

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

DRAFT MINUTES DEC. 16, 1999

The December 16 Stakeholder meeting began at 9:30 a.m. in the HR building at the Big Island Mill.

Present: Keith Flynt, G-P; Pat Purdy, G-P; Pat Hill, G-P; Dave Beck, EPA; Charlie Howland, EPA; Cindy Huber, US Forest Service; Steve Donohue, EPA; Pat Moore, G-P; John Bellemore, US Forest Service; Judy Strang, Pedlar River Institute; Lloyd Lorenzi, DOE; Mike Ohl, G-P; Bill Jernigan, G-P; Zoe Miles, G-P, Jeff Johnson, G-P; David Beck, EPA; Larry Leonard, VA-DEQ; Jackie Bell, G-P; Charles Edmonds.

Pat Moore welcomed everyone and asked each person to introduce him/herself and the agency which he/she represents.

Charlie Howland, EPA, gave a presentation on "Elements of the X-L Process":

- a) Some of the points included in his presentation included the history of Project X-L and how it addresses new technologies. Project X-L is designed with the recognition that community stakeholders have more knowledge than laymen would have had in the past. Project X-L works in partnership with industry, stakeholders and regulators, including sustainable development and environmental justice issues. It also strives to strengthen existing programs.
- b) Involvement in Project X-L is voluntary and is designed to allow industries to test innovative technologies and transfer lessons learned with others in the industry.
- c) The criteria for X-L is stakeholder involvement, transferability, feasibility, accountability/evaluation, and avoiding shifting of risk burden.
- d) 35 projects have reached the final X-L level as of 10/99. 15 are still in development, including Big Island.
- e) Stakeholders can be involved as direct participants, commentators, or general public.
- f) Stakeholder expectations include:
  - i. Transparent process
  - ii. Everyone has access to information
  - iii. Everyone is treated with respect
  - iv. Stakeholders have the opportunity to influence outcome
  - v. Stakeholders have responsibility to work for positive outcome
- a) Final Project Agreement (FPA) development steps were discussed.
- b) Judy Strang asked what communication had been used to contact stakeholders. A discussion followed about the various people and organizations that had been contacted during 1999 as potential stakeholders.

Pat Moore then gave a presentation on "General Mill and Project Overview": ( A hard copy of the presentation has been made available to all Stakeholders and can be found in the local project repositories)

- a) The Big Island Mill uses 400,000 tons of recycled material a year and is one of the five largest sites for recycled material.
- b) The Cluster Rule was explained.
- c) Gasification benefits, including a discussion of steam recovery and transferability to industry was presented.

- d) Gasification is more energy efficient because the steam generated can be used, reducing conventional power boiler use.
- e) Asking for flexibility does not mean that we will burn more or less coal.
- f) The representatives from the US Forest Service presented concerns about visibility, water quality, sulfur dioxide, NOX emissions, and ozone levels. They are seeing a forest growth loss greater than 10%.
- g) A discussion followed about modeling for all emissions.
- h) A discussion was held about enrolling "fringe" stakeholders.

Mike Ohl presented "Technical Review of Gasification" and process explanations. ( Again, this presentation has been made available to all participants and can be found in the repositories.) Questions and answers followed. Mike passed around samples of black liquor and green liquor.

The questions was asked how this process will affect the noise coming from the mill. Will it increase? Pat Purdy answered that the mill will be looking at ways of insulating the process. Jeff Johnson said there should be a noise reduction because when the mill blows pulp mill steam, that is a major source of noise. It will be collected under the MACT I modifications process.

Judy Strang made the comment that the hum from the mill can be heard far away.

Pat Hill presented "Stakeholder Expectations, Roles, and Responsibilities":

- a) Who are stakeholders?
- b) What is the difference between stakeholders and commentators?
- c) A discussion ensued about the difference between "dictating" and "vetoing" by the EPA.
- d) Consensus is general agreement, not unanimous agreement. It is hoped this general consensus will be reached during the process. However, if matters of disagreement arise for which no consensus is reached, the vote of simple majority will be the determinant. Anyone may file a minority report.
- e) The stakeholder process involves
  - i. Time commitment
  - ii. Project schedule
  - iii. Stakeholders reaching out to new members
  - iv. Repositories have been made available at the Amherst and Big Island public libraries, which includes all the public documents.
- a) The FPA will:
  - i. Be filed in the Federal Register and Virginia Register.
  - ii. Can be signed by stakeholder.
  - iii. Include any letters of support.
- a) The EPA has commented that the Big Island Mill has done a good job of enrolling stakeholders.

A discussion followed about the NEPA process. Lloyd Lorenzi, DOE, advised the group that the discussion was premature.

Following a break, the group worked on amendments to the draft FPA.

The following is a list of the comment made during this discussion:

- A. Clarify “replacing non-renewable coal” on bottom of pg. 1.
- B. Clarify/define “medium machines” in next to last sentence of pg. 1.
- C. Add a glossary.
- D. Eliminate the paragraph about flooding on pg. 2, but keep the first sentence from that paragraph.
- E. Add Dave Beck to pg. 4
- F. Add an appendix w/ a list of stakeholders
- G. Delete “epamail” on Donahue’s e-mail address.
- H. Pg. 6 – Charlie made a point of ? of other ideas/approaches out there – should be raised now. Pg. 6 (b) last paragraph. (*Need help with this comment from anyone who remembers*)
- I. FDA – decision tree – does this need to be more specific?
- J. Pg. 6 – how long will the trials last? When will they be conducted?
- K. Include kraft trials
- L. Pg. 7 – performance testing expanded – permits
- M. Define what constitutes “failure.”
- N. Include Tomlinson Recovery boiler in emissions table.
- O. Add facility wide to Table of Emissions
- P. Pg. 6/7, section B – American Forest Service as source
- Q. Section B -Cost savings section needs clarifying. Also through “capital effectiveness.”
- R. Section D - Under “innovation,” take out comparison to Recovery Boiler
- S. Section E - AFPA move to “transferability”
- T. Section IV, a – steam swap – permit?
- U. General – what will be the legally enforceable document? Mention revised Va. Permit, possibly how interacts w/ Mact II relief.
- V. Define what would trigger ammendments.

Discussion of when to have the next meeting resulted in the group agreeing to meet on January 19, 2000, at 8:30 a.m. at the mill, with the next meeting tentatively set for February 9, 2000, at 8:30 a.m., and the final meeting for March 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting closed at 4:30 p.m. with any interested participants taking a tour of the mill.

Zoe Miles  
Communications Manager