

**MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
OPERATING PERMIT TECHNICAL REVIEW DOCUMENT**

**Permitting and Compliance Division
1520 E. Sixth Avenue
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, Montana 59620-0901**

Roseburg Forest Products
Missoula Particleboard Facility
Section 8, Township 13 North, Range 19 West, Missoula County, Montana
3300 Raser Road
P.O. Box 4007
Missoula, Montana 59806

The following table summarizes the air quality programs testing, monitoring, and reporting requirements applicable to this facility.

Facility Compliance Requirements	Yes	No	Comments
Source Tests Required	X		Method 5, Method 9, Method 201A, Method 2
Ambient Monitoring Required		X	
COMS Required		X	
CEMS Required		X	
Schedule of Compliance Required		X	
Annual Compliance Certification and Semiannual Reporting Required	X		
Monthly Reporting Required		X	
Quarterly Reporting Required		X	
Applicable Air Quality Programs			
ARM Subchapter 7 Preconstruction Permitting	X		MAQP #2303-14
New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)		X	
National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS)	X		40 CFR 61, Subpart M
Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)	X		40 CFR 63, Subparts JJ and DDDD
Major New Source Review (NSR) – includes Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and/or Non-attainment Area (NAA) NSR	X		
Risk Management Plan Required (RMP)		X	
Acid Rain Title IV		X	
Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM)	X		Appendix E of Permit OP2303-03
State Implementation Plan (SIP)	X		General SIP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION 3

 A. PURPOSE 3

 B. FACILITY LOCATION 3

 C. FACILITY BACKGROUND INFORMATION 3

 D. CURRENT PERMIT ACTION 8

 E. TAKING AND DAMAGING ANALYSIS 9

 F. COMPLIANCE DESIGNATION 9

SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS 11

 A. FACILITY PROCESS DESCRIPTION 11

 B. EMISSION UNITS AND POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE IDENTIFICATION 11

 C. CATEGORICALLY INSIGNIFICANT SOURCES/ACTIVITIES 17

SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS 19

 A. EMISSION LIMITS AND STANDARDS 19

 B. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS 23

 C. TEST METHODS AND PROCEDURES 23

 D. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS 28

 E. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS 28

 F. PUBLIC NOTICE 28

 G. DRAFT PERMIT COMMENTS 29

SECTION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS 34

SECTION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS 38

 A. MACT STANDARDS 38

 B. NESHAP STANDARDS 38

 C. NSPS STANDARDS 38

 D. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN 38

SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Purpose

This document establishes the basis for the decisions made regarding the applicable requirements, monitoring plan, and compliance status of emission units affected by the operating permit proposed for this facility. The document is intended for reference during review of the proposed permit by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the public. It is also intended to provide background information not included in the operating permit and to document issues that may become important during modifications or renewals of the permit. Conclusions in this document are based on information provided in the renewal application submitted by Roseburg Forest Products (Roseburg) on January 8, 2007, associated correspondence submitted on March 6 and June 26, 2007, the application for a routine control device maintenance exemption submitted on August 31, 2007, and de minimis notifications submitted on January 22 and 23, 2008.

B. Facility Location

Roseburg's Missoula Particleboard Plant is located in Missoula County, Montana, approximately 1 mile northwest of the city limits of Missoula on Raser Road. The 189-acre site is located in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 8, Township 13 North, Range 19 West. The mill is located in an industrial area with no critical receptors within one mile.

C. Facility Background Information

MAQP History

On September 16, 1986, Louisiana-Pacific (LP) was granted a general Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) for their particle board plant, including the plant expansion and other related equipment, located near Missoula, in Missoula County, Montana. The application was given **MAQP #2303**.

The particle board plant existed in the Missoula area prior to 1968 and operated under **MAQP #1274**. The original mill had a capacity of 100 million square feet (MMft²) of $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch particle board. LP expanded the mill capacity in 1987 by 50%, using the offsets provided by the closure of the Evans Products plant. The expanded mill had a capacity of 150 MMft² of $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch particle board. The mill consisted of four rotary dryers, which were heated by the exhaust gases from the sander dust boiler, sander dust burner, and natural gas burners. The old press line utilized a batch press with a capacity of 100 MMft² of particle board on a $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch basis. The 1987 expansion added two new wood particle dryers, two new predryers with a Coen sander dust burner, and a new press line with a continuous press. A GEKA200 natural gas heater was also added to heat the new press line.

The first MAQP modification, to add general fugitive dust control measures to the facility, was issued on March 20, 1992, and was given **MAQP #2303-M**. On July 1, 1987, EPA promulgated new ambient air quality standards for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of ten microns or less (PM₁₀). The annual standard is 50 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m³) and the 24-hour standard is 150 ug/m³. These standards were, in turn, adopted by the Montana Board of Environmental Review (Board) on April 15, 1988. Due to violations of these standards, Missoula was designated as a PM₁₀ nonattainment area. As a result of this designation, the Department of Environmental Quality (Department) and the Missoula County Air Pollution Control Agency (Missoula County) developed a plan to control these emissions and bring the area into compliance with the federal and state ambient air quality standards.

In order to identify the emission sources that were contributing to the violation of the PM₁₀ standard, Missoula County conducted a chemical mass balance study (CMB) of the area. The LP mill was not identified as a significant contributor to the problem by this method, but fugitive dust was a problem at the plant and was addressed at all other point sources in nonattainment areas. Therefore, a MAQP modification was required in order to add general fugitive dust control measures to this facility.

Since the State implementation Plan (SIP) process did not identify this source as a significant contributor to the Missoula nonattainment problem, no emission limitations were changed or added to the MAQP. Only cyclone-controlled and fugitive dust sources were addressed in detail. MAQP #2303-M replaced MAQP #2303.

On August 9, 1993, **MAQP #2303-02** was issued to LP for an alteration to their existing MAQP to install a baghouse and controls to reduce emissions from an existing outside truck dump. The outside truck dump was located at the southeastern end of the LP facility.

