



# **Report on the Substitution of Wood from Construction & Demolition Debris for Conventional Fuels in Biomass Boilers**

**Maine Department of Environmental Protection  
17 State House Station  
Augusta, Maine 04333-0017**

**April 2007**

**Contact: Paula Clark, Director  
Division of Solid Waste Management  
207-287-7718**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report to the Legislature on the  
Substitution of Wood from Construction & Demolition Debris  
For Conventional Fuels in Biomass Boilers  
Submitted Pursuant to PL 2006 Chapter 617

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>II. BACKGROUND - HISTORY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
A. Biomass Energy in Maine .....	2
B. The Use of Wood from CDD in Biomass Boilers .....	3
C. Regulation of the Use of CDD Wood Fuel .....	4
<b>III GENERATION, HANDLING AND PROCESSING OF CDD</b> .....	<b>5</b>
A. Municipal Collection of CDD .....	5
B. Processing of CDD .....	6
1. Methods.....	6
2. Contaminant Identification and Removal .....	7
3. Products and Recyclables .....	10
4. Maine Processing Facilities .....	10
5. New England Processing Facilities Review .....	10
C. Material Recovery and Source Separation at the Point of Generation or Collection.....	11
1. Source Separation during Construction and Demolition .....	12
2. Economic Feasibility of Building Deconstruction.....	13
<b>IV. USE OF CDD WOOD FUEL IN BOILERS</b> .....	<b>13</b>
A. CDD Wood Fuel Supply and Use .....	14
B. CDD Wood Fuel Quality.....	15
C. CDD Wood Fuel Use – Impacts.....	19
1. Ash Generation .....	19
2. Landfill Capacity .....	20
<b>V. BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY FOR BURNING CDD WOOD FUEL</b> .....	<b>21</b>
A. Best Available Control Technology .....	21
B. Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT).....	22
C. Air Toxic Regulation in Maine.....	23
D. BACT for CDD in Maine.....	24
E. Fate of Dioxin and Arsenic from CDD Burning .....	24
F. Ongoing Air Toxics Investigation into CDD Wood Fuel .....	25
G. Conclusion: What is BACT for CDD?.....	26

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report is submitted pursuant to PL 2006 Chapter 617 (attached as **Appendix A**) which was passed as emergency legislation during the last legislative session. In part, the legislation directed the Department to:

- Evaluate the feasibility of requiring source separation and state-of-the-art processing that will achieve, to the greatest extent practicable, the removal of all toxic materials from construction and demolition debris prior to combustion in a boiler;
- Evaluate the economic and technological feasibility of requiring all boilers that burn construction and demolition debris to use the best available control technology in order to minimize toxic air emissions; and,
- Evaluate the effects of allowing the substitution of wood from construction and demolition debris for conventional fuels used in a boiler to exceed 50% of total fuel by weight combusted on an annual average basis if the following conditions are met: 1. the boiler is designed and constructed for the primary purpose of power generation and not waste disposal; 2. the boiler employs the best available control technology as determined by the department; and 3. all other applicable regulatory standards are met with regard to the facility.

## II. BACKGROUND - HISTORY

### A. Biomass Energy in Maine

Maine has numerous forest product manufacturing plants that burn wood to generate steam, heat and or electricity for internal use. Additionally, ten “stand-alone” biomass facilities have been built in Maine to generate electrical power from the combustion of wood and wood by-products. The construction of these facilities was due in part to public policy that encouraged construction of renewable energy facilities. Specifically, state and federal law directed utilities to provide long-term purchase contracts for electricity from renewable energy facilities at rates that were projected to be the future cost for replacement power.

The electrical rates awarded in the 1980’s to most of biomass facilities, turned out to be significantly above the actual electrical market rates that exist now. In turn, most of these contracts have now expired or been terminated, forcing these facilities to sell electricity into the region’s market at rates significantly below their original projections. This drop in electrical price has jeopardized the financial viability of biomass facilities. An analysis of electricity prices in New Hampshire forecast that electricity prices there will not reach a level at which existing biomass facilities can be profitable without external support until 2014. Maine’s stand-alone biomass facilities have also been adversely affected by these lower prices; as many as six of the facilities have been idled for periods of time in recent years. Strategies that these facilities have used to remain financially viable include: timing operation to coincide with high electricity price period, participating in

“green power” markets, and diversifying their fuel to include wood from non-forest sources. These sources include wood fuel made from construction and demolition debris (“CDD”). CDD derived wood fuel is purchased by biomass plants at a significantly lower price than wood chips made directly from standing forest trees.<sup>1</sup>

## **B. The Use of Wood from CDD in Biomass Boilers**

Throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s, Maine’s stand-alone biomass facilities burned only wood chips from trees and wood by-products from forest based industries. In 2000, Boralex Athens Energy, Inc., located in Athens, Maine submitted the first application to the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to utilize wood from CDD as part of its biomass fuel mix. This application was submitted under DEP’s Chapter 418 rules, *Beneficial Use of Solid Wastes*, which, in part, regulate the use of waste or waste derived materials as fuel substitutes in industrial boilers. Prior fuel substitution applications received by the DEP were made primarily by paper mills for combustion of high fuel value mill wastes in the facility’s own biomass boiler(s). Such proposals involved substituting a waste material that did not differ greatly from their current fuels and which constituted a relatively small portion of that boiler’s fuel mix.

The Boralex Athens Energy application presented new issues and questions involving fuel quality and handling. At this time, the Department also considered the question of when a boiler is most appropriately licensed under the solid waste incinerator standards or under the standards for fuel substitution – beneficial use. As a matter of policy, the Department determined that licensing under the fuel substitution standards was appropriate when 50% or less of the total fuel supply was waste or waste derived. Volumes greater than 50% would categorize the boiler as a solid waste incinerator. The significance of this determination, in part, is that under Maine law, new commercial solid waste disposal facilities (landfills and incinerators) are prohibited. In January 2001, DEP issued the Boralex Athens Energy facility a license to substitute CDD derived wood fuel for up to 50% of its biomass fuel. The existing air emission license was also modified to accommodate differences in the type of fuel.

In 2002, a fire occurred in the biomass fuel stockpile at the Boralex Athens plant. As a result of questions concerning the composition of the fuel and subsequent uncontrolled emissions from the stockpile fire, the Department initiated an investigation of the quality of the CDD wood fuel then being used. This work, conducted by University of Maine Professor of Civil Engineering Dr. Dana Humphrey, analyzed the biomass fuel stockpile for the physical characteristics of its wood and non-wood components. The Department concluded that the quantity of metal, plastic and treated wood present was sufficient to raise concerns if the fuel burned in an uncontrolled manner, such as in the stockpile fire. It was further concluded that more studies were needed to better define the relationships between contaminants in the fuel and both fugitive and stack air emissions. The Department determined that it was appropriate and necessary to revise the beneficial use-

---

<sup>1</sup> Innovative Natural Resource Solutions LLC, *Current Conditions and Factors Influencing the Future of Maine’s Forest Products Industry*, prepared for Department of Conservation - Maine Forest Service and Maine Technology Institute, March 2005, pages 150-152.

fuel substitution rules to more fully address the emerging issues associated with the processing, storage and use of CDD at biomass boilers.

By the end of 2005, the Department had approved the use of CDD wood fuel at six other power generation facilities: Boralex (Stratton), Boralex (Livermore Falls), Greenville Steam, Georgia-Pacific (Old Town; now owned by Red Shield), Lincoln Pulp and Paper (Lincoln), and Wheelabrator (Sherman).

