

Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D, *Chairman*
Carlos Rubinstein, *Commissioner*
Toby Baker, *Commissioner*
Zak Covar, *Executive Director*



TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

October 10, 2012

TO: Persons on the Attached Mailing List

**RE: Docket No. 2012-0482-AIR
INVISTA S.a.r.l.
Request(s) filed on Permit No. 809**

The above-referenced application and all timely filed hearing requests/requests for reconsideration on the above-referenced application will be considered by the commissioners of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) during the public meeting on **November 14, 2012**. The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. in Room 201S of Building E, at the commission's offices located at 12100 Park 35 Circle in Austin, Texas.

In accordance with commission rules, copies of the timely hearing requests/requests for reconsideration have been forwarded to the applicant, the Executive Director of the TCEQ, and the Public Interest Counsel of the TCEQ. Each of these persons is entitled to file a formal written response to the hearing requests/requests for reconsideration on or before 5:00 p.m. on **October 22, 2012**. Persons who have filed timely hearing requests/requests for reconsideration may file a formal written reply to these responses on or before 5:00 p.m. on **November 5, 2012**.

All responses and replies must be filed with the Chief Clerk of the TCEQ. Responses and replies may be filed with the Chief Clerk electronically at <http://www10.tceq.state.tx.us/epic/efilings/> or by filing an original and 7 copies with the Chief Clerk of the TCEQ. The mailing address of the Chief Clerk is: Office of Chief Clerk, ATTN: Agenda Docket Clerk, Mail Code 105, TCEQ, P. O. Box 13087, Austin, Texas 78711-3087 [Fax number (512) 239-3311]. On the same day any response is transmitted to the Chief Clerk, a copy must also be sent to the Executive Director, the Public Interest Counsel, the Applicant and the requesters at their addresses listed on the attached mailing list. On the same day any reply is transmitted to the Chief Clerk, a copy must also be sent to the Executive Director, the Public Interest Counsel, and other requesters and the applicant at their addresses listed on the attached mailing list.

The procedures for evaluating hearing requests/requests for reconsideration are located in 30 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 55, Subchapter F (§§55.200-211) of the commission's rules. The procedures for filing and serving responses and replies are located in 30 TAC Chapters 1 (§§1.10-11) and 55 (§55.209) of the commission's rules.

The hardcopy filing requirement is waived by the General Counsel pursuant to 30 TAC §1.10(h). Copies of these rules may be obtained by calling the Public Education Program toll free at 1-800-687-4040.

The commissioners will not take oral argument or additional comment on this matter at the public meeting. Therefore, it is important to address the sufficiency of the requests in timely filed written responses and requesters' replies. At the public meeting, the commissioners may ask questions of the applicant, requesters, or TCEQ staff. The commissioners will make a decision on the request(s) during the meeting and will base that decision on the timely written requests, public comments, any written responses and replies, any responses to questions during the meeting, and applicable statutes and rules. Copies of all timely public comments and requests have been forwarded to the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution to determine if informal, voluntary mediation might help resolve any dispute.

The attachment to this letter is intended to help you better understand how the TCEQ processes and evaluates hearing requests and requests for reconsideration. To obtain additional information, or to ask questions about anything in this letter, please call the Public Education Program toll free at 1-800-687-4040.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bridget C. Bohac". The signature is written in a cursive style with a small dot above the letter 'i' in "Bridget".

Bridget C. Bohac
Chief Clerk

Enclosures: Copies of the Executive Director's Response to Comments and protestant correspondence to Applicant, Executive Director, Office of Public Interest Counsel, and Alternative Dispute Resolution.

ATTACHMENT

Procedures Concerning Requests for Reconsideration and Requests for Contested Case Hearing

The purpose of this document is to describe commission procedures for evaluating requests for reconsideration and requests for contested case hearing. This document is not intended to be a comprehensive guide to public participation at the TCEQ.

The three commissioners determine the validity of requests for reconsideration and requests for contested case hearing and vote to grant or deny the requests during a public meeting. These public meetings are usually held every other Wednesday in Austin. Prior to the meeting, the following occurs:

- (1) the written requests are distributed to the executive director, the public interest counsel, and the applicant. These persons may file a response at least 23 days before the meeting;
- (2) the requester may then file a reply to the responses at least 9 days before the meeting. This is the requester's opportunity to address any deficiencies in the request that have been identified by TCEQ staff or the applicant. The requester must submit any information he or she wishes the commissioners to consider (ex: maps or diagrams showing requester's location relative to the applicant's proposed activities) by this deadline; and
- (3) the commissioners read the requests, the responses to requests, and the replies, before the public meeting. Then, during the public meeting, the commissioners vote to grant or deny the requests.

