

# DEPOSITION OF ANDREW KEYFAUVER October 29, 2009

11:20 a.m. to 4:05 p.m.

Before the Environmental Quality Council, State of Wyoming

IN THE MATTER OF:

MEDICINE BOW FUEL & POWER, LLC
IAR PERMIT CT-5873

Docket No. 09-2801

### **APPEARANCES:**

#### Andrea Issod

Sierra Club 85 Second Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94105 (414) 977-5544 Appeared for the Plaintiff.

# Nancy E. Vehr

State of Wyoming, Attorney General's Office 123 Capitol Building Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002 (307) 777-7580 Appeared for the Department of Environmental Quality.

### Mary A. Throne

Throne Law Office, P.C. 211 West 19<sup>th</sup>, Suite 200 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001 and

## John A. Coppede

Hickey & Evans, LLP 1800 Carey Avenue, Suite 700 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001 (307) 634-1525 Appeared for Medicine Bow Fuel & Power.

# Hansen & Meadors, LLC Court Reporting & Legal Video Services

109 East 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 46 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001 Phone (307) 432-4061

Fax: (877) 482-1230

e-mail: hansenmeadors@reporterworks.com

ANDREW KEYFAUVER, 2 called as a witness, being first duly sworn, testified

as follows:

**EXAMINATION** 

BY MS. ISSOD:

Q Good morning, Mr. Keyfauver.

A Good morning.

Q Can you please state your full name and

address for the record. 9

10 A It's Andrew Keyfauver. My work address is 122 West 25th Street, Chevenne, Wyoming 82002.

Q And you're currently employed by the Wyoming 13 Department of Environmental Quality, correct?

A Correct.

Q And have you appeared at a deposition before?

A No.

14

15

16

Q This is your first. So let me go over some 17 18 ground rules. I'm basically just going to ask you a few 19 questions about your job and about the permit for the

20 Medicine Bow facility, the Medicine Bow Fuel and Power

21 facility. If at any time you don't hear me or if you

22 don't understand the question, then just say so. Ask me

23 to repeat the question or tell me that you don't

24 understand it, and I will rephrase it.

Try to state your answers clearly. A nod of

public -- the application, the public notice, the

2 decision document, some of the other -- I think -- the

decision document, yeah. That's -- that's as best as I

recall ---

6

11

17

20

25

Q Great.

A - is currently in here.

Q Great. So is everything in here, in this

folder, in the administrative record?

A I believe all but the Deseret permit. I

10 looked at that.

Q Okav.

12 A I don't have a decision document.

13 Q Okay. So in the notice of this deposition,

14 we asked for you to bring certain documents with you,

including correspondence and notes. Did you bring any

16 correspondence with you today?

A No.

18 MS. VEHR: I brought all the admin record

19 stuff and that.

MS. ISSOD: Okay.

21 Q (By Ms. Issod) Do you have any handwritten

notes with you, outside of what is in the administrative 22

23 record already?

24 A No. I do not.

Q Okay. Do you have any handwritten notes

the head doesn't work for the record. He's going to

2 take down your response. If you need to take a break at

any time, please just say so. If we have a question

pending, I'll ask you to answer the question before we

5 take a break, but whenever you need to.

If you ever realize that an answer you gave was inaccurate or you'd like to add something, just tell me you'd like to supplement an earlier answer, that you just remembered something.

if you don't remember the information necessary to answer the question, just say so, that you

don't recall. And please do not answer a question unless 14 you're 100 percent sure that you understand it. Okay. Do you understand all those instructions?

A Yes, I do. 16

15

17

21

22

Q Okay. Is there anything I should know about your physical health or mental state today that will

impair your ability to respond to questions? 19 20

A I'm perfectly fine.

Q Great. Okay. In preparation for this deposition, did you review any documents?

A These documents I have in this folder.

24 Q Okay.

25 A It's pretty much the application, the regarding this matter since the administrative record

2 was assembled?

A No. I do not.

Q Okay. So how long have you been working at the DEQ?

A I've been working for Air Quality Division

for just over nine years.

Q Nine years. And what is your current job

title?

13

15

A I believe it is currently program engineer.

It's -- it's changed like four times in the last year

and a half.

Q. Oh.

14 A That job classification status.

Q Can you discuss your responsibilities as a

16 program engineer?

17 A I am a senior permit engineer in Air Quality

18 Division. Reviews permit applications. Typically, PSD

or what they call more complex technical applications,

such as coal mines or synthetic minor type of

21 applications in regards to NSR.

22 Q Okay. Did you have primary responsibility at

23 DEQ for review of Medicine Bow's prevention of

24 significant deterioration permit?

25 A Yes.

9

11

59

A As I recall, the applicant provided counts for components.

components in the facility?

Q Is it true to estimate fugitive component leaks, you generally need three things: a component count; information about the design of each component; and emission factors for each component?

61

62

A I'd ask for clarification what you mean by "design."

Q Okay. Details about each component.

10 A I would say that there are multiple factors that go into fugitive emission calculations, such as the type of service that the component is in. Is it a 14 valve, a flange. The emission factors is just one piece 15 that comes in that AP 42.

Q Okay. So can you fully describe all the pieces that you need to calculate fugitive component 18 leak emissions?

A I'll try and recall all of them. But you 20 need a count of the equipment. Whether it be pumps.

21 Need to know if it's a pump, a valve, a flange. What 22 type of service it's in, whether it's gas service,

23 liquid service, gas and liquid service. The VOC

24 constituent. Based on the type of valve and service,

25 you can use the AP 42 factors to arrive at emission

60

A To arrive at whether it's practically enforceable.

