New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
2176 Guilderland Avenue, Schenectady, New York 12306
(518) 382-0680 (phone) – (518) 382-1065 (FAX)

May 28, 1992

Thomas C. Jorling
Commissioner

Dear Interested Party,

This letter is to acknowledge receipt of your comment letters and/or statements given at the Legislative Public Comment Hearing on the Norlite 373 Hazardous Waste/Air Pollution Control permit application. The Department appreciates the time and thought which went into your comments. We have carefully considered them and as you are by now aware have issued approval of the permit.

We recognize this decision may not satisfy everyone but a copy of the Responsiveness Summary is provided as a response to how the Department dealt with your comments and concerns. The Department is pledged to actively pursuing strict compliance at the Norlite facility and see substantial progress having been made and more to come in the next 7 months to reduce further the negative impacts on the residents around the plant particularly those related to fugitive dust.

We have added a new requirement on Norlite for a yearly Compliance Report which will be made available for public review. Its purpose to not only to better inform you of what is happening at the facility in terms of compliance with Department permits and consent orders, but also allow for us to hear from you to better gauge the effectiveness of the site's environmental controls from your standpoint and pinpoint problem areas to be dealtewith. The first report will be due in the fall with subsequent reports due annually inthe spring. Also a copy of the updated complete application is being kept on file at the Cohoes Public Library.

If you have questions please feel free to contact either myself, Sanjay Saraiya at 457-9254eor Mike Styk (who coordinates our environmental monitoring program at Norlitel at 382-0680.

Sincerely Yours,

William J. Clarke

William J. Clarke
Regional Permit Administrator
Region 4

NORLI16H.17

NORLITE 373 HW/APC

FACT SHEET ADDENDUM

H. RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

1. PUBLIC NOTICE AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Initial public notice issued the last week of December, 1991 and published in the Department's Environmental Notice Bulletin (ENB), Albany Times Union and broadcast on WGY radio. Notice of Public Information Meeting and Legislative Public Comment Hearing was issued 3/18/92 with publication in the ENB (the week of 3/16/92), Times Union (3/20, 3/24, 3/25/92) and broadcast on WGY radio (3/20/92). The Public Information meeting was held the evening of April 8,1992 in the Cohoes City Hall with the Legislative Public Comment Hearing held at the same time and location on April 23,1992. The public comment period closed on 5/8/92 with the hearing record and letters received being made part of the total record of the Department's decision and determinations on this application and permit. A total of 7 speakers presented comments at the Legislative Public Comment Hearing and 10 letters were received along with 4 from Norlite (see attachments A and B).

2. ISSUES RAISED AND DEPARTMENT RESPONSE/DETERMINATIONS

As was stated at the Public Hearing the Department has four choices regarding further action on this permit application: 1) issue the permit with the conditions contained in the draft permit; 2) deny the permit; 3) issue the permit with changes to the draft permit or 4) determine that substantive or significant issues have been raised necessitating an adjudicatory hearing before an Administrative Law Judge.

After reviewing and evaluating the public comments, the applicant's responses to these comments and the comments submitted by the applicant, the Department finds that no substantive or significant issues have been raised requiring adjudication and issuance of the permit is warranted. Specifically approved are:

1) The continuing operations of storage of up to 144,000 gallons of liquid organic hazardous wastes and its use as fuel in the lightweight aggregate kilns as well as the storage of up to 214 55 gallon drums of storage tank sludges prior to offsite shipment and disposal.

2) The installation of new facilities to upgrade and/or replace existing so as to meet regulatory standards and improve environmental controls. This includes replacement hazardous waste storage, processing and piping facilities with secondary containment. The upgrading of the air pollution control equipment is covered by prior approvals under a 1989 consent order. The installation of a wastewater treatment plant is covered under the facility's SPDES permit. Dust and noise control improvements have been specifically incorporated into the permit conditions.