At the present time only three biomass power plants are burning CDD wood fuel. The Boralex plant in Athens was shut down and sold to Georgia-Pacific for its Old Town paper mill. The plant is now owned and operated by Red Shield. The other biomass plants presently using CDD wood fuel are the Boralex plants in Livermore Falls and Stratton. An application for the use of CDD fuel at S.D. Warren in Westbrook is currently pending. Although an application has not yet been submitted, GenPower has indicated its interest in building a facility with “best available control technology” (BACT) to control air pollutants, that would be specifically designed to burn fuel that consists of 100% CDD derived wood fuel. Although Greenville Steam, Lincoln Pulp and Paper, and Wheelabrator-Sherman are licensed to burn CDD wood fuel, they have either never burned CDD wood fuel or have ceased using this fuel.

### **C. Regulation of the Use of CDD Wood Fuel**

The use of CDD wood fuel is licensed by the Department as a fuel substitution activity under Chapter 418 (Beneficial Use of Solid Waste) of the Solid Waste Management Rules. Such use also requires an air emission license from the Department’s Bureau of Air Quality.

Following the fuel fire in Athens, the Department determined that further research and evaluation concerning CDD fuel quality was necessary to form the technical foundation for rulemaking. Revisions to the rules were determined to be appropriate and necessary to strengthen and clarify the standards for use of CDD wood as fuel. A study was designed and implemented through the cooperative efforts of the Department (Solid Waste and Air Quality programs), the University of Maine, and Boralex Energy. The work was funded through a “supplemental environmental project (or “SEP”) as part of an enforcement action against Boralex associated with violations at Boralex facilities in Maine. The project resulted in a May 2005 report entitled: “Fate of Dioxin and Arsenic from the Combustion of Construction and Demolition Debris and Treated Wood”.

The study, done under the oversight of Dr. Dana Humphrey from the University of Maine, included combustion studies of multiple test fuel blends and the simultaneous monitoring of boiler operations, stack emissions and emissions controls, fuel quality, and ash quality. At the conclusion of the study the University of Maine issued the report which included a risk evaluation of the air emissions for dioxin and arsenic resulting from these different fuel blends. The study found that the worst case ambient air impact results were well below the Maximum Ambient Air Guidelines, leading the DEP to conclude that the levels of dioxin and arsenic emitted by biomass boilers burning CDD wood fuel

at any of these levels would not pose significant public health impacts from an ambient air quality standpoint. (Also see Section V(E) of this report.)

Based upon the results of this study and knowledge and experience gained over several years, the Department proposed revisions to the fuel substitution provisions of the rules. It was concluded by the Department that the most effective way to ensure environmental protection when CDD wood fuel is used, is through the application of specific fuel quality and fuel handling standards. The proposed revisions addressed the potential contaminants in CDD wood fuel itself, the allowable limits for these contaminants, fuel handling, fuel sampling and testing, and sampling and testing of the resultant ash. Fuel quality characteristics addressed in the rule included the amount of: pressure treated wood, plastics, non-combustible materials (such as metal), asbestos, and “fines”. The rule also imposed specific chemical limits for arsenic, lead and PCBs. Revisions to the rule were adopted by the Board of Environmental Protection and became effective on June 16, 2006. The Department’s rule concerning beneficial use of solid waste, specifically, the use of waste including CDD wood as a fuel substitute (CMR 06-096 Chapter 418 Section 6) is attached as **Appendix B**.

As a matter of practice and policy, prior to the adoption of the revised fuel substitution rules in 2006, the Department, through its licenses, did not allow the substitution of more than 50% CDD fuel (on an average annual basis) for conventional fuels at biomass boilers. This limitation was not imposed in response to a specific technical or scientific concern, but to address the policy need to distinguish, from a regulatory perspective, between a beneficial use activity (fuel substitution) and a solid waste disposal facility (incinerator). This distinction is important since there are certain statutory restrictions and standards that apply solely to “solid waste disposal facilities” (landfills and incinerators). Among these is a ban on the establishment of any new commercial solid waste incinerator. PL 2006 Chapter 617 provided specifically that the Department’s rule: “may not allow the substitution of wood from construction and demolition debris for conventional fuels used in a boiler to exceed 50% of total fuel by weight combusted on an average annual basis”.

### **III. GENERATION, HANDLING AND PROCESSING OF CDD**

#### **A. Municipal Collection of CDD**

Maine towns manage CDD through their local solid waste facilities, including 239 transfer stations, 9 municipal solid waste landfills, 18 municipal CDD landfills, and 2 commercial landfills. The State Planning Office estimates that in 2005, Maine generated 301,549 tons of CDD.

Much of Maine’s municipal solid waste is delivered to small transfer stations. These facilities are of a size and have a customer base that allow for significant control of how the waste is delivered. They have the ability to direct delivery of relatively pure components of the construction and demolition debris waste stream pre-separated for

reuse, recycling or processing. At these local facilities, residents can be required to separate yard waste for chipping and composting, asphalt shingles to be recycled into road patching material, tree limbs and trunks into firewood, and “clean” CDD wood (without plastics, pressure-treated wood, wall-board, glass and siding) for citizen reuse and/or processing into biomass fuel. Transfer stations which manage CDD waste wood for the fuel market by requiring source separation can typically receive a waste stream that is at least 95% wood.

In 2005, 571,834 tons of CDD waste (both in-state and out-of-state generated) was landfilled in Maine’s three largest landfills having capacity available for municipal waste (Pine Tree in Hampden, Juniper Ridge in Old Town, and Waste Management in Norridgewock). Data from the Maine State Planning Office show that in 2004, 12,730 tons of CDD waste from municipalities was recycled. Most CDD in Maine is landfilled without processing. Additionally, at some small transfer stations, the wood portion of CDD waste suitable for fuel is not recycled; it is open-burned, without air pollution controls or energy recovery.

## **B. Processing of CDD**

### **1. Methods**

Mixed CDD is processed for reuse using a variety of methods at several different types of facilities. CDD processors can produce a fuel that meets the new standards of the solid waste rules by employing strategies to control the quality of CDD received for processing and by utilizing various processing technologies.

Mechanical processing, in combination with other methods, is used by the established CDD processing facilities to which CDD wastes are transported for processing into fuel and other products and recyclables. Processing facilities known as “positive pick” operations are designed to remove materials from the process conveyor line that are suitable to be processed into recycled materials such as CDD wood fuel.

“Negative pick” operations are designed to remove materials from the process conveyor line that are not suitable for such recycling (such as metal, plastics, treated wood, shingles, aggregates, etc.). All CDD processing facilities receive materials in a similar manner. Materials are “tipped” from the delivery container or truck onto a floor or pad where the load is inspected by the facility staff. Processing facilities immediately remove oversized materials that are clearly not suitable for further processing into a container destined for a disposal. Removal of oversized material is essential to efficient throughput of CDD materials and for protection of the processing equipment. CDD materials are then put through a vibrating shaker screen to remove dirt and aggregates. The remaining material is placed on a conveyor belt to remove the suitable wood material (in a positive pick process) or to remove the non-wood material (in a negative pick process). Non-wood materials are then removed for off-site disposal or recycling.

