

AIR EMISSION SOURCE CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

Source ID No.: 1490001

Effective Date: Draft

Source Name: Westar Energy, Inc. - Jeffrey Energy Center

NAICS: 221112, Fossil fuel power generation

Site Location: 25905 Jeffrey Road
St. Mary's, Kansas 66536

Site Owner/Operator Name: Westar Energy, Inc.

**Site Owner's/Operator's
Mailing Address:** 818 South Kansas Avenue
Topeka, Kansas 66612

**Contact Person for Site Owner/
Operator:** Mr. Daniel R. Wilkus, P.E. – Manager, Air Programs
Telephone Number (785) 575-1614

This permit is issued pursuant to K.S.A. 65-3008 as amended.

Description of Activity Subject to Air Pollution Control Regulations

Westar Energy, Inc. (Westar) is proposing to initiate an emission reduction project at its Jeffrey Energy Center (JEC) to add/rebuild air pollution controls, improve plant efficiency, and supply steam energy to a new, separately-owned, ethanol plant. The ethanol plant will be an independent facility near JEC, under different management and control, which will benefit from the process stream generated at JEC.

Increased utilization of the boilers may be realized through the following project elements: steam extraction for the ethanol plant and anti-slagging chemical (downtime reduction). Improved steam turbine efficiency may increase heat input to the boilers.

Since the proposed modification will be a major modification of a major stationary source for at least one regulated pollutant emitted in excess of the PSD significant emission levels, it will be subject to the requirements of 40 CFR 52.21, Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), as adopted under K.A.R. 28-19-350. JEC1, JEC2, and JEC3 are affected sources subject to Title IV

of the Federal Clean Air Act, Acid Deposition Control. The proposed project does not constitute a modification or reconstruction for the purpose of determining applicability of New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) requirements.

Emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOC), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), particulate matter (PM), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and carbon monoxide (CO) were evaluated for this permit review. This project is subject to the provision of K.A.R. 28-19-300 (Construction permits and approvals; applicability) because the projected increase in CO emissions due to the project exceeds 100 tons per year.

An air dispersion modeling impact analysis, an additional impact analysis, and a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) determination were conducted as a part of the construction permit application process.

Significant Applicable Air Pollution Control Regulations

The following significant Kansas air quality regulations were determined to be applicable to this project:

K.A.R. 28-19-300 Construction permits and approvals; applicability

Air Emission Unit Technical Specifications

The following equipment or equivalent is approved:

1. Add steam extraction from steam turbines to support ethanol plant
 - Extraction from each of the three JEC steam turbines, and
 - Maximum design extraction is 330,000 lb/hr total for all three combined
2. Improve steam turbine efficiency and increase electrical output
 - New high pressure (HP), intermediate pressure (IP), and low pressure (LP) rotors and inner casings
 - Heat input capacity for each boiler following steam turbine improvements is expected to be 8262 MMBtu/hr
3. Addition of anti-slagging additive to each of the three JEC boilers
4. Boiler efficiency improvements
 - Reheater surface area adjustment
 - Superheater platen membrane tip changes
 - Boiler air and gas path flow improvements

5. Rebuild of scrubbers¹
 - Rebuild existing wet limestone scrubber on each of the three boiler units
 - Add limestone handling and gypsum/landfill handling
6. ESP upgrades
 - Replace existing collection plates and discharge electrodes
7. Addition of Low NO_x burners and separated over-fire air (SOFA) to JEC1 and JEC2, and tuning of all three boilers².

¹. KDHE issued an Air Construction Approval on March 28, 2007 for the portions of this project that were determined to have an increase in a regulated pollutant.

². KDHE issued an Air Construction Permit on October 4, 2005 for the addition of Low NO_x burners and SOFA to JEC3.

