

**TABLE OF CONTENTS TO
THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
FOR THE
FREDERICK /CARROLL COUNTY RENEWABLE WASTE-TO-ENERGY
FACILITY
PERMIT APPLICATION HEARINGS/COMMENT PERIODS**

Dates and Locations	1
Purpose of the Hearings	1
Tentative Determinations	1
Comment Information	2

Section I: Responses to Comments of a General Nature or Comments that are Non-Media Specific 2

Comment 1: <i>Impact on Property Values</i>	2
Comment 2: <i>The Project's effect on the Historical Significance of the Monocacy National Battlefield</i>	3
Comment 3: <i>Safety Issues</i>	4
Comment 4: Night Time Lighting	5
Comment 5: Visual Impact	5
Comment 6: Opportunity for Public Comment	6
Comment 7: Road and Truck Traffic Issues	8
Comment 8: Do the Citizens of Frederick County Have the Right to Close the Facility Down?	9
Comment 9: Contract and Economic Issues	9
Comment 10: Concerns about Burning Tires	10
Comment 11: Archaeological Issues	11
Comment 12: How does NMWDA's projection of 15,000 tons of metals to be recovered at the facility annually compare with Montgomery County's incinerator?	11
Comment 13: Should the zip code of the facility be 21704 instead of 21701 as noted on the application?	11

Section II: Responses to comments related to the air quality control permit to construct and NNSR and PSD approvals 12

Comment 1: Comments Relating to Hazardous Air Pollutants/Toxic Air Pollutants	12
Comment 2: Comments Relating to the Applicability of EPA Regulations	13
Comment 3: Comments Relating to Health Impacts	14
Comment 4: Health-Risk Assessment	15
Comment 5: Compliance Issues	17
Comment 6: Ambient Air Quality/Ozone Non-Attainment Issues	18
Comment 7: Mercury	20
Comment 8: Fine Particulates	21
Comment 9: Monitoring Requirements	23
Comment 10: Emission Offsets	23

Comment 11: Cumulative Impacts	24
Comment 12: Technology.....	26
Comment 13: Modeling Issues	26
Comment 14: Dust/Odors	27
Comment 15: Alternate Sites Analysis.....	28
Comment 16: Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	29
Comment 17: Truck Traffic.....	30
Comment 18: Deposition.....	31

Section II, Subsection 1: Responses to EIP.....32

Comment 1: PM _{2.5} Applicability	33
Comment 2: VOC Applicability	32
Comment 3: NO _x Precursor.....	33
Comment 4: PM _{2.5} Applicability	33
Comment 5: SO ₂ Emissions.....	34
Comment 6: Emissions Limits.....	35
Comment 7: CEM Data	36
Comment 8: Monitoring	36
Comment 9: Opacity	37
Comment 10: Mass Emissions.....	37
Comment 11: CO BACT	37
Comment 12: CEMS Data	39
Comment 13: GHG Emissions	40
a) MDE must explain how the proposed GHG emission limit was calculated; it is much higher than that for Energy Answers’ Baltimore incinerator; the CO ₂ emissions factor that was used was forty percent higher than that used by EPA’s emissions factor; there is no explanation of how steam flow rate was calculated..	40
b) MDE must revise the draft PSD permit to clarify the compliance demonstration method for the GHG limit.....	42
c) MDE must revise the PSD permit to state that the GHG limit applies to biogenic and non-biogenic emissions	42
Comment 14: Preconstruction monitoring data for NO _x , CO, SO ₂ and PM ₁₀	43
Comment 15: Air Quality Impacts.....	43
a) MDE must define the incinerator’s “Maximum Continuous Rating” and must revise the permit to limit the incinerator to operation under modeled conditions.....	43
b) MDE must identify which SO ₂ emission rate was used in evaluating SO ₂ impacts on short-term air quality standards.....	44

Section II, Subsection 2: Responses to Georgetown University Law Center, Institute for Public Representation.....44

Comment 1: Potential to emit SO ₂	44
a) The proposed permit mistakes the facility’s potential to emit SO ₂ at maximum capacity	44

b) Potential to emit calculations are inadequate because they do not include fugitive emissions from truck traffic. Fugitive emissions must be considered in determining the major status of a large municipal waste incinerator	45
c) The basis for calculating the potential to emit is inadequate	45
Comment 2: Fuel Mix Assumption.....	45
Comment 3: SO ₂ Emissions.....	46
Comment 4: Toxic Pollutants	46
Comment 5: Dioxins/Furans	47
a) FCCRWTE’s proposed permit must require more frequent monitoring	47
b) Annual stack testing of cadmium, lead and dioxins/furans is inadequate	47
c) The proposed permits do not adequately specify mercury monitoring requirement or explain the rationale for the proposed heavy metal monitoring regime	48
d) MDE must revise its permit approval because it has not specified the monitoring regime for mercury.....	48
Comment 6: Sewage Sludge and Tires	49
Comment 7: The Proposed Permits Must Set Minimum Standards for Imported Waste	49
Comment 8: Alternative Site Analysis	50
Comment 9: Carroll County.....	51
Comment 10: Material Separation Plan.....	51
a) MDE must consider waste separation as a fuel-cleaning technology.....	51
b) MDE must revise its BACT analysis of clean fuels to include separated waste	52
c) Waste separation is not only an available technology, it is the best available technology for GHG reduction	52
Comment 11: NO _x Offsets	54
Comment 12: The Refuse Disposal Permit Does Not Specify Disposal Sites for Ash	54

