OPA
JUL 02 2001
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
JUN 29 PM 11:57
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Johnny Arney
PO Box 582
Elkhart Tex
75944
(936) 8543148

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
ADSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Johnny Arney

Name

PO Box 582

Address

Etoile Tex 75944

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002

19690
DSK

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Atkinson

Name

PO Box 582

Address

Etoile Tex 75944

City/State/Zip

I live with in 12 Miles of Paper Mill But work at a Bisness 50 Hour a Week less than 1 Mile from the

OPA H
JUL 02 2001
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
JUN 29 PM 11:57

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Dian Avriett

Dian Avriett
1422 N. Timberland Dr.
Lufkin, Texas, 75901
(936) 639-6322

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:22

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002

19690
DSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Dian Avriett
Name

1422 N. Timberland Dr.
Address

Lufkin, Texas, 75901
City/State/Zip

I own a business within 1 mile of this mill and am there 60+ hours a week. I am concerned about the emissions for my 19 employees (4 with respiratory problems) as well as for myself.

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

OPA H
JUL 02 2001

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Jammie Arnett
605 Sugar Lane
Lufkin Tex
75902
Ph# 936-639-5584

Received Jun-29-2001 11:18 From-9366324669 To-TNRCC / CHIEF CLERK Page 002

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
JAN -4 PM 3:23
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
19490 NSR
OPA
JAN 07 2002

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Name

1005 Sugar Lane

Address

Lufkin Tex 75901

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:22
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Jay Aurich

Name

221 Lee Ln

Address

Lufkin Tx 75904

City/State/Zip

OPA H
JAN 04 2002

19690
NSR

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Louis W. Cable

Name

102 Spyglass Dr.

Address

Lufkin, TX 75901

City/State/Zip

JAN 04 2002
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
19690
NSK

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Dr. Maryjane H. Cadle
Name

102 Spyglass
Address

Lufkin, TX 75901
City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OPA
JAN 04 2002

19690
NSR

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Bonnie Donovan

Name

910 Whitehouse Dr.

Address

Lufkin, Texas 75901

City/State/Zip

JAN 04 2002

19690
NSR

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

GINA DONOVAN
Name

#3 RED OAK LANE
Address

LUFKIN, TX 75904
City/State/Zip

OPA
JUL 02 2001

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Richard M. Donovan
910 Whitehouse Dr.
Lufkin, TX 75901

JAN 04 2002
19690
NSR
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:12
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Richard M. Donovan

Name

910 WHITEHOUSE

Address

LUFKIN, TEXAS 75901

City/State/Zip

It is sad that we have to insist that our laws be enforced!

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
'02 JAN -4 PM 3:23
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
DSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Susana Encarnación

Name

5041 Third Street

Address

Lufkin, Tx 75901

City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
JAN -4 PM 3:22
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Jerry Ferguson
Name

1605 Atkinson Drive
Address

Lufkin Tx 75901
City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:22
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002

19690
DSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Juanita Gandy
Name

108 Glass Street
Address

Lufkin, Texas 75901
City/State/Zip

OPA H
JUL 02 2001
19690
NSR

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Faye Grigga & James R. Grigga
925 Sol St St
Lufkin Texas
75901
637-2940

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
JUL 29 AM 11:57

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:22

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002

19690
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Faye Griggs

Name

925 So. 1st St.

Address

Lufkin, Texas 75901

City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

JAN -4 PM 3: 22

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002

19600
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

James Briggs

Name

925 So 1st st

Address

Lufkin Tx 75901

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
19690 OPA H DSR
JAN 07 2002

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Deadra Johnson

Name

Rt 3 Bx 530-B

Address

Huntington, Tx 75949

City/State/Zip

OPA
JAN 04 2002
4
19690
NSR
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Gary Kirby
Name

1207 Gary Road
Address

Lufkin, Texas 75901
City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OPA
JAN 04 2002
2002 JAN -3 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
19680 DSK

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Gaylyn Kirby (Gaylyn Kirby)

Name

1207 Gary Rd.

Address

Lufkin, Tx 75901

City/State/Zip

OPA H
JUL 02 2001
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Office of the Chief Clerk, MC105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin Texas, 78711-3087
6/28/01

Re: Air Emissions Permit No. 8068
TNRCC Account No. AC-00-17-B

Dear Chief Clerk Castanuela;

The purpose of this correspondence is to request a contested case hearing pertaining to the referenced permit. We also request that a public meeting be held so that TNRCC can respond to questions pertaining to the release of toxic materials to the atmosphere which include large quantities of Chloroform and other toxic substances including Acetone, Ammonia, Chlorine, Methanol, Hydrochloric acid and Sulfuric acid..