Requests for Reconsideration

A request for reconsideration must expressly state that the person is requesting that the commission reconsider the executive director's decision and state the reasons why the commission should reconsider the executive director's decision. The commission will consider a request for reconsideration at a scheduled public meeting and grant or deny the request.

Requests for Contested Case Hearing

A contested case hearing is an evidentiary proceeding, similar to a hearing in civil court. The law allows for holding a contested case hearing on certain types of applications.

A valid request for a contested case hearing must:

- (1) demonstrate that the requester is an "affected person" with a "personal justiciable interest" related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power or economic interest which would be affected by the application in a manner not common to the general public;

- (2) if the request is made by a group or association, identify one or more members who have standing to request a hearing, and the interests the group or association seeks to protect;
- (3) expressly request a contested case hearing;
- (4) raise disputed issues of fact that are relevant and material to the commission's decision on the application which were raised during the comment period and not withdrawn prior to the filing of the Executive Director's Response to Comment; and
- (5) include any other information as specified in public notices.

The commission is authorized to protect human health and safety, and natural resources. The commission cannot address other matters outside the commission's authority, such as the effect of the existence of a proposed facility on nearby property values.

When the commissioners deny hearing requests, they often proceed to vote on approval or denial of the application. Alternatively, they may remand the application to the executive director for final action. If a hearing request is granted and the application is referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH), the commissioners will specify a list of issues which will be the subject of the hearing and an expected date for the SOAH judge's proposal for decision. The SOAH judge will conduct the hearing and submit a proposal to the commission to approve or deny the application.

The Alternative Dispute Resolution Office may contact requesters to determine their interest in informal discussions with the permit applicant and a mediator.

By necessity this document gives a very general description of commission procedures. If you have any questions, please call the Public Education Program toll free at 1-800-687-4040.

**MAILING LIST
INVISTA S.A.R.L.
DOCKET NO. 2012-0482-AIR; PERMIT NO. 809**

FOR THE APPLICANT:

J. Michael Miller
David D. Childs
INVISTA S.a.r.l.
P.O. Box 2626
Victoria, Texas 77902-2626
Tel: (361) 572-1108
Fax: (361) 572-1515

Christopher Thiele
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 2300
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel: (512) 542-8632
Fax: (512) 472-9123

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
via electronic mail:

John Minter, Staff Attorney
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Environmental Law Division, MC-173
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-0600
Fax: (512) 239-0606

Ramiro Cruz, Technical Staff
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Air Permits Division, MC-163
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-1302
Fax: (512) 239-1300

Brian Christian, Director
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Small Business and Environmental
Assistance Division
Public Education Program, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-4000
Fax: (512) 239-5678

FOR PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL
via electronic mail:

Mr. Blas J. Coy, Jr., Attorney
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Public Interest Counsel, MC-103
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-6363
Fax: (512) 239-6377

**FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE
RESOLUTION**
via electronic mail:

Mr. Kyle Lucas
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Alternative Dispute Resolution, MC-222
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-4010
Fax: (512) 239-4015

FOR THE CHIEF CLERK:

Ms. Bridget C. Bohac
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Office of Chief Clerk, MC-105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-3300
Fax: (512) 239-3311

**See attached list of
Requesters/Interested Persons.**

REQUESTER(S)