Q Okay. So some aspects of the plan might not be enforceable; some aspects might be enforceable.

MS. VEHR: Objection.

Q Okay.

A Yes.

24 entirety, not in pieces.

Q Okay.

do his compliance job.

conditions that he can enforce.

plan regarding this pressure check?

A I'd say no, there is not.

3 job.

10

11 12

13

15

17

20

23

13

16

20

23

24

A -- how he is -- how he does his compliance

Q But part of your job is to ensure that he can

A I'd say that was part of my job, is to set

check are required. Do you see that sentence?

Q Okay. How are the pressure checks 16 enforceable if there's no numerical specificity?

A I am not an expert, but I would -- I could

18 only guess that the pressure checks are part of a safety

19 procedure prior to sending the gas down to other units.

those pressure checks, how is that -- is that an

enforceable requirement of this plan?

Q But if there's no limit on the outcome of

A I believe the plan is to be reviewed in its

Q Is there any numerical specificity in the

Q Okay. In the third bullet under Gasifier, it

reads, A low pressure and normal operating pressure

MR. COPPEDE: Misstates his testimony.

A When it comes to certain line items like this well pressure, probably say that would be hard to enforce.

Q (By Ms. Issod) Okay. Move on to another subject. How do you estimate emissions from fugitive component leaks?

A Using -- the applicant used AP 42 emissions -- either AP 42 emission factors or SOCMI, as 15 they're sometimes referred to.

Q What does SOCMI stand for?

A Synthetic -- I do not recall exactly, but 18 synthetic organic chemical manufacturing industry, or 19 something like that.

Q Okay. So what -- what does the applicant do with these emission factors to estimate fugitive 22 component leaks?

A Could you reword . . .

Q Okay. In order to calculate fugitive

25 component leaks, don't you need a count of the number of

factors -- or emissions based on counts.

Q Okay. Do you recall the number of components Medicine Bow used to estimate its fugitive component leaks? 4

A No, I do not.

Q Is there a document that you could quickly look through to refresh your memory?

A It would be in the application. Probably in Appendix B where all the emission calculations were.

10 Q Okay. Well, regardless of the number, how did you verify this number?

A I verified the emission factors that they 13 used, based on what they say is the service and the EOC content and compared those with the known EPA factors.

Q How did you verify the number of components?

16 A That was provided to us by the applicant, 17 based on their -- their latest design drawings.

Q Did they provide to you their latest design drawing?

A No.

21 Q Did you ask for their latest design drawings?

22

23 Q Okay. Are emissions from fugitive component leaks a large source of volatile organic -- strike that; start over -- volatile organic compounds?

Hansen & Meadors, LLC

15

18

19

20

5

95

Q In this table, it refers to planned 2 maintenance emissions for the gasifiers. Do you know what those emissions are?

A As I recall, the planned emissions were 5 emissions from when they had to take down the gasifier 6 change out nozzle or replace in the factory, and during -- when they bring that gasification unit back on line, those emissions would go over to the flare until it met specifications.

Q So are these emissions included in the PTE. the gasifier change-out emissions?

A Planned maintenance, yes.

Q And do you know those were included?

A Because they identified those as routine, 15 foreseeable emissions happening during a year.

Q And would this involve any startup or 17 shutdown for the gasifier?

A Those involve startup for the gasifiers.

19 Q So is it fair to say that routine startup 20 emissions are included in the PTE for sulfur dioxide?

A Yes.

MS. THRONE: I don't have any more questions.

23 MS. VEHR: Did you guys have any more

24 questions?

13

21

22

MR. COPPEDE: No. 25

A Yes.

Q Okay. And are there any points you want to clarify in responses to any of the questions you've been asked today?

97

A I think I'm good.

Q Okay. Could you just generally explain who else would have been involved in the permitting process for this --

A Permitting process? I was involved as the 10 application reviewer. Josh Nall was involved as the 11 modeler for the application. Darla Potter and Chad 12 Schlichtmeier were involved as the NSR program 13 supervisor and manager. Let's see. Kimberly Metz was 14 involved, as she is the NSR program administrative 15 assistant, so she was involved with the public notice 16 and assigning AP numbers, put the final permit together. 17 And Dave Finley and John Corra were involved in assigning final permits. 18 19

Q So somebody reviewed your work before the final permit got issued?

A There were a couple layers of review prior

MS. VEHR: That's all the questions I have.

24 Thanks again. 25

20

21

22

23

MS. ISSOD: Dan?

96 **EXAMINATION** 2 BY MS. VEHR: Q Okay. I just had a couple of questions on PM 2.5. Are you familiar with the term PM 2.5 precursors? 5 A Yes, I am. 6 Q And would you tell me what a PM 2.5 precursor 7 is? 8 A As I understand, EPA has identified PM 2.5 9 precursors as SOX and NOX emissions which can form 10 sulfates and nitrates downstream in a facility. 11 Q Okay. And does the Medicine Bow permit 12 account for SOX emissions? 13 A It -- yes. Q And does the Medicine Bow facility account 15 for NOX emissions? 16 A Yes, it does. 17 Q And the permit contains emission limits for 18 those precursor pollutants? 19 A Yes, it does. 20 Q You were handed today five exhibits. Are 21 there other documents that you reviewed in processing 22 this permit? 23 A Yes, there were. 24 Q Okay. And when you were asked questions,

25 that was based on your best recollection as of today?

98 SPEAKER: Yes. 2 MS. ISSOD: Redirect? Anything? 3 SPEAKER: No, I'm fine. 4 MS. ISSOD: Great. 5 MS. VEHR: Thank you. 6 (The deposition adjourned at 4:05 p.m.) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24