Records indicate that there is only one other industrial facility in the entire Unite States that emits more carcinogenic Chloroform than the paper mill seeking the permit amendment and renewal. The citizens of Lufkin should have the opportunity to become informed of these air emissions and their possible effect upon local residents.

Sincerely

Jimmy Laird
PO Box 583
Etoile Tex
75944
(936) 854 2765

19690 4
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OPA
JAN 25 2002

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN 25 AM 10: 32
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

James & Kerry Lemon
Name

Rt 5, Box 2760
Address

Nacogdoches, Tx. 75964
City/State/Zip

H
19690
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OPA
JAN 25 2002

2002 JAN 25 AM 10: 2
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Kerry Bryant Lemon – Kerry Bryant Lemon
Name

Rt 5 Box 2760
Address

Nacogdoches TX 75964
City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002

19690
NSK

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely, Helen Madden

Helen Madden
Name

Rt. 3, Box 4757
Address

Lufkin Texas 75901
City/State/Zip

I Have five Children, 3 of the five Have Severe Health Condions, They were Raised Here Next Door to Donohue. I'm very Concerned About the Health of my Kids that RANGE from 32 to 39 years of age

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
H
19690
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing..

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Sammy L Madden

Name

Rt 3 Box 4757

Address

Lufkin, Tx, 75901

City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA 19690 DSK
JAN 07 2002

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Roy C. McCroskey

Name

Rt 17 Box 6778

Address

Lufkin, TX 75904

City/State/Zip

I work 35 hrs a week in Immediate vicinity — & am worried about air quality!

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
H
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely, David Melton

David Melton
Name

Rt. 3, Box 4747
Address

Lufkin Texas 75901
City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
'02 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
H
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Daniel Ortiz

Name

316 Hopkins

Address

Tx Lufkin 75901

City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

19690 NSR
OPA
JAN 07 2002

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Sara Ortega.
Name

307 Hopkis.
Address

Lufkin. TX 75901
City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Dusty Rhodes
Name

Rt. ~~210~~ 5, Box 1690
Address

Lufkin, Texas, 75904
City/State/Zip

My workplace is one mile from this mill.

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2002 JAN -4 PM 3:23

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
H
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Julia Robles.

Name

Rt. 3. Box 4602

Address

Lufkin Tx. 75901

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
02 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA
JAN 07 2002
H
19690
DSK

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Carmen Rogue

Name

316 Hopkins ~~TX~~

Address

Lufkins TX 75901

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA H
JAN 07 2002
19690
DSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Sandra Rumney
Name

Rt. 7 Box 1253
Address

Lufkin, TX 75904
City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
'02 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA H
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Heather Seay

Name

221 Lee Ln

Address

Lufkin, TX. 75904

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
DSK

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Kim Seay

Name

221 Lee Ln

Address

Lufkin Tx 75901

City/State/Zip

TEXAS NATURAL
RESOURCE
CONSERVATION
COMMISSION

2002 JAN 14 AM 11: 25

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

H
19690
NSR

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OPA

JAN 14 2002

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Wm. B. Shelton Jr MD.

Name

1006 Southwood

Address

Lufkin, Tx 75904

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Donna Stanley

Name

PO Box 582

Address

Etoile Tex 75944

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA 4
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Dwayne K. Sumrall

Name

2007 Oakland Circle

Address

Lufkin, Tex 75902

City/State/Zip

9690
NSR

H

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

2001 DEC 27 AM 11:29

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA

DEC 27 2001

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Mary Taylor

Name

P.O. Box 5317

Address

Sam Rayburn, 2 75951

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
'02 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
DSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Janya Thompson
Name

212 Maplewood Dr.
Address

Lufkin, Tx. 75901
City/State/Zip

I live w/in 2 miles of the mill and have a child with asthma. On windy days he can't go out to play. Since this summer we have had to increase his medication. We believe this has something to do with the "new" machine. My family is from Lufkin and we are having to consider mov... 9.

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA H
JAN 07 2002
19690
WSK

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Norma O. Tousha

Name

Rt 1 Box 291 B

Address

Corrigan Tx 75939

City/State/Zip

Atten LaDonna Castanuela
Office of the Chief Clerk
MC-105
TNRCC
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

TEXAS NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2002 JAN -4 PM 3:24
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
OPA
JAN 07 2002
19690
NSR

December 2001

Dear TNRCC,

I have a number of specific concerns about Donahue's proposed air quality permit renewal and amendment. Since the entire permit is being renewed, every aspect of Donohue's operation should be subject to review, comment, and change. First and foremost, I request a public meeting on the issues I've raised in these comments and I request a contested case hearing on the air quality permit renewal and amendment Donohue/Abitibi has requested.