Air Emissions Estimates from the Proposed Activity

Project Emissions (tons/year)					
Pollutant	Baseline Emissions	Projected Actual Emissions ¹	Estimated Emissions Change	Significant Emission Increase (SEI)	Baseline Emissions Plus SEI ⁷
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	30,723 ²	13,283	-17,440	40	30,763
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	289 ³	317	28	40	329
Particulate Matter less than 10 microns (PM ₁₀) ⁶	2,005 ⁴	1,851	-154	15	2,020
Particulate Matter (PM) ⁶	3,102 ⁴	2,918	-184	25	3,127
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	67,362 ²	13,283	-54,079	40	67,402
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	2,412 ³	22,138 ⁵	19,726 ⁵		

¹. These Projected Actual Emissions are not enforceable permit limits or conditions. They are projections used to determine PSD applicability. They do not include any increase in emissions that could have been accommodated during the baseline period and is attributable to an increase in projected capacity utilization at the facility that is unrelated to this modification, including any increased utilization due to the rate of electricity demand growth for the utility system as a whole. *See* 40 CFR 52.21(b)(41).

². Acid Rain CEM data used to determine baseline emissions.

³. AP-42 emission factors used to determine baseline emissions; section 1.1 dated 9/98 and section 1.3 dated 9/98.

⁴. Results of stack tests conducted 3/02 and 4/02 used to determine baseline emissions.

⁵. Emission estimates are based on new emission limits for JEC1 and JEC2, and existing emission limit on JEC3.

⁶. Filterable particulate matter portion only.

⁷. Actual emissions (minus emissions that could have been accommodated during the baseline period and are due to demand growth) should be compared to this number, which should not be exceeded when reporting under Monitoring, Recordkeeping and Reporting item 5.

Air Emission Limitations

Coal-fired Boilers JEC1 and JEC2:

1. The thirty (30) day rolling average emission rate of carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from each boiler unit shall not exceed 0.25 lb/mmBtu, excluding periods of startup, shutdown, and malfunction.

2. The purpose of this project is to reduce the NO_x emissions from each boiler unit. In the event difficulties are encountered demonstrating compliance with the CO limit while optimizing NO_x emissions, the owner or operator may request a revision to the CO limit.

Monitoring, Recordkeeping and Reporting

1. Compliance with the CO BACT limit shall be demonstrated with a continuous emission monitoring system (CEMS). The CO CEMS shall be installed, certified, operated, maintained, and quality assured according to 40 CFR 60, Appendix B, Performance Specification 4 (PS4) and 40 CFR 60, Appendix F (Quality Assurance/Quality Control) within 180 days after startup.
2. Provide a report of the CO CEMS certification within 30 days after certification is completed.
3. Reports of excess CO emissions shall be submitted semi-annually in accordance with the requirements in 60.7(c).
4. CO Records shall be kept on site for 2 years in accordance with 60.7(f).
5. In accordance with 40 CFR 52.21(r)(6)(iii):
Monitor, calculate, and maintain a record of the annual emissions of NO_x, VOC, PM₁₀, PM and SO₂, in tons per year on a calendar year basis, for a period of 10 years following resumption of regular operations after the change.
6. In accordance with 40 CFR 52.21(r)(6)(iv):
Submit a report to KDHE within 60 days after the end of each calendar year during which records must be generated under paragraph (r)(6)(iii) of 40 CFR 52.21 setting out the unit's annual emissions.

General Provisions

1. This document shall become void if installation of this Project has not commenced within 18 months of the effective date of this permit, or if installation is interrupted for a period of 18 months or longer.
2. A construction permit or approval must be issued by KDHE prior to commencing any construction or modification of equipment or processes which result in an increase in potential-to-emit equal to or greater than the thresholds specified at K.A.R. 28-19-300.
3. Upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, the permittee shall allow a representative of the KDHE (including authorized contractors of the KDHE) to:

- (a) enter upon the permittee's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted or where records must be kept under conditions of this document;
 - (b) have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under conditions of this document;
 - (c) inspect at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices or operations regulated or required under this document; and
 - (d) sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring compliance with this document or as otherwise authorized by the Secretary of the KDHE, any substances or parameters at any location.
4. The emission unit or stationary source which is the subject of this document shall be operated in compliance with all applicable requirements of the Kansas Air Quality Act and the Federal Clean Air Act.
5. This document does not relieve the permittee of the obligation to obtain other approvals, permits, licenses or documents of sanction which may be required by other federal, state or local government agencies.
6. Issuance of this document does not relieve the owner or operator of any requirement to obtain an air quality operating permit under any applicable provision of K.A.R. 28-19-500.