If appropriately sized, positive pick facilities are capable of producing a higher quality CDD wood fuel with less effort than negative pick operations. They tend to require a more “wood rich” feedstock and to recover a lesser percentage of the total wood content due to their inability to remove small pieces of wood (<12 inches) at the picking stations. Positive pick facilities generally do not process as much CDD on a daily basis as negative picks, as the process sorting line is more heavily dependent on people than removal machinery. In general, negative pick facilities are able to process larger volumes of CDD on a daily basis and capture a greater percentage of the total wood content. In order to accomplish this however, significant capital and operational expenses are incurred for additional processing equipment with which to separate usable from non-usable materials (such as screens, float tanks, etc.) and for employees to hand pick unsuitable materials (such as metal, plastics, treated wood, shingles, etc.)

## **2. Contaminant Identification and Removal**

The Department’s rules concerning the use of CDD wood fuel focus on fuel quality and the removal of contaminants necessary to achieve the fuel quality standards. The rule establishes specific standards for: non-combustibles, plastics, treated wood, fines, asbestos, arsenic, lead and PCBs.

*Plastics* in the fuel may be removed by hand at the processing facility and by equipment such as screens or “classifiers” that separate low density plastics from more dense materials.

*Non-combustibles and fines* can also be removed by screens or sometimes by flotation units which separate the wood from heavier non-combustibles. “Fines” (small sized particles that may contain relatively high concentrations of certain contaminants such as lead), are a fuel contaminant that traditionally may be difficult for the small source separation facilities such as Maine’s municipal transfer stations to minimize, since their fuel wood stockpiles may not be stored on a paved surface and the mobile processors that serve them many not employ screens to remove these fines. Negative pick facilities tend to generate a significant amount of fines and usually install additional processing equipment to remove them.

*Pressure treated wood* can be controlled by visual inspection and removal. This can first be carried out at the construction or demolition site by the people doing the construction/demolition work. It can also be carried out at the processing facility by people specifically tasked with spotting and removing any pressure treated wood that is delivered.

Studies concerning the accuracy and feasibility of using chemical or other methods to differentiate CCA treated wood from non-treated wood in construction and demolition debris have been on-going by the University of Miami and the

University of Florida since 2001. The most recent document completed on this subject was a final draft of a report dated January 3, 2006, entitled titled “*Augmented Sorting of Recovered Wood Waste Using Stain and X-ray Technologies*”, and prepared for the Town of Medley, Florida. The report evaluated the effectiveness of visual identification of treated wood using a chemical indicator stain (“PAN indicator”) and using no stain, and using a hand held X-ray fluorescence (“XRF”) unit. Prior to this study, the performance of portable hand-held x-ray units for sorting wood waste had not been documented during either manual sorting or sorting through the traditional conveyor belt picking-line process.

The conclusions of this study were the following:

- the facility hosting the study was able to effectively identify loads of wood that were relatively uncontaminated by CCA wood by spot-checking source separated loads of wood as they entered the facility;
- visual sorting methods with no augmentation were found to be quick and reliable for relatively uncontaminated loads of construction and demolition debris wood;
- visual sorting augmented by PAN Indicator stain was most useful for source-separated loads that were suspected of containing a larger amount of suspect treated wood;
- visual methods augmented with PAN Indicator stain were found to be more time consuming and not sufficiently reliable with commingled construction and demolition debris wood;
- identification in commingled construction and demolition debris wood could be aided with the use of hand-held x-ray fluorescent (XRF) units to spot check suspect wood; and
- sorting times and accuracy depended highly on the individual sorting the wood although improvement was noticed with experience.

XRF units can present a safety issue in that the x-rays were found to penetrate through wood and therefore the units needed to be handled carefully and appropriately.

The report indicated that the relative costs per metric ton of the different sorting methods were influenced primarily by labor costs which ranged from \$24 for visual sorting of relatively uncontaminated source-separated wood to \$114 for XRF sorting of commingled wood.<sup>2</sup>

Two existing Maine programs target contaminants that can significantly contaminate CDD wood generated from demolition activity. These programs target the treatment and/or removal of asbestos and lead containing paint from standing structures and from some buildings scheduled for demolition.

---

<sup>2</sup> Solo-Gabriele, Helena, Gary Jacobi, Eduardo Lam and Timothy Townsend, *Augmented Sorting of Recovered Wood Waste Using Stain and X-ray Technologies*, Department of Civil, Arch., and Environ. Engineering, University of Miami, submitted January 3, 2006 (draft).

Department of Environmental Protection Regulation Chapter 425 (Asbestos Management Regulations) requires that prior to conducting a renovation or demolition activity that impacts any building material or component likely to contain *asbestos*, the owner or operator must have an inspection conducted to determine if asbestos-containing materials are present or must presume that asbestos –containing materials are present and an asbestos abatement is required. Prior to renovation or demolition, if more than 3 square feet or 3 linear feet of asbestos containing material is present, that material must be removed by properly trained and licensed asbestos abatement professionals. Asbestos contained in materials that are intact and bound with a matrix that will minimize the potential release of asbestos fibers (e.g., floor tile, asphalt shingles) may be left in place when demolition is performed by large equipment and specific work practices and worker protection actions are implemented. Single family residences, and residences constructed after 1980 that consist of two (2) to four (4) units, are exempt from the inspection provisions stated above. The result of these regulatory requirements is that no building can legally be demolished or renovated in Maine in a manner likely to release asbestos fibers.

For structures demolished by large equipment with non-friable asbestos-containing flooring or roofing left in place, an additional processing step is needed to prevent asbestos contamination of wood fuel derived from construction and demolition debris. This additional process step must insure that asbestos-containing roofing and flooring and the attached substrate materials are separated from wood that is going to be shredded or abraded. Subjecting non-friable asbestos-containing materials (“ACM”) to crushing, shredding or abrading will release previously bound asbestos fibers into the environment and contaminate other materials intended for use. State and federal laws require that the separated ACM and attached substrate be disposed of in a landfill licensed to accept asbestos waste.

The Department believes that *lead* is potentially present in the environment of almost 80% of the housing in Maine. Buildings built before 1950, could have been painted with paints containing up to 50% lead. Buildings built, painted or remodeled before 1978 are also likely to have paint coating that contain some percentage of lead. In 1997, Maine enacted an “Act to Ensure Safe Abatement of Lead Hazards” which directed the Maine DEP to adopt regulations establishing procedures and requirements for the certification and licensing of persons engaged in residential lead-based paint activities, work practice standards for those activities, and licensing and accreditation of lead abatement training programs.

The primary risk posed by lead-based paint and lead dust contamination in a pre-1978 house is the likelihood of causing lead poisoning in children and adults, with children under 6 (six) years of age being particularly vulnerable. Currently, the Maine *Lead Management Regulations* apply only to work performed on

residential buildings and child occupied facilities when the clear intent of the work is to abate lead hazards. The *Lead Management Regulations* do not apply to renovation or remodeling activities or to work on other commercial and industrial facilities and consequently do not serve to limit lead levels in construction or demolition wood that may be used as fuel. The Department has established in rule a specific standard for lead concentrations in blended CDD wood fuel (<375 mg/kg).

Neither of these Federal or Maine laws or regulations prevent the potential lead contamination of wood fuel derived from building remodeling or demolition activities. Levels of contamination higher than 350 mg/kg are considered to present a potential lead poisoning hazard to people who come in direct contact with the wood fuel or dust from the wood fuel that contains that concentration.