The baghouse would pull approximately 27,470 cubic feet per minute (cfm) of air through the top of the existing surge bin on the truck dump. The surge bin is partially shrouded to allow air to enter along the top and sides of the truck when in the dumping position. The air is pulled towards the back and top of the shrouded surge bin and through the baghouse system. The efficiency of the baghouse is estimated to be 99.99%; however, the reduction of fugitive dust emissions was reduced by the amount of air that can be drawn through the baghouse system. With proper manifold ducting and skirting, an estimated average reduction of 90% fugitive emissions was expected. MAQP #2303-02 replaced MAQP #2303-M.

LP was issued **MAQP#2303-03** on March 10, 1995, to replace two existing baghouses (BH100 and BH101) at the Missoula facility with two new baghouses. LP replaced the existing 26,680-cfm Clark baghouse on source PC 401A (forming machine) with a new 35,000-cfm Day Division Model 376 RFW₁₀ baghouse (BH100). In addition, LP replaced the existing 26,680-cfm Clark baghouse on source PC 401B (forming machine) with a new 5,400-cfm Day Division Model 48 RFW-8 baghouse (BH101). The MAQP alteration resulted in a decrease of particulate matter (PM) emissions of approximately 10 tons per year (TPY) because the combined flow from the new baghouses was less than the combined air flow from the two existing baghouses. MAQP #2303-03 replaced MAQP #2303-02.

MAQP #2303-04 was issued to LP on March 9, 1997, to change the allowable particulate emission limitations for the baghouses, cyclones, particle board press vents, and the continuous press vents to more accurately reflect the actual particulate emissions from these sources. The majority of the emission limitations were decreased, although the cyclone and press vent fan limits were increased. Overall, the allowable emissions of the facility decreased by approximately 208 tons of PM per year.

In addition, the alteration allowed LP to increase the outside storage capacity of the contaminated floor sweepings enclosure from 50 cubic yards (yd³) to 50 units (370 yd³). A condition in MAQP #2303-03 required that a control strategy for particulate be employed, which resulted in no increase in associated fugitive emissions. The control strategy proposed by LP included containing the contaminated floor sweepings within the three-sided enclosure and covering the exposed sides with a screen. The Department approved this control strategy with the caveat that if the fugitive emissions were not controlled by the screen, the Department would require an alternative control strategy be employed. Finally, MAQP #2303-04 clarified MAQP conditions, updated the facility's configuration, incorporated **MAQP #1274**, and updated the MAQP with current rule citations and MAQP language.

MAQP #2303-05 was issued to LP on June 29, 1997, after LP requested that the Department modify the MAQP to clarify language concerning the electric eye in the sander dust boiler abort stack. The language was changed to require corrective action when emissions to atmosphere exceeded 20%. The electric eye monitors the boiler exhaust gas, even when it is not being emitted directly to atmosphere. A sentence stating that data from the monitor need not be recorded unless required by the Department was also put back into the MAQP.

MAQP #2303-06 was issued on July 6, 1998. LP requested that the Department modify the requirements for the contaminated floor sweepings from a fixed screen, for the control of fugitives, to a fixed roof enclosure. Emissions were expected to decrease with this modification, as the new roof would improve the control of fugitives, offering more protection than the screen system being replaced. The new roof also facilitated the loading and unloading of sweepings from the three-sided bunker. The above floor sweepings bunker was allowed by the previous MAQP, and this MAQP modification simply updated the MAQP to recognize the improvement to the storage bunker.

MAQP #2303-07 was issued to LP on May 17, 1999. This MAQP alteration allowed LP to rebuild the Line 1 press. The rebuilt press was expected to result in smoother board from Line 1, and thus a decrease in the amount of sanding necessary. The reduced sanding was expected to decrease the sander dust burned at the facility. LP decided to make up the additional heat requirement with natural gas.

The rebuild of the press allowed LP to increase production of Line 1 from approximately 131 MMft²/year to 160 MMft²/year. All emissions resulting from the debottlenecking were considered, to determine whether the change would result in a major modification subject to the requirements of the New Source Review Program (NSR) and, in particular, the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) requirements.

LP proposed, and the Department agreed, to base the actual emissions from the facility on the years 1993 and 1994. The years 1993 and 1994 were considered most representative for Line 1 because of the degradation of the press during the last several years. Based on the past actual to future potential test, the emissions from the press project would exceed significance levels for both PM and PM₁₀. However, because of the addition of new control equipment, LP reduced the net emission increases of PM and PM₁₀ to less than significance levels. Therefore, the requirements of the NSR/PSD program did not apply to this project.

As part of this MAQP action, LP proposed to implement the following emission controls at the facility:

1. A cover and curtains over the Line 2 Reject Dump;
2. A cover over the reclaim hopper;
3. A cover over the lift portion of the outside truck dump;
4. A baghouse in milling and drying (M&D) to control three dryer loop vents and the coarse refiner loop vent;
5. A limit on the allowable emissions from the dryers and from the raw material handling fugitives;
6. A limit on the amount of sander dust which may be combusted in the Coen Burner; and
7. A change in the use of process wax addition to reduce evaporative losses. The wax injection to the sawdust was changed from injection prior to the dryers to injection after the dryers.

The method of calculating the emissions from the raw material handling at the facility was also modified in this MAQP. The control efficiencies for several of the processes increased because of the additional controls required by the MAQP. The control efficiency for the outside truck dump increased from 90% to 99% because LP was required to install a full cover over the lift portion of the truck dump. The control efficiency for the pile reclaim hopper increased from 0% to 50% because LP constructed an earthen berm around the exposed sides of the pile and was required by MAQP to

install a cover over the hopper. The control efficiency for the radial stacker increased from 25% to 50% because of the construction of the earthen berm.

The testing requirements for the dryers and predryers were modified in this MAQP to require the testing of each dryer and predryer once every 5-years. The previous testing requirement was inconsistent with other sources. MAQP #2303-07 replaced MAQP #2303-06.

On August 24, 2000, LP was issued **MAQP #2303-08** in accordance with NSR/PSD. LP requested an alteration to their MAQP on January 7, 2000. The Department requested additional information from LP and received the final submittal on June 9, 2000. In 1979, LP installed a 50-million British thermal unit per hour (MMBtu/hr) Roemmc sander dust/natural gas-fired burner, replaced the original bullnose line with Bullnose #1, and made various changes to baghouses and wood waste handling systems. In 1986-1987, LP installed a second production line (Line 2) with associated sources, a 35-MMBtu/hr Coen sander dust/natural gas-fired burner, Predryers 1 and 2, and the GEKA200.

In 1991, LP installed Bullnose #2. The changes made in each of these years triggered the NSR program for PSD regulations; however, none of the changes were permitted at the time through the PSD regulations. In 1979, LP triggered the PSD regulations for carbon monoxide (CO) and NO_x. In 1986-1987, LP triggered the PSD regulations for NO_x and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). In 1991, LP triggered the PSD regulations for VOCs. LP proposed to permit the 1979, 1986-1987, and 1991 changes in accordance with the PSD regulations. MAQP #2303-08 replaced MAQP #2303-07.

The Department received comments from LP on the preliminary determination (PD) on August 3, 2000. Based on the comments submitted by LP, several changes were made to the MAQP prior to issuance of the Department decision (DD). Most notably, the emission limits for both the Coen and the Roemmc burners were changed. The NO_x, CO, and VOC emission limits placed in the PD for the Coen Burner were calculated by averaging the emissions from burning sander dust and natural gas. While LP could easily comply with this limit while burning natural gas, they would be unable to comply with this limit while burning sander dust. The Department changed the limit in the MAQP to correspond with the emissions from burning sander dust. However, LP was required to burn sander dust during any compliance source tests that are conducted to monitor compliance with the NO_x and CO emission limits for the Coen Burner.

LP requested an increase in the NO_x emission limit for the Roemmc Burner. LP submitted supporting information with their PD comments indicating that the plant would have problems complying with the limit in the PD during the winter months. Because the Department determined that “no additional control” constitutes the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for NO_x, CO, and VOC emissions, the Department determined that changing the emission limit for NO_x and CO would be appropriate. The Department based the new emission limits on the emission factors proposed by LP in MAQP Application #2303-08 and on the unit operating at 2 tons per hour. A complete copy of LP’s comments on the PD and the Department’s responses to the comments are on file with the Department.

On March 2, 2001, LP was issued **MAQP #2303-09** by the Department for a change in emission limits for the Roemmc Burner. Based on more recent source test information, LP requested new emission limits for the Roemmc Burner that more accurately reflected the emissions from the unit. The emission limits for NO_x, CO, and VOC were increased for the Roemmc Burner during this MAQP action. Furthermore, the Department removed the requirements and limitations regarding cyclones from the MAQP, because there are no longer any cyclones that are considered emitting units at LP. All cyclones have either been completely removed from the facility or are no longer attached and in use at the facility.

Because the previous PSD permit determination (#2303-08) was made using the information that was submitted/discussed with LP, the Department determined that the changes required another analysis

of the PSD issue as they related to the Roemmc Burner. All affected portions of the previous application that changed were required to be resubmitted using the new emission limits that LP proposed. MAQP #2303-09 replaced MAQP #2303-08.

On April 24, 2001, the Department received an application (**MAQP Application #2303-10**) from LP for the addition of three temporary natural gas-fired turbines. The turbines were capable of generating approximately 4.5 megawatts of electrical power per turbine. They requested to install the generators/turbines to offset the high cost of power at the time. After submittal of the MAQP application, but before issuance of a preliminary determination, LP submitted a request to withdraw the MAQP application.

MAQP #2303-11 was issued on August 7, 2002, based on a de minimis modification notice and corresponding modification request to minimize the fire hazard in their M&D operations. The proposal was to install an additional pneumatic line to collect dust in the M&D belt room. The new line connects to the existing M&D baghouse (BH55). Although the emission limit for the baghouse would remain the same, the flow through the baghouse would change from 18,000 dry standard cubic feet per minute (dscfm) to 32,000 dscfm. The MAQP change was necessary to change the flowrate limit on the baghouse. In addition, the source test frequency for the Roemmc Burner was changed to once every five years. LP requested the change to account for safety concerns that arise during the testing of the Roemmc. MAQP #2303-11 replaced MAQP #2303-09.

On February 21, 2003, LP and Roseburg submitted a request to transfer the MAQP for the facility from LP to Roseburg. The permitting action was an administrative amendment and updated rule citations in the MAQP. **MAQP #2303-12** replaced MAQP #2303-11.

On October 3, 2005, the Department received a complete MAQP application from Roseburg. Roseburg requested that the Department modify MAQP #2303-12. Roseburg proposed to reconfigure the particleboard predry process involving the removal of one of two predryers and the replacement of the existing Coen sander dust burner with a new direct-fired, low- NO_x burner with dryer gas recirculation. In addition, Roseburg proposed to install a wet electrostatic precipitator (WESP) on the predryer exhaust to control combustion and dryer emissions.

The single predryer is configured so that approximately 50% of its exhaust gases are reintroduced into the duct immediately preceding the predryer drum. This allows the heat to be used more efficiently by increasing the humidity in the predryer to increase heat transfer. Configuring the predry system in this manner resulted in the ability to dry a greater quantity of green sawdust at a higher inlet temperature. Dried sawdust is directed to a storage silo that is controlled with a baghouse. **MAQP #2303-13** replaced MAQP #2303-12.

On August 14, 2007, the Department received a complete permit application from Roseburg requesting that the Department modify MAQP #2303-13. Roseburg proposed to install a Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO) to control emissions of volatile organic hazardous air pollutants from its existing wood-fired green furnish predryer. This RTO would be installed on the outlet of the existing WESP and would be fueled by natural gas. In addition, de minimis changes that had occurred at Roseburg's facility since the issuance of the previous permit were incorporated. These changes included the construction of a melamine application line. New equipment associated with this melamine line included a conveyor line, a hot press, a natural gas-fired burner, and a baghouse. **MAQP #2303-14** replaced MAQP #2303-13.

Title V Operating Permit History

On July 26, 2002, Title V **Operating Permit #OP2303-00** was issued to LP. The permit included all applicable conditions under Title V of the Federal Clean Air Act.

On February 21, 2003, LP and Roseburg submitted a request to transfer the permit for the facility from LP to Roseburg. In addition, on March 20, 2003, Roseburg submitted a request to update the responsible official of the facility. The permit action was an administrative amendment to make the changes and to update rule citations in the permit. Appendix A (Rule Citations) was removed from the permit because it no longer applies. **Operating Permit #OP2303-01** replaced Operating Permit #OP2303-00.

On July 17, 2003, the Department received a letter from Roseburg indicating various typographical errors and permit condition discrepancies contained in Title V operating permit OP2303-01. In addition, since Roseburg was identified as being subject to 40 CFR 63, Subpart JJ, National Emissions Standards for Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations, the Department determined that it was appropriate to include these requirements under the Remanufacturing Facility portion of the operating permit. The permit action modified the Remanufacturing Facility section of the permit, to include applicable 40 CFR 63, Subpart JJ requirements and modified various typographical errors and permit condition discrepancies indicated in the letter received by the Department on July 17, 2003. **Operating Permit #OP2303-02** replaced Operating Permit #OP2303-01.

D. Current Permit Action

On January 8, 2007, the Department received a Title V Operating Permit Renewal Application from Roseburg. On March 9, 2007, the Department received additional information that the Department requested regarding the application. Specific changes that were made to the permit during the permit renewal, excluding routine changes such as updating permit language, rule references, and compliance demonstrations, include the following:

- Appendix E, Ambient Air Quality Monitoring was removed from the permit as requested by Roseburg on July 17, 2003, and approved by the Department on July 31, 2003;
- The permit action from MAQP application #2903-12 was included in the permit: Remove EU009, #2 predryer (DRY 501); Remove EU034, COEN Burner (COEN); and Add EU046, predryer storage silo (BH 60), EU047 Solagen Burner (SOLAGEN), and associated requirements from MAQP;
- The permit action from MAQP #2303-14 was included in the permit: Add EU055, Melamine Baghouse (BH 500) and Add EU056, Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO)), and associated requirements from MAQP;
- EU020 and EU021, six head sander system (BH 300 A and BH 300 B) were combined as EU020, six head sander system (BH 300 A & B);
- EU024 and EU025, eight head sander system (BH 302 and BH 303) were combined as EU024, eight head sander system (BH 302 & 303);
- EU048, Line 1 Board Cooler Vents 1, 2, and 3 and EU049, Line 2 Board Cooler Vents 1 and 2 were added to the permit for completeness;
- EU039, Remanufacturing facility (REMAN) was separated out into individual emitting units as EU050, Bullnose Fugitives (FUG 400), EU051 Paintline Fugitives (FUG 401), EU052, Paint Drying Oven #1 (S400), EU053, Paint Drying Oven #2 (S401), and EU054, Paint Drying Oven #3 (S402);
- EU040 through EU043, #1 through #4 dryer line 1 natural gas burners (DRY-NG 100 through DRY-NG 103) were included with the Line 1 dryers in Section III.C. of the permit;

- EU044 and EU043, #5 and #6 dryer line 2 natural gas burners (DRY-NG 200 and DRY-NG 201) were included with the Line 2 dryers in Section III.D of the permit;
- IEU028, Melamine Press Vents (FUG) and IEU029, Melamine Burner (INTEC) which were approved by the Department on March 14, 2005 as a de minimis change according to the provisions of ARM 17.8.745, were added to the insignificant list because the combined potential to emit (PTE) of the two units is less than significant levels as clarified by Roseburg in a letter dated January 13, 2006;
- Appendix F, Routine Control Device Maintenance Exemption was added to the permit as required in 40 CFR 63.2251; and
- A condition was included in Section III.B – Plant - Wide to identify that the facility is subject to 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDD National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Plywood and Composite Wood Products.

E. Taking and Damaging Analysis

HB 311, the Montana Private Property Assessment Act, requires analysis of every proposed state agency administrative rule, policy, permit condition or permit denial, pertaining to an environmental matter, to determine whether the state action constitutes a taking or damaging of private real property that requires compensation under the Montana or U.S. Constitution. As part of issuing an operating permit, the Department is required to complete a Taking and Damaging Checklist. As required by 2-10-101 through 105, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), the Department has conducted a private property taking and damaging assessment and has determined there are no taking or damaging implications. The checklist was completed on February 29, 2008.

F. Compliance Designation

The Roseburg facility was last inspected on March 1, 2007. During the inspection, the facility appeared to be in compliance with the most current version of both applicable air quality permits (MAQP #2303-13 and Title V Operating Permit OP2303-02). The Department completed a full compliance evaluation as part of completing the March 1, 2007 inspection report.

On April 5, 2007, the Department issued Warning Letter #WLKW07-09 to Roseburg for two violations of permit conditions. The first violation was for the late submittal of a required notification regarding the Solagen Burner. Section II.N of MAQP #2303-13 required Roseburg to provide the Department with written notification of the startup of the Solagen Burner within 15 working days of the actual startup of the burner. Roseburg submitted a letter to the Department of March 22, 2007 stating that Roseburg began heating the Solagen Burner on August 29, 2006, and was fully operational in early September, 2006. The notification was approximately 6 months late.

The second violation was related to source testing at the Solagen Burner. Section II.K of MAQP #2303-13 required Roseburg to test the Solagen Burner for nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide within 90 days of startup of the Solagen Burner. Section II.K also required the compliance source tests to conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (Manual). Section 5 of the Manual requires facilities to submit source test reports to the Department within 60 days of completion of a source test. Roseburg conducted the required source testing on the Solagen Burner on October 25, 2006; therefore, the source test report was due to the Department by December 26, 2006. The Department received the source test report on March 22, 2007, nearly 3 months late. (The Solagen Burner source test was conducted within 90 days of startup and the Source Test Report showed that the emissions from the Solagen Burner were within permit limits.

The Department decided not to pursue further formal enforcement action pursuant to Warning Letter #WLKW07-09 because Roseburg submitted the Solagen Burner startup notification and Solagen Burner Source Test Report to the Department when the Department requested the documents.

SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS

A. Facility Process Description

This plant processes raw wood fiber into particle board by refining the fiber, adding resin, and pressing the mat into boards. The raw material, primarily wood shavings from the planing process in sawmills, is transported to Missoula by truck. This material is unloaded at the plant and moved by conveyor to the dryers and the press line, or out to the storage pile. The material is retrieved from the pile by front-end loader and conveyed to the dryers and the press line. Approximately 50% of the plant production is stored in this pile during the year. The wood fiber is then dried, blended with a resin, and introduced to the press line for particle board production. Many baghouses and cyclones are used in the wood fiber handling systems. Sawdust and sander dust is used as fuel for the boiler and the sander dust burners. This plant also contains a remanufacturing (reman) section, which processes the particle board into finished wood that is used in furniture production and a Melamine line processes the particle board into finished melamine sheets.

B. Emission Units and Pollution Control Device Identification

The Roseburg Particleboard Plant includes the following process and control equipment.

1. Line 1 Dryers (DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, and DRY 103)

Four direct-contact wood particle dryers with multiclone control (DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, and DRY 103). The dryers draw hot combustion gases from the Roemmc burner (ROEMMC) tube to dry particleboard furnish. The combustion gases come from combustion of sander dust and/or a small amount of natural gas in the Boiler (BOILER 1) and the Roemmc burner (ROEMMC). There is an ID fan on the outlet side of the dryer which draws the combustion gas, furnish, and cool makeup air through the dryer. The ID fan exhausts through a multiclone which collects the dried furnish and acts as particulate control. Exhaust gases from each Line 1 dryer exits a common vertical stack. Each dryer is equipped with a natural gas burner which is used if hot gas from the Roemmc burner is not available. Each of the dryers has a rated capacity of 20,000 pounds per hour (lb/hr) of wet wood (annual average hourly rate). The natural gas back-up burners for DRY100 and DRY102 have capacities of 28 MMBtu/hr and the natural gas back-up burners for DRY103 and DRY104 have capacities of 22 MMBtu/hr.

2. Line 2 Dryers (DRY 200 and DRY 201)

Two direct-contact wood particle dryers with multiclone control (DRY 200 and DRY 201). The dryers draw hot combustion gases from the Roemmc burner (ROEMMC) tube to dry particleboard furnish. The combustion gases come from combustion of sander dust and/or a small amount of natural gas in the Boiler (BOILER 1) and the Roemmc burner (ROEMMC). There is an ID fan on the outlet side of the dryer which draws the combustion gas, furnish, and cool makeup air through the dryer. The ID fan exhausts through a multiclone which collects the dried furnish and acts as particulate control. Each dryer is equipped with a natural gas burner which is used if hot gas from the Roemmc burner is not available. Each of the dryers has a rated capacity of 20,000 lb/hr of wet wood (annual average hourly rate). The natural gas back-up burner for DRY200 has a capacity of 28 MMBtu/hr, and the natural gas back-up burner for DRY201 has a capacity of 22 MMBtu/hr.

3. #1 Predryer (DRY 500)

A direct-contact predryer (DRY 500) with medium efficiency cyclone, WESP, and RTO control. The predryer draws hot combustion gases from the Solagen tube to dry particleboard furnish.

The combustion gases come from combustion of sander dust and/or a small amount of natural gas in the Solagen burner (SOLAGEN). There is an ID fan on the outlet side of the dryer which draws the combustion gas, furnish and cool makeup air through the dryer. The ID fan exhausts through a medium efficiency cyclone, which collects the dried furnish and then through a WESP, which acts as particulate control, and then through a RTO to control volatile organic hazardous air pollutants. The predryer is equipped with low NO_x burners and is configured so that approximately 50% of its exhaust gas will be reintroduced into the duct immediately preceding the predryer drum. The predryer has a rated capacity of 46,000 bone dry pound per hour (BDP/hr) of wet wood. The Solagen burner has a rated capacity of 45 MMBtu/hr.

4. Outside Truck Dump (BH 50)

Outside Truck Dump (BH 50) represents the unloading of trucks at the outside truck dump. Product is trucked in and unloaded onto conveyors with a hydraulic truck dump. Emissions from product unloading are collected with an aspiration system connected to a baghouse (BH 50). Material collected by the baghouse is transferred to the covered storage area.

5. Milling and Drying (BH 55)

Milling and Drying (BH 55) represents the refining and material transfer from the refiners to the Line 1 dryers. The material is refined and conveyed pneumatically to the dryers. Excess air flow from the system is diverted to the M&D baghouse (BH 55). Material collected by the baghouse is transferred to the sander dust storage bin for the Roemmc burner.

6. Predry (BH 60)

Predry (BH 60) represents the green sawdust that has been dried by the predryer (DRY 500). Dried green sawdust is conveyed into a storage silo, which is controlled by BH 60. with a capacity to hold 80 cubic feet (ft³) and metered into the material mix just prior to the final dryers. Material collected in the baghouse is blown into the storage silo.

7. Reject System Line 1 (BH 100)

Reject System Line 1 (BH 100) represents the aspiration and reject system on Line 1. Material is collected along a series of aspiration points throughout the forming and storage bin areas. Two small cyclones collect any potential fugitive dust at the forming bin and face and core bins. The collected product from the cyclones is deposited on the forming line and exhaust is routed to BH 100. Side trim, material collected in the press pit and any mat reject is augured to another collection cyclone and deposited back into the system. Exhaust from the cyclone is also collected by BH 100.

8. Reject System Relay (BH 101)

Reject System Relay (BH 101) represents the relay baghouse for BH 100. All collected material from the Reject System on Line 1 is pneumatically transferred to BH101. Collected material is stored in covered storage and recycled through the particle board process.

9. 5 X 25 Board Trimsaws System (BH 102)

5 X 25 Board Trimsaws System (BH 102) represents Line 1, 5 X 25 particleboard trim and sizing. After being processed and cooled, the particleboard is trimmed to marketable dimensions. The end trim is hogged and pneumatically transferred to one of the two baghouses. Sawdust that is generated is also collected and transferred to the baghouses. Material collected by the baghouses

- is pneumatically transferred to the covered storage area. Exhaust from the system vents through BH 102.
10. 5 X 16 Board Trimsaws System (BH 103)
- 5 X 16 Board Trimsaws System (BH 103) represents Line 1 5 X 16 particleboard trim and sizing. After being processed and cooled, the particleboard is trimmed to marketable dimensions. The end trim is hogged and pneumatically transferred to one of the two baghouses. Sawdust that is generated is also collected and transferred to the baghouses. Material collected by the baghouses is pneumatically transferred to the covered storage area. Exhaust from the system vents through BH 103.
11. Face Air System Line 2 (BH 200)
- Face Air System Line 2 (BH 200) represents the collection system on Line 2 face dryer infeed. Furnish is collected by a cyclone and fed into the core dryer. Exhaust from the cyclone is vented through BH 200. Material collected in the baghouse is pneumatically transferred back to the face dryer cyclone.
12. Core Air System Line 2 (BH 201)
- Core Air System Line 2 (BH 201) represents the collection system on Line 2 core dryer infeed. Furnish is collected by a cyclone and fed into the core dryer. Exhaust from the cyclone is vented through BH 201. Material collected in the baghouse is pneumatically transferred back to the face dryer cyclone.
13. Former Aspiration and Mat Trim System (BH 202)
- Former Aspiration and Mat Trim System (BH 202) represents the aspiration and collection system on the Line 2 former, mat trim, and pre-press. Airborne particles from the former, side trim on the mats, and airborne particles along the pre-press are collected and pneumatically transferred to BH202. Material collected in the baghouse is pneumatically transferred to a relay system located by the covered storage area (BH 204).
14. Board Trim System Line 2 (BH 203)
- Board Trim System Line 2 (BH 203) represents Line 2 particleboard trim and sizing. After being processed and cooled, the particleboard is trimmed to marketable dimensions. The end trim is hogged and pneumatically transferred to BH 203. Material collected by the baghouse is pneumatically transferred to a relay system by the covered storage area (BH 204).
15. Board and Trim System Line 2 Relay (BH 204)
- Board and Trim System Line 2 Relay (BH 204) represents the relay for baghouses BH 202 and BH 203. Collected materials from BH 202 and BH 203 are pneumatically transferred to BH 204. Collected material is stored in covered storage and recycled through the particleboard process.
16. Six Head Sander (BH 300A and BH 300B)
- BH 300 A represents the aspirations system on the six head sander. A percentage of the particleboard manufactured is finish sanded for market. This system represents one of two systems in use. The board is top and bottom sanded and all sander dust is collected by a series of pickup points along the process. Collected sanderdust is pneumatically transferred to BH 300A.

Material collected in BH 300A is pneumatically transferred to a relay system baghouse located by the sanderdust storage bin (BH 301).

BH 300 B represents the aspirations system on the six head sander. A percentage of the particleboard manufactured is finish sanded for market. This system represents one of two systems in use. The board is top and bottom sanded and all sanderdust is collected by a series of pickup points along the process. Collected sanderdust is pneumatically transferred to BH 300B. Material collected in BH 300B is pneumatically transferred to a relay system baghouse located by the sanderdust storage bin (BH 301).

17. Six Head Sander and Reman Flatline System Relay (BH 301)

Six Head Sander and Reman Flatline System Relay (BH 301) represents the relay for baghouses BH 300A, BH 300B, and BH 400. All collected materials from BH 300A, BH 300B, and BH 400 are pneumatically transferred to BH 301. Collected material is augured into one of the two sanderdust storage bins.

18. Eight Head Sander (BH 302 and BH 303)

BH302 and BH 303 each represents one of two aspiration systems on the eight head sander. A percentage of the particleboard manufactured is finish sanded for market. The board is top and bottom sanded and all sanderdust is collected by a series of pickup points along the process. Collected material is pneumatically transferred to one of two baghouses (BH302 or BH303). Material collected in the baghouses is pneumatically transferred to a relay system baghouse (BH 304) located by the sanderdust storage bin.

19. Eight Head Sander System Relay (BH 304)

Eight Head Sander System Relay (BH 304) represents the relay for baghouses BH 302 and BH 303. All collected materials from BH 302 and BH 303 are pneumatically transferred to BH 304. Collected material is augured into one of two sanderdust storage bins.

20. Reman Flat Line Sander System Relay (BH 400)

Reman Flat Line Sander System Relay (BH 400) represents the aspiration system on the particleboard manufacturing flatline (Reman) sanding system. Particleboard going through the reman process is first double head sanded, coated, dried, and then single head sanded. Sanderdust is collected by a series of pickup points along both processes. Collected sanderdust is pneumatically transferred to BH 400. Material collected in BH 400 is pneumatically transferred to a relay system baghouse (BH 301) located by one of the two sanderdust storage bins.

21. Schilling and Bullnose Saw System (BH 401)

Schilling and Bullnose Saw System (BH 401) represents the aspiration system on the Reman finishing system (Particleboard going through the reman process after being coated and cut to length by the schilling saw). Sawdust from the process is pneumatically conveyed to BH 401. After the schilling saw, the product is conveyed through the bullnose system. The bullnose rounds one edge of the board. All material from the router is pneumatically collected and transferred to a relay system (BH 404) located by the covered storage area.

22. Schilling and Bullnose saw system Relay (BH 404)

Schilling and Bullnose saw system Relay (BH 404) represents the relay for BH 401. All collected materials from BH 401 are pneumatically transferred to BH 404. Collected material is conveyed into the covered storage building.

23. Melamine Baghouse (BH 500)

The Melamine Baghouse (BH 500) represents the dust and melamine trip collection air system. Resin dust from the back side of the melamine paper, along with wood dust left over from sanding is collected in the process before the press. After the press, excess melamine trim is collected in the Melamine Baghouse. From there the dust and melamine trim passes through an airlock into a collection hopper. When the hopper is full, it is taken to a landfill and dumped.

24. Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 1 (PRESS 100)

Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 1 (PRESS 100) represents the four exhaust vents above the particleboard batch press on Line 1. The press is heated by steam from the boiler (Boiler #1). After the mat is formed and trimmed, it is conveyed to the press loader. The mats are loaded and pressed. Heat, steam, and gases from the press are drawn to a biofilter by the three powered press vents above the process. There is a pre-press vent before the four press exhaust vents that stack testing has shown draws air in and does not exhaust to the atmosphere.

25. Line 1 Board Cooler Vents 1, 2, and 3

Line 1 Board Cooler Vents 1, 2, and 3 represent three board cooling chambers. After exiting the hot press, board panels need to be cooled before being stacked for extended periods. This process is done in the board cooling chambers. Outside ambient air from above the building roof is forced down into each cooling chamber with two large fans in the ducts. As the board panel enters the chambers it is tipped on edge with forks with approximately six inches between each panel. The board panels move slowly through the chambers with cool air passing between the panels. The chambers are designed so that cool air flows from right to left. In the second part of the chambers, the air flow is reversed. There are two large ducts with fans that exhaust through the roof of the building. Above the roof, there are smaller ducts connecting the infeed and exhaust ducts. During the winter months, infeed air is mixed with exhaust to a desired temperature for cooling the panels. Too much cold air will warp thin panels, causing problems when sawing.

26. Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 2 (PRESS 200)

Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 2 (PRESS 200) represents the four exhaust vents above the continuous particleboard press on Line 2. The continuous press is heated by hot oil from the GEKA heater. After the mat is formed, it is continuously conveyed through a pre-press to the press. The mat travels through the press and is trimmed to length after the process. Heat and gases from the press are drawn to a biofilter by the four powered press vents above the process.

27. Line 2 Board Cooling Vents 1 and 2

Line 2 Board Cooling Vents 1 and 2 Represents two board cooling chambers. After exiting the hot press, board panels need to be cooled before being stacked for extended periods. This process is done in the board cooling chambers. Outside ambient air from above the building roof is forced down into the cooling chamber with two large fans in the ducts. As the board panel enters the chamber, it is tipped on edge with forks with about six inches between each panel. The

chambers are designed so that cool air flows from right to left. In the second part of the chambers, the air flow is reversed. There are two large ducts (with fans) that exhaust through the roof of the building. Above the roof, there are smaller ducts connecting the infeed and exhaust ducts. During the winter months, infeed air is mixed with exhaust to a desired temperature for cooling the panels. Too much cold air will warp thin panels, causing problems when sawing.

28. Boiler #1 (BOILER 1)

Boiler #1 (BOILER 1) represents a 55 MMBtu/hr sanderdust and/or natural gas fired boiler that supplies steam to the hydraulic press on Line 1 (PRESS 100). Steam from the boiler is also used as building heat. In normal operation, the boiler exhaust gas vents into the ROEMMC tube, which supplies heat to the six dryers. In this situation, emissions from the boiler vent to atmosphere either through the six dryers and dryer pollution control equipment or through the ROEMMC stack. The boiler also has an abort stack to divert hot gases directly to the atmosphere in case of fire or other problems. Opacity is measured in the ash separator by an audible monitor that sounds when opacity exceeds 20%. The opacity monitor is used as a process tool as described in MAQP #2303-13.

29. Roemmc Burner (ROEMMC)

Roemmc Burner (ROEMMC) represents a 50 MMBtu/hr sanderdust and/or natural gas burner that supplies heat to the six wood particle dryers. The Roemmc burner exhaust gas vents into a heating duct called the Roemmc tube which feeds heat to the dryers. The exhaust gas may also vent directly into the atmosphere through the Roemmc burner stack. The combustion rate of the burner may be varied depending on the amount of heat needed to dry the furnish. This, in turn, is dependent on season, throughput, and moisture content of the furnish.

30. Solagen Burner (SOLAGEN)

Solagen Burner (SOLAGEN) represents the sander dust or natural gas-fired burner primarily intended to heat the wood particle predryer. The Solagen burner utilizes a minor amount of exhaust gases from the predryer in order to reduce NOx emissions. All exhaust gases from the Solagen burner are ducted through the predryer. The Solagen burner has a maximum rated design capacity of 45 MMBtu/hr.

31. Line 2 Oil Heater (GEKA)

Line 2 Oil Heater (GEKA) represents the natural gas fired thermal oil heater for Line 2. The GEKA thermal oil heater burns natural gas and heats thermal oil to heat the Line 2 press (PRESS 200). The unit has a maximum heat output rating of 20 MMBtu/hr.

32. Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO)

The RTO controls volatile organic hazardous air pollutant emissions from the predryer. The RTO runs on natural gas and has a burner capacity of 8 MMBtu/hr.

33. Outside Truck Dump (FUG 50)

Outside Truck Dump (FUG 50) represents the unloading of trucks at the outside truck dump. Product is trucked in and unloaded onto conveyers with a hydraulic truck dump. The truck dump is partially covered (only part of the trailer and the cab are exposed). Fugitive emissions from product unloading are collected with an aspiration system connected to a baghouse (BH 50).

Unloaded product is conveyed to either inside storage, outside storage, or directly to the pre-dry chip bins.