CYNTHIA BROOKHOUSER
293 STOCKADE DR
VICTORIA TX 77905-2691

DOUGLAS LAWRENCE
1103 OLD BLOOMINGTON RD N
VICTORIA TX 77905-1824

HARRY D CAMPBELL, SR
523 OLD BLOOMINGTON RD N
VICTORIA TX 77905-2106

ASA & MARILYN LOGAN
562 OLD BLOOMINGTON RD N
VICTORIA TX 77905-2106

BARBARA CHAMBERS
114 SAM HOUSTON DR
VICTORIA TX 77901-4735

MARVIN A PATTERSON
55 DERNAL DR
VICTORIA TX 77905-1811

BRANDON HASKELL COOK
7548 STATE HIGHWAY 185 S
VICTORIA TX 77905-1821

ANTON & JOANNE PIEGSA
144 CLUB DR
VICTORIA TX 77905-1808

THOMAS DAVIDSON
1202 MALLETT DR
VICTORIA TX 77904-3376

CARMINE SCHIFANO
170 CRESCENT DR
VICTORIA TX 77905-1809

JOHN L DENNING
7268 STATE HIGHWAY 185 S
VICTORIA TX 77905-1819

ARLENE SCHULTZ
PO BOX 2573
VICTORIA TX 77902-2573

SHARON HARPER
1130 FM 1432
VICTORIA TX 77905-1826

VERNON SINGLETON
3908 HOUSTON HWY
VICTORIA TX 77901-4706

W TODD HOFFNER
HOEFFNER BILEK & EIDMAN
440 LOUISIANA ST STE 720
HOUSTON TX 77002-1639

VERNON SINGLETON
164 HILLTOP DR
VICTORIA TX 77905-1803

W TODD HOFFNER
914 PRESTON ST STE 800
HOUSTON TX 77002-1815

DIANNA & H E STEVENSON
1276 FM 1432
VICTORIA TX 77905-1826

W TODD HOFFNER
HOEFFNER & BILEK
1000 LOUISIANA ST STE 1302
HOUSTON TX 77002-5021

GEORGIA VEGA
117 LOUISIANA AVE
VICTORIA TX 77905-2119

DIANE & ROBERT HOWELL
14 LOUISIANA AVE
VICTORIA TX 77905-2110

FORREST VOLKERT
7250 STATE HIGHWAY 185 S
VICTORIA TX 77905-1819

APPLICATION BY

INVISTA S.a.r.l.
Nitric Acid Plant
Victoria, Victoria County

§
§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE

TEXAS COMMISSION ON

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

TEXAS
COMMISSION
ON ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY
2012 FEB 27 PM 2:49
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

The Executive Director (ED) of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the Commission or TCEQ) files this Response to Public Comment (Response) on the proposed application for renewal of Permit Number (No.) 809.

As required by Title 30 Texas Administrative Code Section 55.156 [30 TAC § 55.156], before an application is approved, the ED prepares a response to all timely, relevant and material, or significant comments. The Office of Chief Clerk received a timely comment letter from W. Todd Hoeffner, representing the following persons: Cynthia Brookhouser, H.D. Campbell, Barbara Chambers, Brandon Haskell Cook, Thomas Davidson, Johnny Denning, Sharon Harper, Robert and Diane Howell, Douglas Lawrence, Asa and Marilyn Logan, Marvin Patterson, Anton and Joanne Piegsa, Carmine Schifano, Arlene Schultz, Vernon Singleton, H.E. and Dianna Stevenson, Georgia Vega, and Forrest Volkert. This Response addresses all timely public comments received, whether or not withdrawn. If you need more information about this permit application or the permitting process please call the TCEQ Public Education Program at 1-800-687-4040. General information about the TCEQ can be found at our website at www.tceq.state.gov.

BACKGROUND

Description of Facility

The plant is located at 2695 Old Bloomington Road North, Victoria, Victoria County. Contaminants authorized under this permit include ammonia, nitric acid, nitrogen oxides, nitrous oxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and organic compounds. The plant produces nitric acid by oxidizing ammonia to nitric oxide and then directing the nitric oxide through a water scrubber. This renewal application proposes no changes to the emission rates in the current permit. This permit application is for a renewal that would not result in an increase in allowable emissions and would not result in the emission of an air contaminant not previously emitted.

Procedural History

E.I. DuPont de Nemours Company (DuPont) applied to the TCEQ for the renewal of a permit that will authorize the applicant to continue operating a nitric acid plant. The permit application was received on March 7, 2003, and declared administratively complete on May 23, 2003. The Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain an Air Quality

Permit (public notice) for this permit application was published on June 18, 2003, in the *Victoria Advocate* and on August 13, 2003, in *Revista de Victoria*. A copy of the permit application was placed at the Victoria Public Library in Victoria, throughout of the public comment period. The applicable comment period ended on August 28, 2003.