### **3. Products and Recyclables**

Most large construction and demolition debris processing facilities produce a variety of recycled products in addition to CDD wood fuel. These facilities remove as much salvageable and reusable material from CDD as is practical in order to recover value from the waste constituents and to minimize the transportation and disposal costs associated with landfilling construction and demolition debris. Materials recovered by these facilities include aggregate from bricks, concrete, asphalt, rocks, and dirt; ferrous and non-ferrous metal; asphalt shingles, un-used gypsum board for reuse, and wood for reuse or for fuel in wood-fired biomass boilers. Additionally, other CDD components not suitable for recycling may be mixed with the recovered aggregate materials and marketed to operating landfills as a soil substitute to cover waste or for shaping and grading material for landfill closure projects. Generally, 35-40% of a mixed CDD waste stream can be processed into CDD wood fuel. (See **Appendix C: “Components of Processed Construction and Demolition Debris From 4 New England Processing Facilities”**).

### **4. Maine Processing Facilities**

Current in-state processing of CDD wood is performed by mobile shredders that process stockpiles of pre-separated CDD wood into fuel at municipal collection sites, and by four commercial processing plants – Aggregate Recycling Corp (ARC) in Eliot, Commercial Paving in Scarborough, KTI Biofuels in Lewiston, and Simpson, Inc. in Sanford. In 2005, these facilities processed a total of 69,787 tons of mixed CDD, with about 30,000 tons of this brought in from out of state.

### **5. New England Processing Facilities Review**

In 2006, DEP staff visited 12 different processing facilities to review their operations and evaluate the quality of the CDD fuels produced (See Section IV-B for data and discussion regarding fuel quality). These facilities included the major commercial processors and several municipal source separation operations at which processing occurs through the use of mobile processing equipment.

**Table 1** presents information concerning the volumes of material handled at these facilities and the processing methods used.

**Table 1**  
**Representative New England CDD Processing Facilities/Sites**  
**Volumes of Material Received and Produced and Processing Technology - 2006**

<b>Facility/Site</b>	<b>Mixed CDD or Source Separated CDD Wood* Received (tons/yr)</b>	<b>CDD Wood Fuel Produced (tons/yr)</b>	<b>Fuel Sorting Technology</b>
ERRCO (NH)	175,000	87,000	Negative Pick
LL&S (NH)	175,000	30,000	Negative Pick
KTI (ME)	48,800	18,130	Negative Pick
ARC (ME)	14,680	8,100	Negative Pick
Pond View (RI)	100,000	35,000	Positive Pick
NER (MA)	73,000	20,000	Positive Pick
Simpson (ME)	7,700	**	Positive Pick
Plan-It (ME)	4,200*	4,000	Source Separation
Old Town (ME)	850*	800	Source Separation
Crossroads (ME)	2,100*	2,000	Source Separation
Augusta (ME)	2,100*	2,000	Source Separation
Boothbay (ME)	5,250*	5,000	Source Separation

\*\* Number not available

### **C. Material Recovery and Source Separation at the Point of Generation or Collection**

Source separating non-pressure treated CDD wood at the point of its generation or collection can significantly simplify and facilitate the processing of this material into quality CDD wood fuel. At municipal transfer stations, source separation of many different types of materials is commonly required including the separation of newspaper, cardboard, plastics and glass for recycling. Similar requirements can be extended to individuals and companies that deliver construction and demolition debris so the wood suitable for processing into CDD wood fuel is pre-separated from roofing, siding, plastics or metal and from pressure treated wood.

“Source separation” is the most basic strategy for controlling the quality of the waste. It entails the sorting of usable elements of CDD at the point of generation (i.e. a demolition site) or collection (i.e. a municipal transfer station). At transfer stations, residents bring in a variety of CDD materials and are typically required to sort them by component (wood, metal, etc.). Municipal wood piles are generally comprised of around 95% wood and are either processed into fuel by mobile processors or are open burned. Wood storage areas are inexpensive to construct and operate, but are heavily dependent on supervision of the customers to ensure adequate separation of potential contaminants such as plastics and pressure-treated wood.

At a transfer station, sorting and removal is most efficiently accomplished by having 1) adequate signage to educate the public on what are “suitable materials” and 2) by having facility staff inspect materials as they are disposed of in the smaller CDD “day pile” storage bins. As material is disposed of at the “day pile” by the public, facility staff are able effectively inspect this pile and remove any unsuitable material they encounter. Facility staff should be the only ones able to move the “day pile” to the larger CDD storage piles as they await adequate volume to enable material processing into CDD wood fuel.

Some facilities require source separated loads from demolition and building contractors. Typically, the processing facilities offer generators financial incentives to send wood rich loads of CDD separately from wood poor loads. This allows the processor to use the wood poor CDD loads to create landfill closure material or to by-pass the CDD directly to landfills for disposal.

### **1. Source Separation during Construction and Demolition**

Separation of potentially suitable wood during building construction is straightforward and simple. Wood not used in the structure can be easily separated into a number of separate piles at a site. This scrap or leftover wood is often new lumber that can still be used for its original purpose. Wood from demolition activity is not nearly as readily separated for reuse. This wood has already been attached to lumber of other types, dimensions and grades, or to other non-wood building materials. In order to achieve a similar degree of material salvage at a demolition site, a significantly more involved process must be used.

Salvaging activities are differentiated by the scope of the salvaging operations. The removal of windows, doors, kitchen and bathroom fixtures, moldings, mantles, and other small architectural components is commonly referred to as “non-structural salvage”. In this context, wooden molding is reused as molding, mantelpieces as mantelpieces, cabinets as cabinets and lumber as lumber. The removal of wooden barn boards, flooring, timbers and lumber; along with the salvaging of bricks or granite is considered to be “structural salvage”. Such material salvaging is practical anywhere there is a real market for the items being salvaged, and is done throughout Maine and the U.S. Whether, when and how it is carried out is simply a matter of economics: the value of the salvaged material, the strength of markets for salvaged materials, and the expense of salvage operations.

Structural salvaging is also referred to as “deconstruction”. The term “deconstruction”, as currently used, is often interpreted to mean the complete disassembly of a building or portion of a building into its component parts and materials. In actuality, the complete dismantling and reuse of every component and all materials from a building is almost never carried out. Practical, timing and financial considerations often do not make comprehensive deconstruction and materials sorting operations feasible.

The bulk of current lumber reuse activities in Maine occur through the “Maine Housing & Building Materials Exchange” (located in Gray and Sanford, see Appendix C), through private transactions like those facilitated in *Uncle Henry’s* weekly publication, and through reclamation at public recycling programs and transfer stations.

## **2. Economic Feasibility of Building Deconstruction**

A defining characteristic of non-structural salvage is that it does not affect the structural integrity of the building. For example, the removal of fixtures, windows, doors, moldings and most cabinet will not normally weaken the construction integrity of the remaining structure. People can routinely still safely work inside the structure. Examples of this reuse or the marketing of salvaged items for reuse can be found each week in Uncle Henry’s “Building Materials” section where typically many individuals and small companies will advertise the sale of salvaged fixtures and building items. Other examples include the monthly State Surplus Sales conducted by the Maine Bureau of General Services where unique windows, hardware and other building materials are available for purchase after major building renovation projects. Another notable example is the “Maine Housing & Building Materials Exchange” (BME) with locations in Gray and Sanford, Maine (See **Appendix C**).