3) Allowing an increase in the concentrations of metals in the hazardous waste fuels if the Department agrees with the conclusions in the pending Norlite wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) engineering report and previously submitted mass balance analysis that with the exception of placing a limitation on mercury, the increases in the other six metals (zinc, copper, nickel, selenium, arsenic and chromium) will have little or no additional deleterious effect on the quality of the currently untreated air pollution control scrubber system wastewater discharge. (As discussed elsewhere a new WWTP will be under construction within the next few months.) Two new liquid organic waste streams having waste codes FO24 and FO25 and the incineration of the storage tank sludges will have to successfully pass the Kiln 1 Trial Burn stack test this summer before they can be burned as fuel.

In response to the comments received, certain changes and additions to the permit are warranted to reflect the completion of certain permit requirements already, incorporate certain minor acceptable changes in operational parameters, incorporate the revised facility improvements plans (e.g. the replacement hazardous waste storage tank/piping system) reviewed as part of this application, assure fugitive dust controls are strictly implemented and adhered to and assure attention to compliance on all permit/consent order requirements through the institution of a yearly compliance report which will be available for public review. Attachment C details the changes made to the permit. Changes of particular note include:

1) the incorporation of the dust control measures and compliance deadline (12/30/92) which go beyond the primary control measures found in the presently required dust control plan;

2) adding a requirement for a yearly compliance report covering facility compliance on all DEC permits (Hazardous Waste, Air Pollution Control, SPDES wastewater discharge, Mined Land Reclamation and Solid Waste) and project key compliance elements or milestones. This report will be supplemented by a DEC evaluation of facility compliance and made available for public review and comment. Its purpose is to assure more regular communication with the public on progress in meeting compliance schedules, operating standards and an added means of gauging the

effectiveness of environmental controls and identifying problems which need follow-up.

Several changes requested by Norlite in the draft permit (e.g. increasing the Halogen (or Chlorine) concentration in the Hazardous waste fuel have been determined to be major actions which will be subject to public review in a major modification of this permit later this year.

The key issues raised in the public comments along with the Department's responses and determinations are described below:

1) Norlite has generated severe dust and noise impacts on area residents. Commentors' requests ranged from shutting Norlite down to limiting their use of hazardous waste as a fuel until they do a satisfactory job in substantially lessening/eliminating this problem. Additional commentors requested that hours of operation be limited and Norlite install additional noise control equipment.

DEC Response: Dust, in particular fugitive dust from non smokestack sources such as lightweight aggregate piles, conveyors, haul roads to name a few, has been identified as a significant problem by the Department based upon our own inspections and citizen complaints. There are no specific quantitative emission standards for fugitive dust emissions as there are for smokestack emissions. Therefore, in prior years Department Air Pollution Control permits only covered stack emissions. Department efforts to control dust were focused on assuring these stack sources were meeting emission standards for particulates by determining how clear or opaque the non steam stack emissions were. Included in these control efforts were particulate emission controls on the storage silos. To minimize fugitive dust emissions Department inspectors as part of their Department's environmental monitoring program oversight of Norlite's use of hazardous waste fuel (LGF), would routinely require the company to keep its water trucks operational in order to control dust coming off the haul roads. In 1990 as part of a settlement of SPDES wastewater limits discharge violations into the Salt Kill the signed Order on Consent imposed a requirement for Norlite to develop and then implement upon Department approval a Fugitive Dust control plan and a Noise control plan. These plans were submitted, approved and incorporated into the Air Pollution Control permits for the Kilns as enforceable permit requirements in the fall of 1990. The company was required to install and maintain measures such as additional water sprays on roads, material transfer points and storage piles, enclosures around material screening operations, covers on some conveyors, winterizing water spray lines, improving housekeeping procedures, install radar activated backup whistles on heavy equipment. etc.. The order also required that the company to submit in September,

1991 a progress report and an evaluation of the effectiveness of these primary control measures and the need to implement a secondary tier, or more stringent, level of controls found in the plan such as wind barriers, more enclosures around material transfer points, use of a windscreen/noise barrier along the eastern boundary of the facility.