Section III: Responses to Comments on Water Related Permits

Comment 1: Deny the Discharge Permit	55
Comment 2: Deposition of Pollutants.....	55
Comment 3: Temperature of Discharge.....	56
Comment 4: Toxic Pollutants	58
Comment 5: Dilution of Pollutants.....	58
Comment 6: Temperature Effect on Chemical Composition	59
Comment 7: Self-monitoring	59
Comment 8: Toxicity Concerns	59
Comment 9: Pollutants from Eastalco	60
Comment 10: Contaminated Washwater	60
Comment 11: Cooling Tower Additives.....	60
Comment 12: Dissolved Oxygen Levels	61
Comment 13: Products of Combustion in the Wastewater.....	61
Comment 14: Anti-degradation	61

Comment 15: Toxicity Testing	62
Comment 16: Preventing Storm Water Runoff	63
Comment 17: Contamination of Storm Water Runoff.....	63
Comment 18: Metal Limits and Monitoring.....	63
Comment 19: Scrubber Effect of Cooling Towers	64
Comment 20: Disposal of Ash.....	64
Comment 21: Sewer Concerns.....	65
Comment 22: Disinfectant concerns	65
Comment 23: Impacts on Monocacy	66
Comment 24: Reuse of Wastewater.....	66

Section IV: Responses to Comments on the Solid Waste Permit67

Comment 1: Proximity of the Proposed Incinerator to Schools and Day Care Facilities.....	67
Comment 2: Waste Incineration Creates a Market for Trash in Maryland Which Will Have Negative Impacts on Local Recycling and Composting Programs.....	67
Comment 3: Effect of Potential Lower Trash Volumes on the Incinerator	69
Comment 4: Ship Trash Out of State	71
Comment 5: Current and Future Recycling Efforts will Leave Little Left in the Garbage Stream with Very Much Burnable Energy	71
Comment 6: Adverse Environmental Impact and Public Health Concerns.....	71
Comment 7: Dust	72
Comment 8: Effects of Solid Waste Handling Issues on Monocacy Battlefield	72
Comment 9: Concerns about Disposal of Toxic Ash Generated from Burning Trash at the County's Landfill	74
Comment 10: Ash Volumes in the Landfill.....	75
Comment 11: Blowing Ash	76
Comment 12: Ash Transport Mitigation Measures	76
Comment 13: Is Ash a Hazardous Waste?.....	77
Comment 14: Self-Monitoring.....	77
Comment 15: Violations of Environmental Regulations by Wheelabrator	77
Comment 16: The Following are Comments Received on Specific Conditions of the Draft Refuse Disposal Permit	78
a) Part II, Facility Specific Conditions C.1 and 2	78
(i) The Refuse Disposal Permit limits the acceptance of waste to a maximum of 602,250 tons per year, while the Air Permit Allows 1,500 tons per day to be burned. The average per day should be allowed to exceed 1,500 to allow for some variability, but the average over a year should not exceed the 1,500 tons per day. Are there specific emission, pollution or air quality parameter limits above which MDE will impose restrictions on the volume of material accepted at the facility?	78
(ii) Who determines if nuisance conditions, harborage of disease vectors, etc. are occurring at the site and will monitoring results determine if these restrictions are	

	undertaken or will the responsibility fall on neighbors to detect the nuisance conditions?.....	78
b)	Part II, Facility Specific Condition E.....	79
	(i) How will Wheelabrator mitigate mercury in waste if their preliminary Mercury Diversion Plan (MDP) says mercury-containing items are typically small in size and difficult to identify in the waste stream? The MDP relies heavily upon efforts of the counties to inform the public of potential environmental issues associated with improper disposal of mercury; will there be new programs set up and who will pay for them?.....	79
	(ii) The facility will likely need to import half of its waste stream per year from unknown sources in order to operate at full capacity. The MDP does not address waste coming from outside sources, and the permit should require that jurisdictions providing waste meet standards satisfying Frederick and Carroll Counties' hazardous waste diversion goals. Will the public be able to comment on the MDP? Acceptance of sewage sludge at the facility should be limited to sewage sludge from wastewater treatment plants that serve dental offices that use amalgam separators, due to the presence of mercury in sewage sludge	79
c)	Part III, General Condition A.....	81
d)	Part III, General Conditions B and C.....	83
	(i) Permit should specify exactly how the facility must be enclosed, and whether hanging slats are required or sufficient to consider truck entry and exit openings "closed"	83
	(ii) Will there be regular inspections of the facility to ensure that solid waste is being handled appropriately and nuisance conditions are controlled? What means of enforcement does the county have to ensure compliance with the permit conditions, how can the county force compliance if complaints are received, and can the county assess financial penalties and take legal proceedings if the facility is in violation?	83
e)	Part III, General Condition D.....	83
	(i) How is it determined where the ash will be disposed, and what will prevent the Reichs Ford Road Landfill from running out of space if all ash goes there? Will records be kept on how much ash is disposed of and where it is landfilled?	83
	(ii) A recipient facility for ash should be identified in the application for ash that required testing demonstrates to be hazardous.....	84