The economic feasibility of structural salvage in a particular municipality, region or state is dependent upon a number of specific factors. Factors that can favorably influence the feasibility of structural salvage or sorting by component include:

- the building contains particularly valuable or unique raw materials such as unique timbers and lumber or other valuable building material;
- the project is not under tight time constraints and rebuilding pressure;
- there is sufficient space on or adjacent to the demolition site to allow for convenient material separation, sorting and organizing;
- contaminants have been removed from the building(s) prior to the start of demolition..

A number of factors can hamper the degree to which materials in a structure may be economically salvaged or sorted by component. These factors include:

- small, disparate projects where economies of scale are not possible;
- worker safety or exposure concerns;
- tight project time frame;
- high labor costs; and
- low salvaged material value.

One point of potential relevance to Maine is that often military base salvage projects can be structured to avoid the redevelopment pressures and timelines common among commercial development projects. At the same time, a military base often has a number of buildings consisting of similar building materials so

economies of scale may be possible. This may provide an opportunity for base redevelopment authorities to minimize the cost and amount of CDD waste associated with demolition activities on a base undergoing redevelopment.

#### IV. USE OF CDD WOOD FUEL IN BOILERS

##### A. CDD Wood Fuel Supply and Use

As discussed in Section II(B) above, only 3 of the 7 boilers approved for CDD wood fuel combustion are presently burning it: Boralex- Stratton, Boralex-Livermore, and Red Shield in Old Town. **Table 2** presents data relevant to the use of CDD wood fuel in biomass boilers in Maine in 2005. Using 286,338 tons of fuel in its power plant, Boralex-Livermore produced 217,002 megawatts of power, with CDD wood fuel accounting for about 44.2% of the total fuel used in the facility. Similarly, using 426,304 tons of fuel in its power plant, Boralex - Stratton produced 267,648 megawatts of power with CDD wood fuel accounting for about 25.9% of the total fuel used in the facility.

**TABLE 2**  
**2005 CDD Wood Fuel Use by Biomass Boilers in Maine**

<b>Boiler</b>	<b>Total annual wood fuel use</b>	<b>Tons CDD wood fuel</b>	<b>% CDD wood fuel</b>	<b>Tons ash generated</b>	<b>% ash per ton wood fuel</b>
Boralex-Livermore	286,338 tons	128,494	45%	28,493 tons	10%
Boralex-Stratton	426,159 tons	110,499	26%	28,156 tons	6.6%

Roughly 75% of the CDD derived wood fuel for each of the Boralex plants was fuel that was processed outside of Maine and shipped as fuel to those facilities.

Red Shield is expected to burn 200,000 tons per year of wood fuel, of which 100,000 tons per year may be CDD wood fuel. The SAPPI biomass facility has capacity to burn 490,000 tons of wood fuel. This facility has submitted an application to burn up to 50% CDD wood fuel; if approved, this facility may combust up to 245,000 tons of CDD wood fuel annually.

As discussed earlier, GenPower has proposed construction of a new boiler designed to burn 100% CDD wood fuel while employing Best Available Control Technology (“BACT”) to meet air emission standards. Its capacity was reported to be planned for 558,000 tons CDD wood fuel per year. DEP estimates that operating this facility at full capacity would produce 55,800 tons per year of ash.

At Maine’s current rate of capture and processing of wood waste from CDD, Maine municipalities supply less than 1% of the maximum annual projected demand for CDD

wood fuel (1.37 million tons – See **Table 5**). Processing of in-state commercial waste currently provides an additional 3%. If all municipal CDD were managed to separate wood waste at the point of collection, and assuming that 25% of the CDD waste stream could be processed into wood fuel, Maine municipalities potentially could generate 75,500 tons of CDD wood fuel annually. This is an estimated 5% of the maximum CDD wood fuel permitted for use in Maine biomass boilers listed in **Table 5**. Managing municipal CDD for maximum CDD wood fuel generation could reduce the amount of Maine landfill capacity currently used for disposal of CDD by 133,200 yds<sup>3</sup> annually.

Several factors make it highly unlikely that the biomass boilers anticipated to routinely burn CDD wood fuel will combust their maximum allowed amounts:

- Currently, of the 5 boilers approved to burned 50% CDD derived wood fuel, 3 are not burning any CDD derived wood fuel, and 2 consistently burn less than the 50% allowed.
- There are practical limits to the amount of CDD derived wood fuel that a boiler burns that are related to operational costs and maintenance.
- There is not sufficient licensed processing capacity in all of New England to process the amount of CDD needed to create 1.3 million tons of CDD wood fuel.
- Processing CDD into fuel and other recycled products is a low profit undertaking which limits the ease and speed by which processing capacity anywhere could be increased.

To combust the maximum amount of CDD wood fuel approved for use, biomass boilers would need to rely upon CDD wood fuel that is produced in Maine from out-of-state CDD and/or on CDD wood fuel that originates outside of Maine, since Maine simply does not generate enough CDD to meet this demand. 238,000 tons (190,400 yds<sup>3</sup>) of out-of state CDD was sent to Maine's commercial landfills in 2005. If this amount were separated and processed for CDD wood fuel production rather than landfilled, it would create an additional 83,300 tons of CDD wood fuel (6% of the projected maximum demand) and reduce the landfill capacity used by at least an equivalent amount.

The wholesale replacement of out-of-state processing capacity by in-state facilities is unlikely since it is significantly less expensive to process locally (nearer the sites of CDD generation) and pay to transport only the portion of CDD that is processed into wood fuel than to transport mixed CDD into Maine for processing. The degree to which out-of-state CDD processors can increase their operational capacity to meet increased fuel demand is also limited. Out-of-state processors are currently operating at close to capacity.

## **B. CDD Wood Fuel Quality**

Shortly after the July 2006 implementation of the revised fuel substitution rules, the Department conducted sampling and analysis of CDD wood fuel from 12 different processing facilities which are representative of the regional CDD processing industry as a whole. The facilities were representative of different CDD sorting/processing technologies: 4 negative pick processors, 3 positive pick processors, and 5 source

separation facilities. Collectively the 12 facilities produce approximately 205,000 tons of CDD wood fuel annually. The CDD wood fuel sampled was tested to determine whether the fuel met the regulatory physical standards for plastics, non-burnable, treated wood, and fines, and the chemical standards for arsenic and lead.

An evaluation was conducted to determine whether there is a correlation between the amount of treated wood and arsenic, and the amount of painted wood and lead. The relationship between the arsenic and treated wood data does not support using the treated wood data to predict arsenic concentration in the CDD wood fuel. This result supports the conclusion of the university of Maine study that there may be sources of arsenic in the CDD wood fuel other than the treated wood fraction. Similarly, the painted wood data do not correlate well to lead concentrations in the CDD wood fuel. The percentage of painted wood in the CDD wood fuel has varied without significant corresponding changes in the concentration of lead in the fuel. There has been no correlation between the amount of painted wood in CDD derived wood fuel and lead concentration in either the fuel or resulting ash. All future analyses of both will be closely evaluated to determine if this remains true.

Plastic is readily separated from wood on a pick line in large part because it is often colored and contrasts sharply with wood. When more plastic than usual is found in the CDD wood fuel the cause is often the presence of a plastic/wood composite that is designed to resemble wood. This can be addressed by mechanical separation, as plastics and wood differ significantly in density. Fuels from all facilities reviewed were well within Chapter 418 CDD wood fuel standards for plastic content.