I have experienced and endured years of air pollution problems from the plant, and have breathed the plant's dust, fumes and odors which we find unpleasant and sickening and damaging to my health and property. Based on the plant's bad history of polluting our community without either the company or the TNRCC addressing these problems or adverse health effects that we have continuously suffered, I believe that Donahue's air emissions are clearly excessive and in need of being greatly reduced and better controlled than the current proposed permit requires. I believe more controls or a requirement for a completely closed system is needed to protect my family's health and public health—something this permit fails to achieve.

1. Plant's draft permit allows for a significant increase in emissions of toxic pollution

The new Donohue permit will allow 7,563.32 tons/year or over 15 million pounds per year of pollutants to be released into the air. This is a 9% increase (over 600 tons) in tons per year of total criteria emissions over 1995 & 1997 levels. The increase in sulfur dioxide emissions is especially staggering: 436% more than in 1995.

Specifically, I am very concerned about all of the Donahue plant's air pollution routinely blowing onto my property, home and public access areas. These pollutants include nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter, chlorine, chlorine dioxide, total reduced sulfur compounds, hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, dimethyl disulfide, sulfuric acid, volatile organic compounds, methanol, carbon monoxide, and other potential pollutants not identified in the draft permit but that the plant is likely to emit; other unidentified potential air pollutants include but are not limited to dioxins, furans, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), heavy metals, benzene, carbon disulfide, carbonyl sulfide, and others. The bottom line is that none of the air pollutants that the Donahue plant will be allowed by the TNRCC permit to emit into the air is safe to breathe.

2. Plant's draft permit authorizes unacceptable quantities and complex mixtures of toxic chemicals that cause or contribute to a broad range of adverse health impacts including respiratory illness, cancer, immune system effects, and more.

Specifically, I am very concerned about the adverse health effects from breathing and ingesting such a complex chemical mixture or toxic soup of emissions due to all of the Donahue plant's air pollution combined, particularly because the agency's health effects review process does not

adequately take into account such complex mixtures by only analyzing the pollutants one-by-one rather than as a whole toxic soup (where synergistic, additive and/or various interactive effects may occur). Many of the Donahue plant's pollutants cause or contribute to respiratory irritation and illness and aggravation of pre-existing respiratory conditions. A number of the Donahue plant air pollutants are known (or suspected) cancer-causing agents for which there is no safe level of human exposure. A number of Donahue's air pollutants are also known (or suspected) mutation-causing (genetic or DNA) agents for which safe levels of human exposure are problematic to delineate. A number of Donahue's pollutants are known (or suspected) teratogenic-causing (birth defects) agents where safe levels of infant human exposure are exceptionally difficult to define. Other plant pollutants cause impairment of the human immune system, endocrine system, reproductive system, nervous system, brain, kidneys, liver, and other organ systems.

3. Donohue's air emissions negatively affect special populations around the plant.

There are day-care centers and retirement homes within half a mile of the Donohue plant. Although TNRCC states that there is no school within 3000 feet of the plant, there IS in fact a school approximately 2700 feet from the plant. The elderly and the young are especially vulnerable to air pollution and deserve extra protection.

There are many ways in which children are at greater risk from pollutants than adults. Children breathe more rapidly than adults, taking in significantly more pollution per body weight than do adults. A resting infant, for example, inhales twice as much air, relative to size, as does a resting adult. Children are more active while outdoors than adults, spending three times as much time engaged in sports and other vigorous activities. Increased activity raises breathing rates and pollution exposure significantly. Children's airways are narrower than those of adults, thus enhancing the inflammatory effect of air pollution. Children are prone to mouth breathing, which significantly increases the dose of pollution reaching the lungs. Children are also particularly vulnerable to toxic substances because their bodies are immature and rapidly growing. Children do not have a fully developed immune system, liver, or kidneys to help protect them from the damaging effects of many chemicals. Immature lungs are unable to remove or neutralize contaminants adequately, and developing brains and neural pathways are particularly vulnerable to toxins. In addition, some chemicals affect the endocrine system, potentially disturbing neural, reproductive, and immune development.

Airborne carcinogens and mutagens appear to have a greater effect on children, possibly because rapidly growing tissues are less differentiated and more "suggestible" than mature tissues.

4. I do not believe that all of the plant's facilities meet BACT (Best Available Control Technology) since public health and my family's health are not being adequately protected at the proposed level of emissions.

The plant needs more air pollution controls and more efficient control levels required for existing plant pollution control technologies in order to reduce toxic emissions from the facilities and adequately protect public health and my family's health.