Permit Engineer

Jason Heitman
Engineering Associate
Air Permitting Section

Date Signed

JTH:saw
c: NEDO

C-7473

PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION (PSD)

PERMIT SUMMARY SHEET

Permit No.: 1490001

Source Name: Jeffrey Energy Center-Westar Energy, Inc.

Source Location: 25905 Jeffrey Road, St. Mary's, KS 66536

Area Designation:

K.A.R. 28-19-350: Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (PSD), affects new major sources and major modifications to major sources in areas designated as "attainment" or "unclassifiable" under section 107 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) for any criteria pollutant. The State of Kansas is classified as attainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for all the criteria pollutants.

This modification is taking place near St. Mary's in Pottawatomie County, Kansas. This area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants.

Project description:

Westar Energy, Inc. (Westar) is proposing to initiate an emission reduction project at its Jeffrey Energy Center (JEC) to add/rebuild air pollution controls, improve plant efficiency, and supply steam energy to a new, separately-owned, ethanol plant. The proposed ethanol plant will be an independent facility near JEC, under different management and control, which will benefit from the process stream generated at JEC.

Increased utilization of the boilers may be realized through the following project elements: steam extraction for the ethanol plant and anti-slagging chemical (downtime reduction). Improved steam turbine efficiency may increase heat input to the boilers.

Significant Applicable Air Emission Regulations

This source is subject to Kansas Administrative Regulations relating to air pollution control. The application for this permit was reviewed and will be evaluated for compliance with the following applicable regulations:

- 1) K.A.R. 28-19-300: Construction Permits and Approvals. Requires “Any person who proposes to construct or modify a stationary source or emissions unit shall obtain a construction permit before commencing such construction or modification.”
- 2) K.A.R. 28-19-350: Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality. "The provisions of K.A.R. 28-19-350 shall apply to the construction of major stationary sources and major modifications of major stationary sources in the areas of the state designated as an attainment area or an unclassified area for any pollutant under the procedures prescribed by section 107(d) of the federal clean air act (42 U.S.C. 7407 (d))."

Air Emissions from the Project:

The potential-to-emit of at least one of the PSD regulated pollutants from the existing Jeffrey Energy Center exceeds 100 tons per year. Hence, Jeffrey Energy Center is considered to be a major stationary source under provisions of K.A.R. 28-19-350.

The potential-to-emit from the proposed project is listed in Table 3-2 of Section 3 and calculated in detail in Appendix C of the application. Proposed potentials-to-emit of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), particulate matter (PM), PM with a diameter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), lead and fluorides were compared with the Significant Emission Rates for PSD applicability for the criteria and non-criteria pollutants. The increase in potential-to-emit is above the PSD significance level for CO and will be reviewed under the PSD regulations. NO_x and SO₂ emissions were greatly reduced under this modification. Project emission of VOC, PM, and PM₁₀ were less than the Significant Emission Rates for PSD applicability.

The proposed emission reduction project is described in Section 2 of the application. The Best Available Control Technology (BACT) analysis assumes an uncontrolled post-project CO potential-to-emit of 300 ppm or less at 3% oxygen, which equates to approximately 0.25 lb/MMBtu. The project will reduce NO_x emissions from Units 1 and 2, and SO_x emissions from Units 1,2, and 3, to 0.15 lb/MMBtu or less.

This project will be a major modification of an existing major stationary source resulting in a net significant increase of CO. As a result, this project will be subject to the various aspects of K.A.R. 28-19-350 such as the use of best available control technology, ambient air quality analysis, and additional impacts upon soils, vegetation and visibility.

Best Available Control Technology (BACT)

The BACT requirement applies to each new or modified affected emissions unit and pollutant emitting activity. Also, individual BACT determinations are performed for

each pollutant emitted from the same emission unit. Consequently, the BACT determination must separately address, for each regulated pollutant with a significant emissions increase at the source, air pollution controls for each emissions unit or pollutant emitting activity subject to review. Westar Energy was required to prepare a BACT analysis for KDHE's review according to the process described in Attachment A. KDHE's evaluation of the BACT analysis for the proposed emission reduction project is presented in Attachment B.