Non-burnable material exclusive of rocks, concrete and brick is reported as metal. Magnetic removal of small pieces of ferrous metal generally works well with the pick line removing larger pieces of metal. However, small non-ferrous metal, especially if attached to a larger chunk of wood is able to pass through with the CDD wood. Technology in the form of an eddy current separator can be used, however this may be cost prohibitive for all but the larger processors. Two of the three facilities that exceeded the non-burnable standard use source separated CDD wood as feedstock. As has been stated earlier in this report, more diligent supervision of customers as they drop off CDD waste, together with more efficient CDD management and storage design at Maine's transfer stations and landfills are most likely to lead to improvement in CDD wood fuel quality.

CDD wood fuel samples from 2 of 12 facilities failed to meet the treated wood standard. Treated wood cannot be removed by mechanical means. Only by a trained person picking over the waste wood can the characteristic yellow-green color be seen and removed. Many processors have begun to reach out to their commercial customers who generate the CDD waste to encourage them to inspect their jobs for treated wood and to organize delivery of their waste by identifying particular loads containing the treated wood. Such activity has been shown to lower the quantity of treated wood that must be removed during CDD wood processing. This in turn lowers the quantity of treated wood

in the CDD wood fuel produced. The effectiveness of this method recommends it to a broader application with all CDD wood fuel producers.

The CDD wood fuel standard most often exceeded is the fines standard. Fines include wood, dirt, and small often unrecognizable bits of everything present in the mixed CDD waste. It was established during the University of Maine study of the Boralex biomass plants, that the fines fraction of the CDD wood fuel contains a higher percentage of potential contaminants than the remainder of the fuel. The standard of <10% fines in commercial CDD wood fuel was established to limit the contaminant load through a means not achievable by simply limiting recognizable plastic, metal, or treated wood. By limiting fines, the overall quality of the CDD wood fuel has been significantly improved. One interesting way of making this point is to note that a typical truckload of CDD wood fuel prior to the Chapter 418 rules weighed in at about 28 tons while currently the same volume load would weigh about 24 tons. Since the volume per truckload has not changed, this means approximately 4 tons of fines and contaminants have been removed as a result of Maine's new CDD fuel standards.

**Table 3** allows the comparison of each facility's success in removing treated wood. The values given are in 100% CDD wood fuel rather than the <50% CDD wood fuel blended with unadulterated wood (ie. whole tree chips) which is allowed as fuel in biomass boilers licensed to burn CDD wood fuel. The requirement for using a CDD wood blended with clean wood provides an additional margin of safety for all contaminants with respect to air emissions.

The two facilities sampled which exceeded the treated wood standard have 2 options for addressing this issue to ensure that their fuel products meet the standards in the future. They can work with their customers to see that jobs are surveyed prior to demolition and that treated wood is batched into designated truckloads for special handling at the processing facility, or they can place more resources into treated wood identification and removal within their processes

**Table 3**  
**CDD Wood Fuel Testing**  
**Results for Physical Parameters**  
**(DEP Sampling – 2006)**

Facility	Plastic	Non-burnable	Treated Wood	Fines
<b>STANDARD</b>	<1.0%	<1.0%	<1.5%	<10% commercial <20% municipal
ERRCO (NH)	0.1	0.0	0.9	8.0
LL&S (NH)	0.5	0.6	1.8	8.8
KTI (ME)	0.4	4.0	3.7	4.1
ARC (ME)	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.3
PondView. (RI)	0.1	0.1	0.0	11.7
NER (MA)	0.0	0.0	0.3	9.6
Simpson (ME)	0.3	0.8	0.3	11.6
Plan-It (ME)	0.0	1.1	1.4	3.0
OldTown (ME)	0.1	1.3	1.5	11.8
WMI (ME)	0.1	0.5	0.6	11.3
Augusta (ME)	0.1	1.0	1.0	4.7
Boothbay (ME)	0.1	0.2	0.0	21.3

Results are presented as the percent by weight. Shaded results exceeded Chapter 418 standards.

**Table 4**  
**CDD Wood Fuel Testing**  
**Results for Chemical Parameters**  
**(DEP Sampling – 2006)**

Facility	Treated Wood	Arsenic	Painted Wood	Lead
<b>STANDARD</b>	<1.5%	50 mg/kg	no standard	<350 mg/kg
ERRCO(NH)	0.9%	81	10.0%	44
LL&S(NH)	1.8%	14.8	5.1%	314
KTI(ME)	3.7%	77	12.2%	24
ARC(ME)	0.0%	67	6.0%	119
Pond View.(RI)	0.0%	41.5	1.5%	82
NER(MA)	0.3%	110	1.4%	44
Simpson(ME)	0.3%	51.8	7.9%	56
Plan-It(ME)	1.4%	23.2	8.4%	139
Old Town(ME)	1.5%	55.3	12.9%	78
WMI(ME)	0.6%	51.2	4.9%	46
Augusta(ME)	1.0%	17.9	15.5%	124
Boothbay(ME)	0.0%	40.2	4.3%	76

*Shaded results exceeded Chapter 418 standards.*

## C. CDD Wood Fuel Use – Impacts

### 1. Ash Generation

The amount of ash generated by a biomass boiler depends upon the composition of the fuel used. For planning purposes, the standard industry assumption when burning 100% “green” wood (i.e., no CDD wood) is that the weight of ash will be 3% of the weight of the fuel input. No similar standard assumptions have been developed for facilities that burn any defined amount of CDD wood fuel. To project the amount of ash that may be generated by facilities operating in Maine, Department staff developed the following estimates based on historic data and accounting for the significant decrease in percent fines allowed in CDD wood fuel under the new Chapter 418 standards:

Ash derived from burning 50/50 CDD/greenwood = 6%

Ash derived from burning 100% CDD = 8%

**Table 5** shows the amounts of ash expected to be generated by each facility if it burns no CDD wood fuel and burns its maximum permitted amount of CDD wood fuel. These numbers can be used to calculate landfill capacity needed to accommodate ash from the combustion of CDD wood fuel in these biomass boilers.

**Table 5**  
**Annual Maximum Fuel Use and Ash Generation from**  
**Current and Proposed CDD Wood Combustion Facilities**

Facility	Maximum Tons Fuel	Maximum tons CDD wood fuel	Tons Ash <u>no</u> CDD wood fuel	Tons Ash <u>max</u> CDD wood fuel	Cubic Yards Ash* – <u>no</u> CDD wood fuel	Cubic Yards Ash* – <u>max</u> CDD wood fuel
Boralex – Livermore	396,000	198,000	11,880	23,760	9,504	19,008
Boralex – Stratton	540,000	270,000	16,200	32,400	12,960	25,920
Red Shield Old Town	200,000	100,000	6,000	12,000	4,800	9,600
S.D. Warren Westbrook	490,000	245,000	14,700	29,400	11,760	23,520
Gen Power	558,000	558,000	N/A	44,640	N/A	35,712
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,184,000</b>	<b>1,371,000</b>	<b>48,780</b>	<b>142,200</b>	<b>39,024</b>	<b>113,760</b>

\*Density of CDD ash averages 1.25 tons/cubic yard when landfilled.

If these five biomass boilers burned CDD wood fuel at their actual/proposed maximum licensed/designed capacities, 100,752 yds<sup>3</sup> more ash would be generated annually than if they burned only green wood and no CDD wood fuel.