DuPont was granted a permit to construct the nitric acid plant at the Victoria chemical complex on May 9, 1973. The plant was issued its original operating permit on July 20, 1978. The plant sought and obtained an amendment that was approved on August 10, 1990, to expand the nitric acid plant. The plant sought and obtained a second amendment that was approved on March 17, 1992, to properly reflect the actual configuration of the plant. The permit was renewed once before, on June 4, 1993. As permit expiration again approached, the DuPont filed a second renewal application on March 7, 2003. Subsequent to filing the renewal application, DuPont sold the nitric acid plant to INVISTA S.a.r.l. (INVISTA). After purchase of the nitric acid plant by INVISTA, but prior to completion of the technical review, the Executive Director agreed to hold active review of this renewal for six months to allow the applicant to complete environmental audits of its newly acquired facilities at the Victoria complex. During technical review of this application, it was determined that the renewal could not be processed without a companion amendment to authorize certain ongoing emissions, primarily nitrous oxide (N₂O). Nitrous oxide is an air contaminant that has historically not been authorized in air quality permits, however, both the applicant and TCEQ concluded it was appropriate to include these emissions in the permit. INVISTA applied for such an amendment on December 30, 2005. Public notice was published in the *Victoria Advocate* on February 8, 2006. No comments were received and after technical review and modeling audits were completed, the amendment was issued on January 31, 2011. During pendency of this action, commission rules were changed effective in 2006, to require authorization of planned maintenance, startup and shutdown (MSS) emissions. On January 7, 2008 INVISTA applied to amend permit No. 809 to authorize MSS emissions from the nitric acid plant. Public notice was published in the *Victoria Advocate* on March 20, 2008. No comments were received as a result of this notice and the amendment was issued on January 31, 2011. The N₂O and MSS emissions added to permit #809 are existing emissions that did not require new construction. The renewal of this permit will not increase permit allowable emissions, i.e. those emissions already authorized in the amended permit. Further, the renewal will not result in an increase in emissions of any air contaminant not previously emitted. In accordance with state law regarding permit renewals (Texas Health and Safety Code, § 382.055(e)), the commission may not impose requirements that are more or less stringent than those of the existing permit.

Due to a change in commission policy, INVISTA was required to re-publish notice of the renewal, as previously amended. The Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain an Air Quality Permit (public notice) for this permit application was republished on October 1, 2010, in the *Victoria Advocate*. The public notice included notification of the amendment actions for N₂O and MSS emissions. Although not required by rule, TCEQ directed INVISTA to publish notice of the Executive Director's preliminary decision to

issue the renewal as amended in the *Victoria Advocate* on April 28, 2011. A copy of the permit application was placed at the Victoria Public Library in Victoria, throughout the public comment period. The applicable comment period ended on May 28, 2011. No additional comments or hearing requests were received.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Mr. Todd Hoeffner, provided the following comments on behalf of the individuals listed above:

COMMENT 1: The DuPont (INVISTA) facility burns hazardous waste from uncontrolled stacks emitting heavy metals including barium, cerium, chromium, cobalt copper, lead, manganese and zinc. These heavy metals are contaminating his clients' property, air, plants and animals. The reason this has occurred is because DuPont has zero pollution control on these stacks. Using DuPont's (INVISTA's) own air modeling and utilizing actual feed rates reported by DuPont (INVISTA) demonstrates that we are being subjected to an unacceptable carcinogenic exposure level according to the BIF [sic] regulations. DuPont (INVISTA) has significantly underestimated the cancer risk. The DuPont (INVISTA) permit should be denied, or alternatively, TCEQ must require installation of pollution control equipment in order to eliminate continued invasion of property, health and livestock.

RESPONSE 1: The commenter appears to refer to the boilers and industrial furnaces (BIF) regulations and to emissions from Stacks 5, 6, and 7. These are the stacks for boilers numbers 1, 2, and 3, which are authorized in INVISTA Permit Nos. 812 and 813. These boilers are not part of the Nitric Acid plant that is the subject of this renewal. INVISTA's Nitric Acid plant is authorized under Permit No. 809. The facilities encompassed by Permit No. 809 do not emit carcinogenic or heavy metal compounds. As explained in more detail in response 3, the emissions from the Nitric Acid plant are subject to best available control technology, as required under the Texas Clean Air Act (Health and Safety Code, Chapter 382).

COMMENT 2: The commenter requested an independent environmental audit of plant emissions at DuPont's (INVISTA's) expense. The audit should consist of testing and modeling of heavy metal emissions and all emissions from uncontrolled stacks. This is necessary because of unreliable reporting of data to regulatory agencies.