In short KDHE has concurred with Westar Energy for the following:

BACT for Carbon Monoxide is 300 ppm CO by volume (0.25 lb/MMBtu), corrected to 3% O₂, on a 30-day rolling average, excluding startup, shutdown.

Ambient Air Impact Analysis

The owner or operator of a proposed source or modification must demonstrate that allowable emission increases from the proposed modification, in conjunction with all other applicable emissions increases or reductions, would not cause or contribute to air pollution in violation of:

- 1) any national ambient air quality standard in any air quality control region; or
- 2) any applicable maximum allowable increase over the baseline concentration in any area.

Westar Energy used EPA approved dispersion modeling guidelines (incorporated as Appendix W of 40 CFR 51) to predict the ambient air impacts of the project. The Air Quality Analysis is summarized in section 6 of the permit application. The AERMOD Modeling System was used to determine the maximum predicted ground-level concentration at 1-hour and 8-hour averaging periods resulting from various operating loads. Tables 6-12, 6-13 and 6-14 of the application show the JEC Unit 1,2, and 3 stack parameters used in the Ambient Air Quality Impact Analysis. The most recent five (5) years of meteorological data available from the Topeka, Kansas, surface station, 2002 through 2006, was used in the modeling. Upper air meteorological data from the Topeka National Weather Service station was used in the modeling. Table 6-15 compares the modeled maximum impact with the modeling significance level and monitoring *de minimis* level at several load levels and averaging periods. Concentrations were below the modeling significance and monitoring *de minimus* levels for all load levels and averaging periods.

Increment consumption analysis was not required since there is no PSD increment level for CO.

Additional Impact Analysis:

Visibility Impairment Analysis

Westar Energy was required to analyze the effects of the project on visibility, soils, and vegetation in the surrounding area and any affected Class I areas. Westar also had to evaluate the effects of commercial, residential, industrial, and other growth associated with the project.

Westar Energy conducted a visibility degradation analysis using NO_x and particulate matter (PM) emissions from the proposed modification. Westar Energy used the document "Workbook for Plume Visual Impact Screening and Analysis", EPA 450/4-88-015, September 1988, and the EPA approved dispersion modeling procedure "VISCREEN" for guidance. Normally, a visibility analysis is performed for Class I (visibility-sensitive) areas located within 100 kilometers of a proposed facility. However, there are no Class I areas in Kansas. The nearest PSD Class I area is Hercules Glades, which is located approximately 408 kilometers east-southeast of JEC. In accordance with KDHE guidance memorandum dated July, 15, 1990, a visibility impairment analysis was conducted at the nearest sensitive area, Shawnee County State Park located approximately 16.8 kilometers to the east of the plant and Tuttle Creek State Park located approximately 40.6 kilometers to the west.

A Level 1 VISCREEN visibility impairment analysis was performed for Shawnee County State Park and Tuttle Creek State Park. The pre-project actual emissions and post-project actual emissions were subjected to VISCREEN analysis and compared. The results are shown in Table 7-2 for Shawnee County State Park and Table 7-3 for Tuttle Creek State Park. The results of the VISCREEN analyses show that visibility at each of the parks should be improved as a result of the project. According to the guidance memorandum a Level-2 visibility impairment screening analysis was not required.

Impacts on Vegetation and Soils

In accordance with the guidance memorandum, an impact analysis on plants, soils, and animals is required for pollutants exceeding the PSD significance levels. The document EPA 450/2-81-078 "A Screening Procedure for the Impacts of Air Pollution Sources on Plants, Soils and Animals" contains information about the effects the increased CO and decreased NO_x, SO_x, and PM emissions would have on such receptors.

The effects of CO on vegetation have undergone only brief laboratory study, thus, its effects on vegetation are somewhat uncertain. Some research indicates that CO exposure may cause the production of internal ethylene in plant tissue at concentrations of greater than 100 ppm. Since the secondary ambient standards for the 1-hour and 8-hour averaging periods, 46 ppm (46,000 µg/m³) and 20 ppm (20,000 µg/m³) respectively, will not be exceeded by the project, this project should have negligible impacts on nearby soils and vegetation.