Based on historic operations, it is more likely that the facilities which are not specifically designed to burn CDD wood fuel will burn less than 50%. If GenPower is licensed and built to combust only up to 50% CDD wood fuel and all five facilities burn a somewhat lower percentage of CDD wood fuel, assuming that the resulting amount of ash will be 5% of the fuel input, the total expected increased landfill capacity needed would be 87,360 yds<sup>3</sup> annually. (GenPower would generate 13,392 yds<sup>3</sup> more ash if it burned 100% CDD wood fuel than if it only burned 50% CDD wood fuel).

In general, ash from the burning of CDD wood fuel is similar to ash derived from the burning of municipal solid waste or from open-burning of CDD at transfer stations or landfills in the state, as shown in **Table 6**. The levels of arsenic and lead present are significantly below the hazardous thresholds.

**Table 6**  
**Comparison of Ash Sampling Results from**  
**Biomass Boilers, Waste to Energy Facilities and Open Burn Piles**  
**(2005-2006 Sampling Data)**

	<b>arsenic</b>	<b>lead</b>	<b>mercury</b>
<i><b>Hazardous Threshold</b></i>	5.0 mg/kg	5.0 mg/kg	0.20 mg/kg
<b>BIOMASS BOILERS</b> (burning CDD wood)			
Stratton (combined ash)	0.14	0.1	not detected
Livermore(fly ash)	0.23	0.3	not detected
Livermore.(bottom ash)	0.16	0.2	not detected
<b>WASTE TO ENERGY FACILITIES</b>			
Maine Energy (RDF*)	0.084	0.220	0.003
EcoMaine. (mass burn)	0.035	0.375	0.003
<b>OPEN BURN PILE</b>			
<b>ASH</b>			
Mean**	0.19	0.46	<0.20

\*Refuse derived fuel

\*\* Mean calculated from data representative of ash from 12 municipal transfer station open burn piles.

## 2. Landfill Capacity

To the DEP's knowledge, none of the residues from the out-of-state processing of CDD wood into fuel was sent to Maine landfills. Therefore, the impact on landfill capacity that out-of-state fuel had on Maine landfill disposal capacity is limited to that portion of the boiler ash that was derived from out-of-state fuel, i.e., approximately 43,000 tons or 34,300 yds<sup>3</sup> (cubic yards).

Some out-of-state CDD was processed by KTI in Lewiston, Maine, and the resulting CDD wood fuel was utilized by Boralex. The wastes from processing

this CDD into fuel were disposed in Maine. In 2005, KTI received 58,117 tons of in-state and out-of-state waste. Of this waste, 23% of the material received (13,368 tons) was non-processible waste that was landfilled in Maine. About 50% of this was derived from out-of-state material, resulting in 6,685 tons of out-of-state waste landfilled in Maine after processing, using about 5,347 yds<sup>3</sup> of landfill space.

In 2005, 16,106 tons (12,885 yds<sup>3</sup>) of ash from Boralex Livermore was disposed of in the IP papermill landfill in Jay, Maine to increase the stability of the landfilled paper mill sludge. The amount of IP's landfill capacity used in that year for Boralex-Livermore ash derived from out-of-state CDD wood fuel was less than 4% of the capacity used that year. Assuming that both the ash from Boralex Stratton and the process waste from KTI-Lewiston were disposed in the Pine Tree landfill in Hampden in 2005, 22,791 tons of CDD processing waste and fuel combustion ash are attributable to out-of-state sources. Pine Tree Landfill received a total of 672,317 tons of waste (all types) in 2005. Therefore, the waste attributable to out-of-state CDD wood fuel from Stratton and processing of out-of-state CDD at KTI was less than 3.5% of the total waste received by Pine Tree Landfill in 2005. Maine's two commercial landfills, Pine Tree and Waste Management in Norridgewock, also received about 238,000 tons of mixed CDD from out of state in 2005.

Remaining capacity for the landfills that are licensed to accept ash from biomass boilers that burn CDD wood fuel is estimated to be:

➤ Pine Tree Landfill	1,026,915 yds <sup>3</sup>
➤ Juniper Ridge Landfill	9,500,000 yds <sup>3</sup>
➤ Waste Management Crossroads Landfill	4,300,000 yds <sup>3</sup>
	(Total: 14,826,915 yds <sup>3</sup> )

Maximum use of CDD wood fuel in the next few years would use less than 1% of this current remaining landfill capacity annually. Also, it is likely that some of the ash from the biomass boilers will continue to be disposed of in generator-owned landfills to add stability to papermill sludge.

## **V. BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY FOR BURNING CDD WOOD FUEL**

### **A. Best Available Control Technology**

“Best Available Control Technology” as defined in 06-096 Chapter §100 means: “an emission limitation (including a visible emissions standard) based on the maximum degree of reduction for each pollutant emitted from or which results from the new or modified emissions unit which the Department on a case-by-case basis, taking into account energy, environmental and economic impacts and other costs, determines is achievable for such emissions unit through application of production processes or

available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning or treatment or innovative fuel combination techniques for control of each pollutant. In no event shall application of BACT result in emissions of any pollutant which would exceed the emissions allowed by any applicable standard under 40 CFR Part 60 and 61 or any applicable emission standard established by the Department. If the Department determines that technological or economic limitations on the application of measurement methodology to a particular emissions unit would make the imposition of an emission standard infeasible, a design, equipment, work practice, operational standard or combination thereof may be prescribed instead to satisfy the requirement for the application of BACT. Such standard shall, to the degree possible, set forth the emission reduction achievable by implementation of such design, equipment, work practice or operation, and shall provide for compliance by means which achieve equivalent results.”

BACT analyses for the criteria air pollutants (nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, particulate matter and volatile organic compounds) have been required since the 1977 Clean Air Act Requirements became effective. The program required that, regardless of existing air quality, new emission sources subject to the EPA New Source Review program would be controlled to a level that represents BACT. This requirement precludes potential applicants from shopping for areas with less stringent emission limitations, and also promotes the research and development of more efficient and more economic alternative technologies.

The Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) developed a BACT Guideline in June 1991 to promote consistent analyses of proposed control technologies and consistent procedures for reviewing BACT determinations from state to state. A uniform set of procedures ensures equitable treatment for prospective applicants and also reduces pressure on reviewing agencies to establish less stringent controls compared to similar projects located elsewhere.

The NESCAUM BACT Guideline employs a “top down” approach. The starting assumption for the top down approach is that the most stringent control possible is BACT. The burden of proof for applying a less stringent level of control rests in the applicant’s case specific evaluation of the control alternatives.

## **B. Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)**

The Environmental Protection Agency adopted a new strategy for dealing with air toxics in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments called Maximum Achievable Control Technology, or MACT.

The strategy abandoned EPA’s 1977 Amendments’ risk based approach to controlling air toxics in favor of a new technology approach. The standards were developed based on control strategies used by source categories or industries and are comprised of three components. In the first phase, EPA developed a list of 188 hazardous air pollutants (HAPS) and the industries or source categories emitting those pollutants were

determined. This created a matrix of 174 different source categories covering major emitters of the 188 HAPS. EPA also designated a list of seven carcinogenic or persistent bioaccumulative toxins (PBT's) which would also be regulated under 40 CFR Part 63.

EPA next began developing MACT standards for these pollutant-source combinations. The MACT standards required sources to meet specific emissions limits that are based on emission levels already being achieved by similar sources in the country. To accomplish this, EPA surveyed a source category or industry and determined the top 12% best controlled facilities. For categories with less than 30 sources, EPA looked at the top five best controlled facilities. EPA developed emission standards based on the control technologies or operational practices utilized by these top sources.