RESPONSE 2: After INVISTA purchased the nitric acid unit and other units of DuPont's Victoria plant in 2004, TCEQ suspended further review of this renewal pending an environmental compliance audit of the newly acquired facilities. In addition, TCEQ and INVISTA agreed that emissions of nitrous oxide (N₂O), be controlled under permit No. 809. After several communications and modeling exercises, emission limits for N₂O meeting best available control technology requirements were established and the permit was amended after newspaper notice and

a public comment period. This renewal application as amended with the N₂O limits was published for comment again in subsequent years, culminating in the final notice that ended in May of 2011. Emissions from the nitric acid plant under permit No. 809 are controlled using best available control technology. To determine a level of emissions that is protective of human health and the environment, INVISTA was required to conduct modeling of ground level concentrations of several air contaminants including NO_x, CO and SO₂ to determine if federally established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) would be exceeded. This modeling was audited by the TCEQ Toxicology Division and determined to meet the NAAQS for these contaminants. Toxicology staff also determined that other contaminants levels such as ammonia and nitric acid did not surpass levels that would trigger health effects concern or further review.

COMMENT 3: At a federal jury trial claiming trespass on clients' property, evidence and testimony support denial of the renewal application. The commenter's clients reside in the maximum pollution impact area according to all dispersion modeling conducted at the facility. The DuPont (INVISTA) stacks have zero pollution control and DuPont (INVISTA) has trespassed and continues to trespass their properties with toxic heavy metals. Data received in June 2003 demonstrates that even breathing air inside residences are [sic] contaminated with heavy metals. Specifically, the residences of Cresent [sic] Valley were analyzed for heavy metals in the soil and air filters inside the homes. This data confirms that the pollution is widespread and inescapable. These heavy metals are entering their bloodstreams and further entering the bloodstreams of our livestock. These heavy metals are causing an extremely high incidence of tumors in the nearby animals. Specifically, the Stevensons' and Harper's properties are located at the maximum impact zone for DuPont's (INVISTA's) pollution. Seven out of nine of the Harper's animals had tumors. The Stevensons' horse had tumors the size of footballs on it; unlike any tumor that the Stevensons' veterinarian or DuPont's (INVISTA's) retained veterinarian had ever seen. While both vets concurred that heavy metal poisoning could cause such a rare tumor, DuPont's (INVISTA's) vet simply had no explanation for the real cause. As demonstrated from the sworn testimony of Dr. Horton, the long-time treating vet of the animals, these animals have tumors and respiratory illnesses from heavy metal poisoning. A pond on DuPont's (INVISTA's) property and located in close proximity to the Stevensons' and Harper's properties was tested for heavy metal poisoning of fish and plants. Both the fish and plants were contaminated with the same metals emitting from the stacks in question. Most importantly, the commenter's clients are exposed to substantial unnecessary cancer and health risks. Specifically, Dr. Rod O'Connor performed a risk assessment regarding the clients' exposure to chromium and manganese. Dr. O'Connor determined that the clients were exposed to chromium at levels at least five times greater than the acceptable limits established by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Diseases Registry (ATSDR) and eight times the level for manganese. Moreover, they are at very high risk for lung cancer from chromium and neurological damage from manganese.

RESPONSE 3: There are six emission points associated with the Nitric Acid Plant,

Permit No. 809. When Permit No. 809 is renewed, these emission points will be authorized to emit ammonia, nitric acid, nitrogen oxides, nitrous oxides, and products from the combustion of natural gas. Permit No. 809 will not authorize any emissions of toxic heavy metals. Permit No. 809 will not authorize any emissions of chromium or of manganese. Appropriate pollution control technology is applied to the six emission points.