Growth In Commercial, Residential and Industrial Activity

There will be no associated growth due to the project. Project construction will be limited and no commercial or residential growth is projected to occur because of this project. Given the temporary nature of the construction and the lack of other source growth in the area, the project is not expected to cause any adverse construction or growth related air quality impacts.

Attachment A
KEY STEPS IN THE "TOP-DOWN" BACT ANALYSIS

STEP 1: IDENTIFY ALL POTENTIAL AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES.

The first step in a "Top-Down" analysis is to identify, for the emission unit in question, "all available" control options. Available control options are those air pollution control technologies or techniques with a PRACTICAL POTENTIAL FOR APPLICATION to the emissions unit and the regulated pollutant under review. This includes technologies employed outside of the United States. Air pollution control technologies and techniques include the application of production processes or available methods, systems, and techniques, including fuel cleaning or treatment or innovative fuel combustion techniques for control of the affected pollutant.

STEP 2: ELIMINATE TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE OPTIONS.

The technical feasibility of the control options identified in Step 1 is evaluated with respect to the source-specific (or emissions unit specific) factors. In general, a demonstration of technical infeasibility should be clearly documented and should show, based on physical, chemical, and engineering principles, that difficulties would preclude the successful use of the control option on the emissions unit under review. Technically infeasible control options are then eliminated from further consideration in the BACT analysis.

STEP 3: RANK REMAINING CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES BY CONTROL EFFECTIVENESS.

All remaining control alternatives not eliminated in Step 2 are ranked and then listed in order of over-all control effectiveness for the pollutant under review, with the most effective control alternative at the top. A list should be prepared for each pollutant and for each emissions unit subject to a BACT analysis. The list should present the array of control technology alternatives and should include the following types of information:

- 1) control efficiencies;
- 2) expected emission rate;
- 3) expected emission reduction;
- 4) environmental impacts;
- 5) energy impacts; and
- 6) economic impacts.

STEP 4: EVALUATE MOST EFFECTIVE CONTROLS AND DOCUMENT RESULTS.

The applicant presents the analysis of the associated impacts of the control option in the listing. For each option, the applicant is responsible for presenting an objective evaluation of each impact. Both beneficial and adverse impacts should be discussed and, where possible, quantified. In general, the BACT analysis should focus on the direct impact of the control alternative. The applicant proceeds to consider whether impacts of unregulated air pollutants or impacts in other media would justify selection of an alternative control option. In the event the top candidate is shown to be inappropriate, due to energy, environmental, or economic impacts, the rationale for this finding should be fully documented for the public record. Then the next most stringent alternative in the listing becomes the new control candidate and is similarly evaluated. This process continues until the technology cannot be eliminated.

STEP 5: SELECT BACT.

The most effective control option not eliminated in Step 4 is proposed as BACT for the emission unit to control the pollutant under review.

Attachment B

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT'S EVALUATION OF WESTAR ENERGY JEFFREY ENERGY CENTER'S PROPOSED BACT OPTIONS

Westar Energy conducted an analysis of BACT to control emissions from the emission reduction project. The only significant emission increase from this project is carbon monoxide (CO).

CO BACT for the Emission Reduction Project

The PSD regulations require BACT, which requires the source to evaluate available control options for technical feasibility. Carbon Monoxide (CO) controls consist of an oxidation catalyst or good combustion practices. Catalytic oxidation is capable of reducing CO emissions by 90 percent in a coal-fired boiler. Good combustion practices can ensure baseload limits of 300 ppm for combustion of sub-bituminous coal.

Installing an oxidation catalyst to control CO emissions was deemed technically infeasible for two main reasons. First, high levels of sulfur trioxide and sulfuric acid mist would form as a result of the oxidation of sulfur dioxide found in the boiler exhaust gas. The sulfur trioxide would cause a blue plume from the stack and lead to higher opacity levels. The sulfuric acid mist would cause rapid, destructive corrosion of ducts and equipment downstream of the catalyst. Second, the current catalyst technology is mainly intended for natural gas combustion units. It has not been designed to handle the increased levels of particulate matter and sulfur dioxide found in coal-fired applications. High levels of particulate quickly plug the catalyst material, rendering it ineffective.

