

the treated effluent chemical oxygen demand (COD).

A: Yes. The condensate collection efficiency depends on the flow rate to the UNOX system, and COD is a good indicator of UNOX system performance.

Abstract for [M030017]

Q: Must the Weyerhaeuser calcium-based sulfite pulp mill in Rothschild, Wisconsin continuously monitor the outlet to the weak acid tower scrubber? The company claims the scrubber is not needed to comply with the methanol emission limit.

A: Yes. There is insufficient evidence that the mill is operating in continuous compliance with the emission limit. Thus, Weyerhaeuser must continuously monitor emissions or establish alternative operating parameters that continuously demonstrate compliance.

Abstract for [M030018]

Q: Does 40 CFR 63.342(e)(1) require facilities using trivalent chromium baths to use a pre-mixed bath mixture containing the wetting agent?

A: Yes, 40 CFR 63.342(e)(1) requires the trivalent chromium bath solution components to include a wetting agent. However, the wetting agent does not need to be incorporated into the bath solution by the vendor. The wetting agent must only be included as an integral part of the trivalent chromium bath components when purchasing the solution components from the vendor. The wetting agent can then be added by the source following vendor recommendations.

Abstract for [Z030001]

Q: May Cominco get an emissions test waiver for two sewage sludge incinerators located at the DeLong Mountain Regional Transportation System Port Facility in Alaska?

A: Yes. EPA waives the emissions tests required in 40 CFR 61.53(d)(1) based on Cominco's monthly testing results which show the emission level well below the standard at 40 CFR 61.52(b).

Abstract for [0300001]

Q: Is Lamb-Weston's boiler #1 subject to NSPS Subpart Db after its capacity was changed to below 100 million Btu/hour?

A: No. The boiler is no longer subject to NSPS Subpart Db.

Abstract for [0300002]

Q: Will EPA approve the Predictive Emissions Monitoring System (PEMS) for the boiler subject to NSPS Subpart Db?

A: Yes. EPA approves of the PEMS and requires the company to perform

annual relative accuracy tests to verify the accuracy of the PEMS and send the test results.

Abstract for [0300003]

Q: Will EPA approve an alternative monitoring plan (AMP) with a periodic monitoring system for propane fuel used in the generators at Tesoro's Anacortes Refinery?

A: Yes. Pursuant to 40 CFR 60.105(a)(4)(ii), EPA extends the existing EPA approved-AMP dated May 29, 1996, for Boiler F-753 for application to the generators.

Abstract for [0300004]

Q1: May Cogentrix conduct performance tests only at 100% load for a combined cycle gas turbine subject to 40 CFR part 75 and NSPS Subpart GG?

A1: Yes. EPA approves this request because the certified NO_x continuous emission monitoring system (CEMS) used in the initial performance test would undergo calibration checks before and after each test run, and the turbine will normally be operated at 100% load.

Q2: May Cogentrix determine sulfur content by collecting samples for analysis for total sulfur in lieu of testing for SO₂ using Method 20?

A2: Yes. This proposal is acceptable to EPA because the turbine would be firing exclusively pipeline natural gas, where given the sulfur content of the fuel, it would not cause SO₂ emissions in excess of the SO₂ standard specified in 40 CFR 60.333.

Abstract for [0300005]

Q: May NW Natural request a reduced notification period for performance testing on two gas fired turbines?

A: Yes. This request is approved because NW Natural had previous correspondence with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) and the weather dependent operational schedule of the turbine would not allow NW Natural to meet the required 180-day deadline in 40 CFR 60.8(a) to conduct performance testing.

Abstract for [0300006]

Q1: Are turbines that were manufactured before October 3, 1977, but that did not begin operation on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) pump stations until after October 3, 1977, subject to NSPS Subpart GG, no matter when they were purchased by Alyeska from the manufacturer or other owner?

A1: No. These stationary gas turbines, that are purchased in completed form, are not subject to NSPS Subpart GG provided they were not "modified" or

"reconstructed" as defined in NSPS Subpart A, on or after October 3, 1977.

Q2: Do the requirements of NSPS Subparts A and GG follow a new turbine wherever it is operated on the TAPS?

A2: Yes. The requirements of NSPS Subparts A and GG follow a turbine constructed, modified or reconstructed after October 3, 1977, regardless of where the turbine is relocated to, but do not apply to the equipment that is powered by the turbine (such as a generator or a pump).

Q3: Do the Alyeska turbines that were manufactured before October 3, 1977 become subject to NSPS Subpart GG if they are relocated between TAPS pump stations as a pool of identical turbines to allow for maintenance of turbines?

A3: No. The relocation of a turbine as part of a pool of identical turbines would not make the turbine subject to NSPS Subpart GG if the turbine is not "modified" or "reconstructed," as those terms are defined in 40 CFR Subpart A, as a result of the relocation. Certain requirements are required in the Title V permit.

Q4: Does a turbine that is not subject to NSPS Subpart GG become subject to it if it is rotated into a location to replace an existing turbine that is subject to NSPS Subpart GG?

A4: No. As discussed above, a relocation of an affected facility is not, by itself, a modification.

Abstract for [0300007]

Q: Does EPA agree with interpretation of the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority that the total amount of landfill gases generated must be considered when making an applicability determination?

A: Yes. Specifically, pertaining to 40 CFR 60.33c(a)(3), the total nonmethane organic compound (NMOC) emission rate from the landfill must be used to determine applicability.

Abstract for [0300008]

Q: Will EPA approve an alternate opacity emissions monitoring method for an auxiliary boiler subject to NSPS Subpart Db?

A: No. The proposal to use Method 9 instead of operating a COMS is denied because the proposed method would not provide an equivalent level of monitoring. The proposal may be acceptable if certain conditions are met.

Abstract for [0300009]

Q: The Native Village of Kotzebue's proposed expanded polystyrene plant plans to purchase polystyrene-bead raw material from other manufacturers. Will the plant be subject to NSPS Subpart DDD?