Table 1

Emission Point No.	Source Name	Controls
14STK-001	AOP Main Stack	Selective Catalytic reduction (SCR) with tail gas nitrogen oxides (NO _x) concentration ≤ 60 ppmvd. No nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) abatement. This is economically reasonable and technically practicable considering the age of the facility and the impact of its emissions on the surrounding area. Best available control technology (BACT) applies.
14FLR-001A	AOP Flare	Flare meets Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 60.18 for a volatile organic compounds (VOC) removal efficiency ≥ 98%, ammonia (NH ₃) removal efficiency ≥ 98%. Unassisted. BACT applies.
14FUG	Fugitives	Fugitive NH ₃ controlled with the audio, visual, and olfactory program. VOC emissions are too small to require an inspection and maintenance program for VOC. BACT applies.
14LTR-001	Nitric Acid Truck Loading/Unloading Facility (fugitive only)	Loading emissions routed to control under Permit 812. Fugitives minimized by reducing connection and disconnection time. BACT applies.
14FUGMSS	Fugitives	Fugitive NH ₃ controlled with the audio, visual, and olfactory program. VOC emissions are too small to require an inspection and maintenance program for VOC. BACT applies.
14STK-002	Sample Sink Vent	A vent hood collects vapors resulting from

	Hood Stack	sampling various vessels and discharges them without controls through a stack outlet 30 feet above. This is economically reasonable and technically practicable considering the age of the facility and the impact of its emissions on the surrounding area. BACT applies.
--	------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

COMMENT 4: Dr. Arch Carson further concurred that they are at significant increased risk for lung cancer and neurological disease from DuPont's (INVISTA's) pollution. Dr. Carson also testified that actual air monitoring results at our property demonstrated that our mortality risk for lung cancer was increased by over 16% as a result of DuPont's (INVISTA's) actions.

RESPONSE 4: The emissions of ammonia, nitric acid, nitrogen oxides, nitrous oxides, and products from the combustion of natural gas will be authorized at levels that are not expected to cause an increased risk for lung cancer and neurological disease. Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) emissions are subject to the 1-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Modeling conducted by the applicant and submitted to TCEQ on November 9, 2010 and December 28, 2010 was audited by the TCEQ Air Dispersion Modeling Team (ADMT) on December 16, 2010 and January 3, 2011 respectively. The audits found the modeling conclusions acceptable and NO₂ emissions from the nitric acid plant will not exceed the NAAQS. Emissions of air contaminants not subject to a NAAQS were evaluated for acceptable effects in the Modeling and Effects Review Applicability Summary Form dated January 24, 2011.

CHANGES MADE IN RESPONSE TO COMMENT

No changes to the draft permit have been made in response to public comment.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Mark R. Vickery, P.G., Executive Director

Robert Martinez, Director
Environmental Law Division



John Minter, Staff Attorney
Environmental Law Division
P.O. Box 13087, MC 173
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
(512) 239-0663

REPRESENTING THE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MAILING LIST
INVISTA, S.a.r.l
AIR QUALITY PERMIT NO. 809

W. Todd Hoeffner
Hoeffner & Bilek
Lyric Office Centre
440 Louisiana Street, Suite 720
Houston, TX 77002-1634

Cynthia Brookhouser
293 Stockade Drive
Victoria, TX 77905-2691

Harry D. Campbell, Sr.
523 Old Bloomington Road North
Victoria, TX 77905-2106

Barbara Chambers
114 Sam Houston Drive
Victoria, TX 77901-4735

John L. Denning
7268 State Highway 185 South
Victoria, TX 77905-1819

Sharon Harper
1130 FM 1432
Victoria, TX 77905-1826

Robert and Diane Howell
14 Louisiana Avenue
Victoria, TX 77905-2110

Douglas Lawrence
1103 Old Bloomington Road North
Victoria, TX 77905-1824

Asa and Marilyn Logan
562 Old Bloomington Road North
Victoria, TX 77905-2106

Marvin A. Patterson
55 Dernal Drive
Victoria, TX 77905-1811

Anton Piegsa and Joanne Piegsa
144 Club Drive
Victoria, TX 77905-1808

Vernon Singleton
3908 Houston Highway
Victoria, TX 77901-4706

Vernon Singleton
164 Hilltop Drive
Victoria, TX 77905-1803

H.E. and Dianna Stevenson
1276 FM 1432
Victoria, TX 77905-1826

Georgia Vega
117 Louisiana Avenue
Victoria, TX 77905-2110

Forrest Volkert
7250 State Highway 185 South
Victoria, TX 77905-1819

Brandon Haskell Cook
7548 State Highway 185 South
Victoria, TX 77905

Thomas Davidson
1202 Mallette Drive
Victoria, TX 77904

Carmine Schifano
170 Crescent Drive
Victoria, TX 77905

Arlene Schultz
P.O. Box 2573
Victoria, TX 77902