Since catalytic oxidation was deemed technically infeasible, good combustion practices were chosen as BACT for CO emissions. KDHE agrees with this analysis.

Notice Concerning Proposed Kansas Air Quality Construction Permit and Public Hearing

Notice is hereby given that the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) is soliciting comments regarding a proposed air quality construction permit. Westar Energy, Inc. (Westar) has applied for an air quality construction permit in accordance with the provisions of K.A.R. 28-19-300 to initiate an emission reduction project at its Jeffery Energy Center in St. Mary's, Kansas. Emissions of particulate matter (PM), PM equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), lead, fluorides, and sulfuric acid mist (H₂SO₄) were evaluated during the permit review process.

The proposed permit is to be issued in accordance with the provisions of K.A.R. 28-19-350, *Prevention of Significant Deterioration* (PSD) which adopt the federal standards, procedures and requirements of 40 CFR 52.21 by reference. These air quality regulations apply to major stationary emission sources located in areas designated as "attainment" under the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). Attainment areas are areas where the air quality meets or is better than the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

The PSD regulations require evaluation of emission reduction techniques to identify the best available control technology (BACT) for each pollutant for which the emission rate exceeds the PSD significant level. The purpose of BACT is to affect the maximum degree of reduction achievable, taking into account energy, environmental and economic impacts for each pollutant under review. Evaluation of the estimated emissions for the proposed Jeffery Energy Center project indicates that the emission rate of carbon monoxide exceeds the significance levels. Westar conducted the required BACT analysis for CO. The department has reviewed Westar's BACT analysis and concurs with its findings.

An ambient impact analysis was performed on the air emissions of CO from the Jeffery Energy Center project. The analysis demonstrated no significant impact on ambient air quality.

An analysis of visibility was conducted for the two nearest Class II areas: Shawnee County State Park and Tuttle Creek State Park. The VISCREEN model results indicate that visibility will be improved overall as a result of the project. No adverse impacts on soils and vegetation in the area are expected. Any federal land manager who has reason to believe they may have a Class I area adversely impacted by the emissions from the proposed project has the opportunity to present KDHE with a demonstration of the adverse impact on the air quality-related values of the federal Class I area during the comment period.

A public comment period has been established to allow citizens the opportunity to express any concerns they may have about this proposed permitting action. The public comment period is to begin on December 20, 2007 and end at 5:00 pm on January 21, 2008. All comments should be submitted in writing to Jason Heitman, Bureau of Air and Radiation, 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 310, Topeka, KS 66612-1366 or presented at the public hearing.

Any member of the public may request to hold a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed issuance of the draft air quality construction permit. Written requests to hold a public hearing should be sent to the attention of Ms. Sherry Walker at the address listed above, or by FAX to (785) 291-3953, and must be received by noon on Monday, January 21, 2008. If a request is received, a public hearing is tentatively scheduled by the KDHE at City Hall, City Commission Meeting Room, South Entrance, 200 S. 7th, St. Mary's, KS 66536 on Thursday, January 24, 2008 at 7:00 pm. **If no requests to hold the public hearing are received by this date and time, the public hearing will be cancelled.**

Copies of the proposed permit, permit application, all supporting documentation, and all information relied upon during the permit application review process are available for public review for a period of 30 days from the date of publication during normal business hours (8:00 AM to 5:00 PM) at the KDHE, Bureau of Air and Radiation (BAR), 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 310, Topeka, KS 66612-1366. Also, a copy of the proposed permit only can be reviewed at the KDHE Northeast District Office, 800 W 24th Street, Lawrence, KS 66046. To obtain or review the proposed permit and supporting documentation, contact Jason Heitman, (785) 296-1691, at the central office of the KDHE. To review the proposed permit only, contact Pat Simpson, (785) 842-4600, in the KDHE Northeast District Office. The standard departmental cost will be assessed for any copies requested.

Roderick L. Bremby, Secretary
Kansas Department of Health and Environment