.12, that allow the use of credible evidence to establish compliance with applicable requirements. At the issuance of this permit, Kentucky has not incorporated these provisions in its air quality regulations.

Appendix B

Attachments Associated with the Comment Letter

(For an electronic copy, see the image file “Comments 10-23-06” under AI 2466, Activity ID APE20050001. A hard copy of the attachments is included with the hard copy of this Response to Comments document.)