5. Fugitive VOC emissions from the Groundwood Mill are excessive and fail to protect public health in Lufkin.

The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is authorized to emit 1,091.9 tons of VOCs all as fugitive gases, which is 2,183,800 pounds per year. We are very concerned about the toxicity and the

volume of the 2,183,800 pounds per year of VOCs, and therefore we request that TNRCC require Donahue to consider installing some type of control technology to biodegrade or incinerate the waste gases in another unit at the plant. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) is the single largest VOC source at the plant with 14% of all plant emissions and is the third largest emissions source at the Lufkin mill. The Groundwood Mill (EPN G-5) accounts for 60% of plant VOC emissions. We believe it's unacceptable for Donahue to emit such large and toxic volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds and that the draft permit renewal/amendment indicates that no air dispersion modeling was conducted on these VOC emissions during the current BACT review and health effects evaluation because previous air toxics modeling suggest there were no adverse impacts from the plant. Having lived in Lufkin all our lives, we totally disagree with the previous modeling predictions for toxics which are contradicted by the horrible chemicals, odors and dust released every day by Donahue's plant.

6. Nuisance potential is significant from Donahue's Lufkin mill

Specifically, the draft permit renewal/amendment fails to address nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions at the Donahue plant. More specifically, we disagree with the agency's Impacts Evaluation No. 3 question and answer on whether the Donahue mill is a sensitive location with respect to nuisance. The plant has causes continuous nuisance air pollution conditions for the whole time it has operated at Lufkin and continues to create horrible nuisance conditions on a daily basis. The agency needs to require Donahue to develop a comprehensive plant plan to correct horrible nuisance odors and nuisance dust conditions before the draft permit is renewed. All Donahue emissions points and fugitive sources are potential causes and/or contributors to nuisance pollution and we are very concerned about nuisance level emissions.

7. Donahue has a history of air pollution violations that warrant a thorough compliance history review.

The Donohue/Champion plant has paid several fines, participated in several agreed orders, and has many notices of violations and complaints dating back over 10 years. Based on this compliance history, TNRCC should seriously consider NOT granting the permit renewal. At the very least, this bad compliance history should be taken into consideration and changes in the permit should be made to make sure Donohue does not continue to poison the Lufkin and surrounding communities.

8. Donohue has a history of persistent upset emissions. These emissions are illegal and should be stopped, not merely permitted.

9. The cumulative impacts of pollution from Donohue's water and air emissions must be taken into consideration.

TNRCC has been instructed by the legislature (effective September 2001) to protect the public from the cumulative impacts of pollution. Many who live near the plant eat fish from the Angelina River and Lake Sam Rayburn as well as breathe in air pollution from the plant. Donohue's permits must adequately limit emissions so that the public is protected from the cumulative impacts. We have no reason to believe Texas state agencies will ensure that humans are protected from the cumulative impacts of pollution. EPA ambient chronic toxicity tests conducted with water samples from the Angelina/Paper Mill Creek confluence consistently fail. Test specimens exhibit reduced reproduction rates and altered growth rates. These tests are run to account for synergistic effects of pollutants on aquatic life have never accounted for synergistic effects on mankind.

10. Title V Requires preventing significant deterioration of air quality

The federal government should require changes in the permit to ensure that illegal exceedances of air emissions will not occur in the future. The enforcement community has not protected the people of Lufkin and lived by its own laws, thus we have a right to a hearing.

11. Does computer modeling show that maximum concentrations at any point down wind have been consistently below maximum allowable concentrations of various pollutants and therefore in compliance with federal standards?

12. The Effects Screening Levels (ESL) have not been verified to protect human health

ESLs do not provide a rational basis for permit decision making, since the ESLs themselves, have not been verified to be protective of human health. The whole system of developing the ESLs is flawed and using them to justify not requiring toxicological information on particular pollutant impacts should not be allowed.

13. A portion of Donohue's emissions are grandfathered and need to be brought up to modern standards.

14. Donohue releases harmful levels of chloroform

According to EPA records, the Donohue paper mill releases the second largest amount of chloroform into the air nationwide—compared to ALL industries, not just paper mills. In 1999 Donohue self-reported that it released 21,640 lbs. Of chloroform as fugitive air releases and 430,084 lbs. From the stacks. In the period from 1993 to 1999 the mill Chloroform air releases were always in excess of 400,000 lbs./year.

16. Is Donohue telling us everything they are releasing?

The surface water permit application submitted by Donohue did not identify several metals (including mercury) as constituents of their effluent even though TNRCC internal memoranda documents significant concentrations of the metals in their discharges. How can we be assured that Donohue is not releasing harmful levels of mercury into the air?

Sincerely,

Rachael Woodson

Name

P O Box 582

Address

Etoile Tex 75944

City/State/Zip