(iii)	Yearly testing of the ash is not sufficient and it's unrepresentative; the waste stream is variable and the different types of waste material as well as the ash itself can be manipulated prior to the annual testing. If an annual sample is found to be hazardous, how will it be possible to retrieve previous loads that were potentially disposed of improperly at local landfills or determine which as was toxic? Bottom ash and fly ash should be tested separately and the designation of whether the ash is hazardous should be based on total concentrations, not how much leaches in short-term laboratory tests. The IP Tox test should be used rather than the TCLP test. Dioxins/furans and zinc should be added to the list of parameters to be tested.....	85
(iv)	The permit should require more detail on how the trucks transporting ash are to be covered to prevent the escape of particulate matter and liquid leakage.....	88
f)	Part IV, Approval Conditions	88
(i)	Is there a limit to the quantity of tires that can be present prior to processing or time allowed before processing? .	88
(ii)	Why is the permittee maintaining records on incoming and outgoing scrap tires for only three years?	89
(iii)	What happens if the 20,000 tons per year allowable burn capacity is exceeded? Is there a limit on the number of tons per year of tires that can be burned after five years and does this limit last for the operational life of the facility?	89
(iv)	For how many years will the permittee have to submit semiannual tonnage reports; will these reports be filed through the lifetime of the facility; and will receipts be issued for the duration of the facility? The scrap tires from consumers need to be tracked in the same fashion as those from commercial haulers and in perpetuity.....	89
(v)	Why does the permit detail the exportation of tires from the facility if the tires are to be burned?	90
(vi)	What enforcement options can MDE employ after a violation? Whole tires are a health hazard and permit should require tires to be chipped prior to receipt at the facility and stored within a building	90
(vii)	What will be done with partially burned scrap tire material since often tires don't fully combust?.....	90
(viii)	What will be done with the scrap metal from the tires; is it clean enough to go to a salvage yard and will trucks transporting the metal be covered during transport?.....	91
(ix)	The draft permit states that the permittee shall not operate the facility in a manner that will "impair the quality of the	

	environment.” This statement needs to be detailed with examples	92
g)	Part V, Standard Conditions	92
	(i) Section A: What is meant by a “responsible individual” and what credentials or education is required of this individual?.....	92
	(ii) Section B: The Right of Entry condition states that MDE, at reasonable times, will be allowed access to the facility. Since the facility will operate 24 hours a day, why would MDE not be granted access at any time? This section should also allow for the use of handled test meters for air sampling.	92
	(iii) Since there will be limited personnel on the tipping floor and many hazardous wastes are small, is it feasible to expect that all incoming loads will be sufficiently inspected to detect unacceptable waste?	93
	(iv) Section F.1 and G: “insure” should read “ensure”	93
	(v) Section K: Under what conditions would MDE authorize contaminated liquids to be discharged to waters of the state and not a treatment facility	93
	(vi) Section O: MDE should specify how quickly repairs should be made to damaged monitoring and pollution control systems; the wording “damage shall be completed as soon as practical” is too general	94
	(vii) Section P: Penalties for Tampering: This condition should include the work “testing”	94
	(viii) Section U: Can the actual expiration date of the permit be included in this Section?	95
	(ix) If Wheelabrator goes out of business or enters bankruptcy while this facility is operational, is the Authority responsible for finding a new business partner to run the operations, would this lead to increased costs to the taxpayers or the Authority, and would this impact local pickup services or importation of waste from Carroll County?	95
	(x) Section X: How will MDE monitor the facility for noncompliance of the permits and regulations and what actions may be taken if noncompliances occur?.....	95
h)	General Comments.....	95
	(i) How much filter cake residue is there, how is it disposed and where, and how is it tested?	95
	(ii) How many bag filters are there, how often are they changed and under what criteria, how are they tested, how are they disposed and where, and are there specific regulations regarding their disposal?	96

(iii)Is scrap metal recovered from the ash stream to be covered and placed in leak proof containers during transport? How will it be handled at metal scrap yards and are there requirements for the proper handling and recycling of ash coated scrap metal?97

(iv)How will the waste ash from the burning of tires be returned to their respective/originating landfills, if scrap tires will be brought to the facility from all points and from various scrap tire haulers? How will this be monitored?97

Comment 17: Frederick Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP)97

Section V: Comments Received in Support of Project (no response necessary).....98