

Title V/Clean Air Act: Sierra Club Petition to Object Filed Addressing Lumber City, Georgia Wood Pellet Manufacturing Plant



Walter Wright, Jr.
wwright@mwlaw.com
(501) 688.8839

10/24/2024

The Georgia Interfaith Power & Light and the Georgia Chapter of the Sierra Club (collectively, “Sierra Club”) filed a Title V Petition to Object (“Petition”) before the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) Administrator related to a Telfair Forest Products, LLC (“Telfair”) facility.

The Title V Petition objects to the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (“EPD”) issuance of a Title V significant Permit modification to its existing wood pellet and wood shavings manufacturing plant located in Lumber City, Georgia.

42 U.S.C. § 7661 requires that states submit each proposed Title V Permit to EPA for review. Section 505(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA object to the issuance of a proposed Title V Permit in writing within 45 days of the receipt of the proposed Permit (and all necessary supporting information) if the agency determines that it is not in compliance with the applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act.

If EPA does not object to a Permit, Section 505(b)(2) provides that any person may petition the EPA Administrator within 60 days of the expiration of the 45-day review period, to object to the permit.

The Petition provides that the facility is currently authorized under its Air Permit to emit 568 tons of VOCs per year. The facility is stated to have not undergone to date PSD/New Source Review. EPD is alleged to have proposed the modified Telfair Permit to EPA in July 2024 with inaccurate emission factors that had been contradicted by previous emissions testing.

Sierra Club argues that EPA must object to the Title V Permit Modification because:

1. The Title V Permit Modification’s inclusion of inaccurate VOC and HAP emission factors in key monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements renders the Permit conditions insufficient to assure Telfair’s compliance with the synthetic minor limits;
2. EPD failed to provide an adequate statement of basis for the Permit Modification due to the statement’s incorrect information regarding the factual basis for the selected VOC and HAP emission factors; and,
3. EPD failed to provide an adequate opportunity for public and EPA review of the Permit Modification’s VOC and HAP monitoring conditions due to EPD’s withholding of centrally important emissions test results.

A copy of the Petition can be downloaded [here](#).