After the implementation of all the MACT standards, EPA will return to a risk-based approach to assess how these technology-based emission limits are protecting public health and the environment. Based on this assessment, EPA may implement additional standards to address any significant remaining, or residual, health or environmental risks.

Boilers at facilities which are major emitters of hazardous air pollutants are subject to 40 CFR Part 63, Subpart DDDDD, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters. New units at these facilities must meet 0.025 lbs per million Btu for particulate matter, and existing units must meet 0.07 lbs per million Btu. All existing units in Maine subject to this MACT standard presently meet the 0.07 lbs per million Btu limit and most already meet the 0.025 lbs per million Btu standard required of new sources

### **C. Air Toxic Regulation in Maine**

There are few air toxics in Maine which have ambient air quality standards (MAAQs) developed and contained in statute. Other air toxics are evaluated using risk based, Maine Ambient Air Guidelines (MAAG) developed by the Department of Health and Human Services' Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Environmental Health (DEH). The DEH uses a risk-based approach for developing MAAG values that are set to be protective for both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic effects. When considering the non-carcinogenic toxicological effects, the levels are set that represent a minimal risk of a deleterious effect from lifetime exposure even for sensitive subpopulations.

For carcinogenic or probable human carcinogens the MAAG values are derived using a quantitative estimate for the chemical's inhalation carcinogenic potency which is used with the target incremental lifetime cancer risk over background rates of a cancer risk of one in one-hundred thousand to calculate the MAAG value. Thus, a lifetime exposure above the MAAG concentration value could result in a cancer occurrence of one in one hundred thousand individuals.

#### **D. BACT for CDD in Maine**

There are presently seven facilities in the State licensed by Department's Bureau of Air Quality (air emission licenses) to combust CDD wood fuel. These facilities are;

- Red Shield in Old Town
- Greenville Steam in Greenville
- SAPPI in Westbrook
- Wheelabrator Sherman in Sherman; and
- Boralex - Stratton,
- Boralex - Livermore Falls
- Boralex - Ashland.

These facilities may utilize between 5% and 50% (by weight on an annual basis) CDD as their total fuel fed to the boilers.

BACT for boilers utilizing CDD wood as a fuel has included high efficiency particulate control in the form of electrostatic precipitators. Air toxic emissions, namely metals and dioxins, adhere to particulate matter and can be effectively removed in this manner. Electrostatic precipitators generally perform at greater than 99% efficiency for removing particulate matter from the flue gas stream. The electrostatic precipitators can also meet Subpart DDDDD, MACT limits. Another form of high efficiency particulate control is through the use of a baghouse. Baghouse control can achieve a slightly higher efficiency than electrostatic precipitators and would likely be required of a new source proposing to combust CDD wood fuel.

#### **E. Fate of Dioxin and Arsenic from CDD Burning**

The University of Maine study resulting in the report entitled, "Fate of Dioxin and Arsenic from the Combustion of Construction and Demolition Debris and Treated Wood", as described in Section II(C) above, was evaluated by the Bureau of Air Quality. The study determined that the worst case ambient air quality impact results from the Livermore Falls facility were only 30% of the Maine Ambient Air Guideline (MAAG) value for arsenic and 0.47% of the MAAG value for dioxin. For the Stratton facility, the worst case impact levels were 3.5% of the MAAG value for arsenic and 0.24% of the MAAG value for dioxin. These values were calculated based on Industrial Source Complex Simple Terrain (ISCST3), refined air dispersion modeling using 5 years of hourly off-site meteorological data.

It was reported in the study that elevated arsenic levels were observed during one of the stack test runs for particulate matter at the Boralex Livermore Falls facility. One of the four electrostatic precipitator fields (ESP) was shut off during the run, leaving only three fields energized. Additional testing runs using all ESP fields resulted in arsenic levels that were approximately 3.5% of the MAAG value for arsenic. As a result of that information, Bureau of Air Quality staff has amended the air emission licenses for those utilizing electrostatic precipitators to require that all fields be in operation when burning CDD wood fuel.

The study determined that arsenic and dioxin emissions from the combustion of CDD wood do not pose an unreasonable risk to public health based on the Maine Ambient Air Guidelines. It is the Department's expectation that the concentrations of metals and compounds currently being tested for at the facilities burning CDD wood will likewise not pose unreasonable public health risks. The Department is presently evaluating that data.

#### **F. Ongoing Air Toxics Investigation into CDD Wood Fuel**

In November of 2005, the Bureau of Air Quality (Bureau) convened a meeting with those facilities in Maine that were burning CDD wood fuel. At that meeting, the Bureau expressed its concern about the relationship between arsenic emissions and electrostatic precipitator operations, as well as the need for increased stack emission testing for additional chemicals and compounds. Those in attendance acknowledged the need for additional air toxics data on stack emissions and agreed to sample for the following metals and compounds based on the frequency noted below, as well as to submit applications to amend their air emission licenses to make the additional testing agreements enforceable:

- For facilities burning between 25 to 50% CDD, stack test two times per year for two years spaced six months apart;
- For facilities burning between 10 to 25% CDD, stack test once per year for two years; and
- For facilities burning less than 10% CDD there is no additional stack testing requirement.

The chemicals and compounds to be stack tested for are antimony, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, vanadium, hydrogen chloride, and dioxin.

The results of the stack testing will be used with facilities' previous site specific air dispersion modeling analyses to determine that the Maine Ambient Air Guidelines are being met. Further, the Department indicated that it would evaluate the data after the first two years of sampling to determine future testing requirements.

Some stack testing data had been obtained and a preliminary review of one data set for the SAPPI Westbrook facility is show below in **Table 7** . The data was used in concert with previous ISCST3, refined air dispersion modeling performed on the mill's #20 power boiler and shows the predicted impacts from the seven metals and compounds listed to be well below either the Maine Ambient Air Quality Standard or the Maine Ambient Air Guideline.

**Table 7  
Westbrook Stack Testing – Metals  
(2006 data)**

Metal	Maine Ambient Air Standard (ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	Bureau of Health Ambient Air Guideline (ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	Impact (ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	% of Guideline or Standard
Arsenic		0.002	0.00062	31%
Cadmium		0.006	0.000039	0.65%
Chromium	0.3		0.00029	0.65%
Copper		2	0.00039	0.02%
Lead	1.5		0.034	0.23%
Manganese		0.05	0.00088	1.8%
Mercury		0.3	<0.00029	0.1%

**G. Conclusion: What is BACT for CDD?**

BACT for CDD wood fuel combustion will vary depending on the type and configuration of the facility proposed.

For facilities combusting CDD wood, the study noted above identified a direct correlation between arsenic emissions and electrostatic precipitator operation. Upon discovery of that correlation, the Department moved to amend the air emission licenses of those facilities with electrostatic precipitators which were combusting CDD wood. These facilities are now required to cease CDD wood combustion unless all of the fields of the electrostatic precipitator are fully operational. Any future BACT determination for CDD combustion at existing facilities utilizing electrostatic precipitators will contain this requirement.

BACT for new sources applying to use CDD wood as fuel shall be the use of a baghouse for high efficiency particulate control and the emission unit shall be subject to the requirements of 40 CFR, Part 60, Subpart DDDDD, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters.