



Air Quality Permitting Response to Public Comments

July 23, 2021

Permit to Construct No. P-2021.0008

Project No. 62589

**Avail Valley Construction-ID, LLC - Driggs
Driggs, Idaho**

Facility ID No. 081-00009

Prepared by:
Zach Pierce, Permit Writer
AIR QUALITY DIVISION

Final

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND	3
PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	3

BACKGROUND

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided for public comment on the proposed permit to construct for Avail Valley Construction-ID, LLC - Driggs from June 16, 2021 through July 16, 2021, in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.209.01.c. During this period, comments were submitted in response to DEQ's proposed action. Each applicable comment and DEQ's response is provided in the following section.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Public comments regarding the technical and regulatory analyses and the air quality aspects of the proposed permit are summarized below. Questions, comments, and/or suggestions received during the comment period that did not relate to the air quality aspects of the permit application, the Department's technical analysis, or the proposed permit are not addressed. For reference purposes, a copy of the Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho can be found at: <http://adminrules.idaho.gov/rules/current/58/0101.pdf>.

Comment 1: Comments were submitted requesting that the permit be denied, because emissions from the facility would jeopardize people, quality of life, and the environment.

Response 1: The permit has been developed in accordance with the Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho (Rules) and applicable Federal regulations.

The modeling analysis conducted for the estimated criteria pollutants demonstrate that the facility will not cause or significantly contribute to a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) provided compliance with the proposed permit is maintained.

Additionally, it was demonstrated that the estimated toxic air pollutant (TAP) emissions resulting from this project comply with Section 210 of the Rules.

Comment 2: Comments were submitted stating that the location of the facility was too close to residences. These comments included concerns regarding the continued growth of the area as well as noise and pollution concerns to nearby residents.

Response 2: Determinations about the location of businesses are made by the appropriate local governing authorities. DEQ does not have the authority to determine the location of the facility or require the facility to relocate as part of this air permitting action. Upon receipt of an air quality application, it is DEQ's responsibility to evaluate emissions, and where appropriate, impose conditions in a permit to ensure compliance with applicable State and Federal air quality requirements.

Comment 3: Comments were submitted stating that the permit be denied because odors are produced when the facility is operating.

Response 3: Permit Condition 2.5 states "the permittee shall not allow, suffer, cause, or permit the emission of odorous gases, liquids, or solids into the atmosphere in such quantities as to cause air pollution," in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.776. The permit also requires recordkeeping requirements pertaining to odor complaints in which the facility must take appropriate corrective action. These requirements have been established to minimize odors originating from the facility and are consistent with requirements in other air permits and State rules.

Comment 4: Section 3.6 of the draft permit should be changed to add a daily production limit. This would make this section consistent with Section 3.17.

Response 4: The daily production limit was added to the final permit for consistency with the analysis and rest of the permit.

Comment 5: The use of met data from Rexburg Idaho does not seem reasonable. This data reflects conditions detected far from the facility location in Driggs, Idaho. I request that additional met data be located or collected and that the met data used for modeling air quality impacts of this permit action be reflective of actual conditions. This is of particular interest to me given that I live in close proximity to the facility. I request that the met data be refined and further modeling conducted before the permit is finalized

Response 5: Ideally, DEQ would use meteorological data obtained from the site where a facility is located. In this case, meteorological data of sufficient quality to use in atmospheric dispersion models were not available for the area around Driggs. Because of the high cost of collecting meteorological data and the time necessary to collect sufficient data (a minimum of one year), DEQ allows minor sources (emission rates less than major source thresholds) to use the most representative meteorological data readily available. Meteorological data from Rexburg is closer to the site than any other readily available dataset and DEQ believes these data are adequately representative of conditions at the site for minor source modeling purposes.

DEQ's experience from permitting portable hot mix asphalt plants, using over 20 different meteorological datasets collected throughout Idaho, has demonstrated that use of different meteorological datasets does not substantially change the magnitude of modeled impacts for hot mix asphalt plants. This is because stack heights of sources are relatively short and maximum impacts tend to be very near the emission release point. Furthermore, DEQ has found that the Rexburg dataset often results in modeled impacts higher than other datasets.

Comment 6: The air quality modeling for TAPs, nickel in particular, should be based upon maximum potential emissions that could occur over one hour of plant operations. I was about to assume the analysis had this basis, as adjusted for operation over 8 months of the year, but then I was not sure. I am concerned that the TAP analysis should reflect potential short term impacts from emissions of carcinogenic metals such as nickel, so I am commenting to make sure this is the case.

Response 6: As indicated in the DEQ Air Impact Modeling Review Memorandum, Idaho Air Rules Section 210 (IDAPA 58.01.01.210) provides requirements and methods/data to use in analyses to demonstrate compliance with TAP emissions. Established Acceptable Ambient Concentrations of Carcinogens (AACCs) are based on long-term impacts, assuming a 70-year potential exposure period. As such, it is appropriate to model using long-term emission rates, which are taken to be maximum allowable annual rates.