In February of 1992 the Department cited Norlite for non compliance with the implementation of the Fugitive Dust Control Plan based upon both site inspections and an evaluation of their 9/91 report on implementation. They were given until the end of February to identify a plan of action to come into full compliance no later than 4/15/92. These compliance deadlines were met and the installation of the primary dust controls from the 1990 plan completed. Several measures have been implemented which go beyond the 1990 plan such as the graveling of key roadways and routing all heavy truck traffic from the Saratoga Street entrance to the Elm Street entrance. In addition, measures such as installing improved kiln seals, completing graveling of all roads, assuring all conveyors have have fully functioning covers, seeding inactive areas, etc. as detailed in their response to comments and Best Management Practices Plan are due for completion by 12/30/92.

The past poor performance of Norlite on dust and noise control is not in dispute. It is also clear from the comments that when the Department did not receive any complaints on dust and noise for nearly all of 1991 this did not mean ongoing impacts of significance to area residents were not occurring. While the comments on dust and noise impacts do not warrant permit denial nor raise substantive and significant issues requiring an Adjudicatory Hearing, they do warrant additional permit conditions to assure strict compliance. Specifically, the added/revised fugitive dust control measures will be added to the permit to supplement the 1990 dust control plan and 1990 noise control plan requirements. Specific operating hour restrictions will not be imposed at this time as 1) no mining, HW deliveries or aggregate pickups are made after working hours, 2) due to the nature of the operation, the kilns are run continuously as their high temperatures do not allow for daily shutdowns and 3) the back up alarms (for which noise reduction measures have been installed) have been identified as the most noticeable and significant source of negative noise impacts from the facility. The Department will also require Norlite to submit a yearly compliance progress report on 4/1 (the first one will be due 10/1/92) describing progress in meeting all permit and consent order requirements and project future key compliance elements. The effectiveness of the fugitive dust controls and the use of the recently installed radar activated equipment backup alarms will be evaluated. This report will be made available for public review and comment. The Department's environmental monitor staff will inspect weekly for dust and noise controls compliance and other requirements and will take whatever action it deems necessary to enforce

them. With Norlite currently in compliance with the primary controls required in the 1990 plans and the additional measures due for completion by 12/30/92, an effective reduction in dust impacts has taken place with further improvements in sight. If warranted, additional measures will be imposed on Norlite to make additional facility improvements to reduce these impacts further. However, this will not reduce the impact of noise and dust to zero given the nature of this facility and its proximity to residential areas. The land use pattern which has developed over the years cannot be undone.

Norlite has in its Mined Land reclamation permit a requirement to monitor blasting with seismic equipment in order to assure it is not exceeding the required levels considered safe by the Department to prevent excessive ground vibrations which might cause damage to nearby structures. The most recent blast cited in the comments was mistakenly not monitored and the company has been put on notice that all blasts must be so monitored and the seismic readings provided to the Department. Based upon our investigation of the blast it was determined that it was carried in a similar manner to all other blasts for which we have seismic readings that show ground vibration levels within the acceptable limits. The reason this blast was so noticeable is that it produced an "air blast" or excessive air concussion but not, the Department believes, excessive ground vibration. Norlite has committed to avoiding this type of blast from occurring again and the Department will be monitoring this to assure this commitment is carried out and if documented damage to adjacent properties is occurring will further take action to address it.

2) Treat Norlite as a "Bad Actor" due to its poor compliance history and restrict/prohibit them from burning certain types or all types of hazardous waste or do not issue permit until they come into compliance with dust control requirements.

DEC response: The Department does have a relatively new policy in place which allows it to deny permit applications or place additional restrictions in the permits for facility owner/operators with a history of past serious and persistent violations such that it calls into question their ability to properly operate the facility that permits are applied for. In 1985 and again in 1989 and 1990 enforcement actions were initiated and resolved with settlements requiring specific facility improvements. For two of the consent orders (1985 and 1989) satisfactory progress was made as a Department environmental monitor program was set up, additional operating restrictions imposed, storage tank facilities upgraded and in 1989 the burning and storage of hazardous waste ceased until the installation of Best Available Control Technology air pollution control equipment was installed with Kiln 2 upgraded in 1990 and Kiln 1 nearing completion. The 1990 order presented a more mixed compliance picture as Norlite did produce the required fugitive dust and noise control plans, but implemented some but not all required

elements. Norlite did submit a waste water discharge treatability options study to bring its discharge into compliance with its permit limits. However, the schedule for an engineering report and plans slipped as Norlite pursued without success a proposal to tie into the County sewer district. Currently Department inspections have found no additional major hazardous waste, SPDES, solid waste, Air Pollution Control or mining violations in this period.

While Norlite clearly has had a mixed compliance history which has resulted in enforcement action and for the 1990 order did not comply with all deadlines, on balance facility improvements and compliance has been accomplished. This coupled with Norlite's meeting of all milestones in 1) the draft HW/APC permit, 2) the revised compliance schedule in its SPDES permit to design, construct and operate a new wastewater treatment plant and 3) its responsiveness to the fugitive dust letter of non-compliance in February,1992 in implementing controls and committing to additional measures results in a Department judgement that Norlite does not fall under the "Bad Actor" policy warranting permit denial or restrictions beyond those contained in the permit.

3) DEC cannot perform adequate oversight and monitoring due the state's fiscal crisis and the demonstrated lack of compliance by Norlite in meeting dust, noise and water pollution control requirements.

DEC Response: The Department has made compliance a priority at this facility. The Department's oversight of this facility consists of several elements:

1) Inspections by DEC staff several times per week including off hours and weekends under the Environmental Monitor program paid for by Norlite (this allows the Department to augment its staff resources in order to focus on major facilities such as Norlite).

2) Periodic detailed inspections by specific DEC program staff (e.g. a yearly detailed hazardous waste inspection is conducted which checks key company records for adherence to the cradle to grave manifest tracking system for hazardous waste which assures all such waste is accounted for including rejected shipments).

3) Built in automatic controls and recording devices on the hazardous waste fuel combustion and flow equipment (the Continuous Emission Monitors, or CEMS, provide a recording of such parameters as temperature, Carbon Monoxide levels, waste fuel quantities and is connected to a Waste Feed Cutoff System, or WFCO, so that if certain required operating parameters -set on the basis of the stack tests-which are found in the permit are exceeded then the waste fuel is cutoff and the kiln switched to either natural gas or fuel oil).

4) Stack tests of air emissions at least once every five years prior to permit renewal or immediately after a major upgrade (Kiln 2 was tested in 1990 and passed after installation of BACT controls, Kiln 1 will be tested this summer after completion of its BACT installations).

5) Analysis of all the hazardous waste fuels received according to a DEC approved Waste Analysis Plan (this process includes the taking of split samples by DEC inspectors every week as a way to verify the per tanker truck load pre-acceptance testing results recorded by Norlite who has an onsite lab and utilizes off site lab services for more complex testing parameters; both Norlite's and the off site lab must be certified by the NYS Department of Health).

6) DEC emergency spill response staff who are on call at all hours to respond to chemical and petroleum spills.

7) An ambient air monitoring program required by this permit designed to measure emission impacts for parameters such as particulates at ground level outside the plant boundaries.

These measures in the Department's view allow for intensive, effective oversight of the Norlite facility. This oversight has been coupled with enforcement actions in 1985, 1989 and 1990 which have and are currently producing demonstrable improvements at the facility. What is needed is to provide additional opportunities for regular dialogue by residents affected by Norlite operations with Department staff both for staff to help gauge the effectiveness of various control measures from the resident's standpoint as well as for residents to be made aware of the measures taken and improvements accomplished. To that end the yearly Compliance Report described above is being instituted as a permit condition.

4) Given the location of Norlite in a river valley, other nearby sources of pollution and proximity to residential areas a commentor requested that Norlite should be limited to burning hazardous waste fuels consisting only of low metal content solvents and alcohols. A further restriction was proposed to allow only combustion of fossil fuels such as natural gas to reduce air pollution impacts (The case of a 1990 denial of a proposed HW incinerator in Braintree, Mass. was held up as an example of why Norlite should not be allowed to burn HW.). This includes not allowing the requested increase in metals concentrations in the HW fuel requested by Norlite nor the use of waste oil and requiring the preparation of a cumulative air emission impact analysis and health risk assessment on respiratory affects, cancer risks and stress related impacts due to facility operations and modifications such as increasing stack heights. Transportation of these wastes was also identified as a risk to residents through potential spills and accidents.

DEC Response: The comments raised here go to the heart of the federal and state laws (and regulations) in trying to define acceptable and safe practices in the storage, handling and disposal of hazardous waste. In making a determination on the approvability of this application the Department had to evaluate a number of key factors to assure the safety and sufficiency of Norlite facilities and operational procedures in transporting, storing and burning hazardous waste. This included:

1) Assuring storage facilities are designed and constructed to stringent hazardous waste standards with secondary containment for additional protection against accidental leaks and they have fire suppression systems such as nitrogen blanketing in case of fire or explosion.

2) Transportation routes do not expose the tanker trucks (which have to meet stringent federal design standards) to unnecessary hazards such as train crossings (which is why HW trucks to Norlite are restricted to the Elm Street entrance).

3) Operational procedures and controls are in place (to prevent unpermitted wastes from being accepted and burned, contingency plans are in place to deal with fires and spills)

4) Stack emissions meet state and federal standards (based upon 1990 stack test and installation of controls to assure these limits are met) and

5) An assessment made utilizing stack test data and computer modeling of the impact of those emissions (this produced the Human Health Risk Assessment (HRA) and Allowable Metals Concentration Report both by ENSR Consulting in December 1991).

All of the permit application material was evaluated by the Department with the NYS Department of Health evaluating the HRA. Based upon this total review the Norlite facility falls within the approvable hazardous waste and air pollution control regulatory requirements for facility design, operating procedures and and emission rates and impacts. This means that such factors as the river valley and increased stack height (which reduces air impacts through greater dispersion) was taken into account along with other sources of air pollution and the impacts on human health in reaching this conclusion. Based upon this review the Department can find no basis to ban or restrict to "low metal" hazardous waste solvents or alcohols and that the requested increase in metals concentrations and the addition of FO24, FO25 wastes and onsite HW storage tank sludge will result in the maintenance of acceptable permitted emission levels (the metals increases are restricted based upon wastewater discharge considerations and the

other FO24,F025 and sludge wastes must successfully pass the Kiln 1 Trial Burn stack test.

Having accepted the delegation of the federal hazardous waste program (RCRA) and in some cases having instituted more stringent controls and requirements, both the federal and state governments have instituted standards which have been judged to be protective of human health and the environment. Revisiting the acceptability of these standards is not appropriate in this proceeding. It is important to recognize that the question of what is acceptable is a policy judgement made in the passage of laws and regulations as well as there implementation. Since zero emissions from a combustion source is impossible and our industrial society is based upon combustion sources, some level of acceptable pollution is allowed based upon an evaluation of available scientific evidence of health and environment impacts. A further judgement has been made that it is preferable for hazardous wastes to be reduced, recycled, neutralized, used as a fuel or destroyed by an incineration process rather that landfilled where the potential for contamination of groundwater is great. Thus the wastes permitted to be burned at Norlite fall into a national strategy for the destruction and in this case beneficial use of this waste material (which is at the low end of the scale in hazard and toxicity) as a fuel. Given the high temperatures (2300 F+) and relatively long residence time for combustion gases to travel through the high temperature kilns thus assuring complete destruction of the liquid organic wastes and the ability of the metals to be bound up in the expanded shale provides for a safe and acceptable means of waste disposal. There will continue to be debate over and changes to (as new scientific studies are made and we gain additional experience) over what are acceptable standards and risk (e.g. is 1 additional cancer incidence in a population of 100,000 over a lifetime when a HW combustion facility has Best Available Control Technology installed sufficient?) as laws and regulations are changed.

Of more immediate significance is the fact that the HW standards have had a demonstrable effect in producing cleaner air emissions and a reduced wastewater discharge from Norlite. Specifically, BACT controls (recirculating wet scrubber and dry baghouse) would not have been required at Norlite (to replace a once trough wet air scrubber) as the standards for the combustion of fossil fuel, including coal, are less stringent than that for hazardous waste combustion. Additionally, due to concerns over Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) emissions Norlite can no longer burn coal during the times it switches over to the burning of fossil fuels exclusively.

Finally, the decision in Massachusetts on the Proposed Braintree HW incinerator has no direct bearing on this facility as Norlite has to meet federal and NYS standards in order to receive a permit. Since the impacts of any industrial facility can never be zero it is clear that even with the best

of standards people living near such facilities may still experience adverse effects such as odors, noise, dust, etc... It is for that reason land use controls such as zoning are enacted in order to separate uses such as heavy industrial from residential. Unfortunately, the historical legacy of development patterns and land use controls in this area has not prevented these type of proximity impacts from occurring. The Department has carried out its responsibilities to impose ever more stringent standards on this facility as a condition for remaining in operation and thereby reduce impacts to the nearby residential areas. Short of closing Norlite down (for which the Department has no basis), denying this permit or imposing more stringent fuel restrictions will not, in the Department's judgement, have any demonstrable effect on these proximity impacts over and above the environmental controls imposed on this facility by the Department.

5) Put emission limits in the permit for Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHS), furans/dioxins and test for these substances in the upcoming trial burn stack test.

DEC Response: These substances were tested in the 1990 Trial Burn with the results found to be well within the acceptable health risk limit of 1 additional cancer incidence in a population of 100,000 from a facility utilizing Best Available Control Technology (BACT) air pollution controls. Even in a Trial Burn prior to the installation of the BACT controls similar results (trace amounts or non detectable levels depending upon the air contaminant) were recorded. Given these results and the criteria under which this testing is required (exceedance of the EPA Tier 1 Carbon Monoxide (CO) limit of 100 Parts per million (PPM) which Norlite does not exceed) the Department finds no grounds to require its testing in the Kiln 1 Trial Burn. This CO limit has been found by DEC and the USEPA to be a reliable emission limit which is effective in assuring that emissions of PAHS, dioxins/furans are within acceptable levels so that specific permit limits for these contaminants are not warranted.

6) Norlite proposed several permit changes.

DEC Response: The changes accepted by the Department and the reasons for acceptance are found in Attachment C while those rejected are listed below:

A) Special condition 12: Delete restriction on use of HW fuel with higher metals limits related to wastewater discharge and treatment. This restriction will be changed pursuant to the permit if the wastewater

treatment plant (WWTP) engineering report's evaluation and recommended interim (until the WWTP is built) treatment procedures are approved by the Department.

B) Permit Modules I and III: Change definitions and requirements for additional onsite investigations, including air monitoring, and site cleanup for closure of solid waste management units as these areas are largely closed and remediated/cleaned up or will be within the next few months. No changes will be made in the permit at this time. If the cleanup and soil sampling results are satisfactory these requirements will be deleted in a future permit modification.

C) Raise halogen (chlorine feed rate from 115 lbs/hr to 312 lbs/hr if it successfully passes the Kiln 1 Trial Burn. Also allow an increase in allowable emission rates for cadmium, mercury and zinc while reducing those for lead and nickel so that the overall increase carcinogenic risk identified in the Health Risk Assessment and impacts evaluated in the metals emissions modeling study remain the same. These changes are major modifications which have yet to be fully evaluated by DEC and the Department of Health and will have to go to public review before authorization can be granted even if the Trial Burn is successfully passed.

7) Recommendation made by commentor to not allow the landfilling of the air pollution control system baghouse dust onsite as it is classified as a hazardous waste.

DEC Response: Previously the once through wet scrubber system produced significant quantities of wet "dust" or shale fines which when dry was suitable for use as intermediate cover material at several area landfills. It was classified as solid waste, but essentially consisted of somewhat fine grained shale. Pursuant to Department requirements Norlite constructed a clay lined landfill onsite to take all shale fines not going to area landfills. The landfill has been filled with residual shale fines generated by onsite cleanup and and is now being closed permanently and monitored. With the new APC system the material generated now is a dry baghouse dust. As a result of a derived from rule (i.e. it came out of a combustion process fueled by HW) this material became classified as a hazardous waste by definition earlier this year when NYS adopted the new USEPA criteria despite having passed tests used to determine if a material is genuinely a hazardous waste or not. However, prior to this Norlite applied for and received a Beneficial Use Determination from the Department that it was permissible to mix this material into the finished lightweight aggregate and reuse it as product. Therefore, this material is not landfilled.

5/28/92
Date

William J. Clarke
William J. Clarke
Regional Permit Administrator
Region 4

NORLI16H.E10

Attachment A

Norlite Legislative Public Comment Hearing

April 23, 1992

Commenters

Mark Pascale
27 Western Avenue
Cohoes, NY

Paul Bourgeois
194 Central AVenue
Cohoes, NY

Richard Quay
812 Draper Avenue
Schenectady, NY

Dean Winner
831 8th Avenue
Troy, NY

Frank Kovacs
41 Lancaster Street
Cohoes, NY

Werner Hetener
125 Ontario Street
Cohoes, NY

Paul Kolakowski
18 Lark Street
Cohoes, NY

E:16WC25

Attachment B

Norlite Public Review 1/1/92 - 5/8/92

COMMENTER	DATE OF LETTER
William J. Ziegler Norlite Corporation 628 So. Saratoga St. PO Box 694 Cohoes, NY 12047	May 1, 1992 May 18, 1992 May 20, 1992 May 21, 1992
Mr. & Mrs. Frank Bielawa 84 Cohoes Road Watervliet, NY 12189	April 6, 1992
Ann C. Kolakowski 18 Lark Street Cohoes, NY 12047	January 15, 1992
Paul J. Kolakowski 18 Lark Street Cohoes, NY 12047	March 30, 1992 May 1, 1992 April 10, 1992
Terrance J. Norris 395 Wlvt. Shaker Road Latham, NY 12110-4741	April 28, 1992
Joan Bilinski, et al 307 Central Avenue Cohoes, NY	
David Emanatian 200 Central Avenue Cohoes, NY 12047-4649	May 4, 1992
Paul A. Bourgeois 194 Central Avenue Cohoes, NY 12047	May 7, 1992
John Ayotte 45 Pleasant Ct. Cohoes, NY 12047	April 28, 1992
Paul S. Greene 31 Carriage Road Clifton Park, NY 12065	

E:16WC24

ATTACHMENT 2

NORLITE CORPORATION
LIST OF CHANGES TO DRAFT 373 PERMIT

PAGE NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	REASON
Permit pg. 4 of 7	Condition 5 modified to eliminate requirement for coating of pumphouse floor and containment system for tanks 100 and 200. Condition 6 modified to eliminate the requirement for submission of a revised closure plan to include the newly proposed units.	Permit requires closure of pumphouse by 12/31/92. Tanks 100 and 200 are to be replaced with new tank systems within 10 months of permit issuance. Revised closure plan received 1/23/92.
Module V. pg. 1 of 2	Conditions A and B modified to identify the replacement drum storage pad and to impose a condition that construction shall not commence prior to written approval of plans and specifications.	Although this change in location was conceptually approved during public notice, engineering plans and specifications need to be approved prior to commencement of construction.
Module VI, pg. 1 of 4	Condition A.1 modified to include newly proposed replacement tanks for tanks 100 and 200. Added condition that construction shall not commence prior to written approval of plans and specifications. Changed waste description from "waste solvents" to "organic wastes".	Although this change in design and location was conceptually approved during public notice, engineering plans and specifications need to be approved prior to commencement of construction. Waste description changed per request of Applicant in order to provide clarification.

Module VI, pg. 2 of 4	Condition B.2(a) and (b) modified to reflect construction of new secondary containment system for the new tanks and added approval condition for plans and specifications. Eliminated submission requirement for design specification for underground piping replacement system. Deleted closure condition if compliance date not met.	Changed to conform with replacement tank system requirements. Design specification for replacement piping system received 1/23/92. Tanks 100 and 200 have already been closed so closure condition is not applicable.
Module VII, pg. 1 of 13	Condition A.4. Installation date for new air pollution equipment changed from June 30, 1992 to July 31, 1992. Condition A.5(a). Trial burn commencement date changed from July 15, 1992 to August 15, 1992. Condition A.5(b). Trial burn report submission date changed from September 30, 1992 to October 30, 1992.	To reflect change in on-going construction schedule. Due to change in review and construction schedule. Due to change in review and construction schedule.
Module VII, pg. 2 of 13	Condition A.6 modified to eliminate installation schedule for the CEM system on Kiln 2.	CEM system was installed and is operational.
Module VII, pg. 5 of 13	Condition added to prohibit incineration of waste codes F024 and F025 until successful performance is demonstrated during trial burn.	Although these waste codes were proposed during public notice, it was required that a successful trial burn demonstration be conducted because of possible presence of solids.

Module VII, pg. 6 of 13	Condition D.1. Upper combustion temperature limit changed from 950°F (hourly rolling avg.) to 1100°F (instantaneous). Condition D.4.(a) deleted (LGF mass feed rate limit). Condition D.4.(b). LGF feed rate changed from 10gpm to 10.1 gpm.	Per Applicant's request to reflect changed conditions due to higher stack height requirement and lesser heat loss conditions. Per Applicant's request to delete mass feed rate since a volumetric feed rate limit exists. Specifying both would result in duplication. Per Applicant's request to reflect true trial burn conditions.
Module VII, pg. 8 of 13	Condition D.12. Automatic cut-off limit for LGF flow changed from 10 to 10.1 gpm. Upper temperature limit changed from 950°F to 1100°F.	Corresponding change to pg. 6 of 13. Corresponding change to pg. 6 of 13.
Module VII, pg. 9 of 13	Condition D.13 modified to eliminate monitoring and recording of the mass feed rate of LGF.	Corresponding change to pg. 6 of 13.
Module VII, pg. 11 of 13	Added Condition D.18 to prohibit feeding LGF more than 30 minutes prior to feeding shale and after 30 minutes of ceasing raw material shale processing.	The Department is permitting the use of Hazardous waste as a fuel in kilns for the production of lightweight aggregate and not for incineration where it can be burned without producing the aggregate.
Module VII, pg. 12 of 13	Condition E.6. modified to delete submission date for air monitoring program.	Air monitoring program submitted.
Module VII, pg. 13 of 13	Condition E.7 modified to delete submission date for air pollution control Operation and Maintenance plan.	Plan submitted.