34. Pile Reclaim Fugitives (FUG 51)

Pile Reclaim Fugitives (FUG 51) represents the loading of products from outside storage into the reclaim system. Product is transferred from the reclaim system to the drying systems of Line 1 and Line 2.

35. Radial Stacker (FUG 52)

Radial Stacker (FUG 52) represents the loading of product from inside storage onto the outside storage pile. The stacker is adjustable and mobile to vary the size and placement of the product pile.

36. Bullnose Fugitives (FUG 400)

Bullnose Fugitives (FUG 400) represents all air emissions that do not exit the reman building. FUG 400 was previously referred to as reman fugitives.

37. Paintline Fugitives (FUG 401)

Paintline Fugitives (FUG 401) represents all the air emissions from the reman building.

C. Categorically Insignificant Sources/Activities

The Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.1201(22)(a) defines an insignificant emission unit as one that emits less than 5 TPY of any regulated pollutant, has the potential to emit less than 500 pounds per year of lead or any hazardous air pollutant, and is not regulated by any applicable requirement other than a generally applicable requirement. The following table contains the insignificant emitting units at the Roseburg facility:

Emissions Unit ID	Description
IEU01	Auxiliary Diesel Generators (I2)
IEU02	Degreasing (I7)
IEU03	Portable Heaters (I9)
IEU04	Wax Pump (I15)
IEU05	Gas Powered Sump Pump (I2)
IEU06	Fire Pond Dredging (I120)
IEU07	Diesel Tank (I23)
IEU08	Gasoline Storage Tank (I22)
IEU09	2 Wax Tanks (I22)
IEU10	10 Resin Tanks (I22)
IEU11	1 Day Use Wax Tank (I22)
IEU12	Propane Storage Tanks (I25, I31)
IEU13	General Repair and Maintenance (I34)
IEU14	Machining – General Maintenance (I36)
IEU15	2-52 Gallon Brine Tanks (I33)
IEU16	Septic System with Lift System (I40)
IEU17	Space Heaters (I43)
IEU18	Steam Cleaning – General Maintenance (I45)
IEU19	Knife Sharpening Solution (I46)
IEU20	Degreasing (I7)
IEU21	Non Processing Heaters (NPHEAT)
IEU22	Wax Pump (I15)
IEU23	Gas Powered Sump Pump (I2)
IEU24	Fire Pond Dredging (I120)

IEU25	Diesel Tank (I23)
IEU26	Gasoline Storage Tank (I22)
IEU27	Melamine Press Vents (FUG)
IEU28	Melamine Burner (INTEC)
IEU29	Paint Drying Oven #1 (S400)
IEU30	Paint Drying Oven #2 (S401)
IEU31	Paint Drying Oven #3 (S402)

SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS

A. Emission Limits and Standards

1. Facility Wide

The facility wide emission limits include limitations on visible air contaminants, airborne PM, PM from fuel-burning equipment, PM from industrial processes, sulfur oxide emissions from sulfur in fuel (liquid, solid, and gaseous), operations during emergency episodes, and various reporting and recordkeeping requirements. These emission limits are applicable to the facility and/or to specific emission units located at the facility.

Roseburg's visible air contaminants are limited to less than 40% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes for all sources installed on or before November 23, 1968, unless otherwise specified by rule or in this permit. Furthermore, Roseburg's visible air contaminants from all sources installed after November 23, 1968, are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes, unless otherwise specified by rule or in this permit.

Roseburg must take reasonable precautions to minimize airborne PM prior to producing, handling, transporting, or storing any material. Furthermore, Roseburg shall not use any street, road, or parking lot, or operate any construction site or demolition project unless reasonable precautions are taken to control emissions of airborne PM. Such emissions of airborne PM are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes, unless otherwise specified by rule or in this permit.

Roseburg is limited on the emissions of PM from the combustion of fuel. The applicable limitation is based on the installation date of the combustion device and the heat input capacity of the device.

Roseburg is limited on the amount of PM that can be discharged from any operation, process, or activity into the outdoor atmosphere. The appropriate emission limit is based on the process weight rate of the respective emitting unit. Certain units within the Roseburg facility contain more stringent emission limits than the limits that would apply based on the process weight rate. For those units, the process weight rate limitation was not included as an applicable requirement because the existing condition was more stringent.

The Roseburg facility is also limited on the sulfur oxide emissions that are allowed from the facility. Roseburg is not allowed to burn any liquid or solid fuels containing sulfur in excess of 1 pound of sulfur per MMBtu fired. In addition, Roseburg may not burn any gaseous fuels containing sulfur in excess of 50 grains per 100 ft³ of gaseous fuel.

The Roseburg facility is subject to the emergency episode plan requirements contained in Chapter 4 of the Missoula City-County Air Pollution Control Program (Chapter 32 of the State of Montana Air Quality Control Implementation Plan). Each stationary source within Missoula County that emits or is capable of emitting 25 TPY or more of PM₁₀, SO₂, CO, O₃, or NO₂ must have an abatement plan for reducing emissions of such pollutants during an air pollutant emergency episode. The plan, which is subject to review and approval by the Missoula City-County Health Department, must sufficiently demonstrate the ability of the source to reduce emissions as required under each stage of the emergency episode avoidance plan. The Missoula City-County Health Department may require sources to periodically review and update their abatement plans and submit them to Missoula City-County Health for review and approval.

2. Plant Wide

In addition to those limits previously identified as “facility-wide” emission limits, the following emission limits apply “plant-wide” at the Roseburg facility. Similar to the facility wide limitations, the plant wide emissions are limited to less than 20% opacity from all sources installed after November 23, 1968.

Operation of Line 1 is limited to 8,500 hours during any rolling 12-month period. Production from Line 2 is limited to 75 MMft² of ¾-inch particle board during any rolling 12-month period.

Control equipment must be installed, operated, and maintained as specified in Permit Application #2303-07, MAQP #2303-14 and Operating Permit #OP2303-03. Permitting decisions were made based on the control equipment that was specified in Permit Application #2303-07. Furthermore, all sander dust handling systems must be enclosed and equipped with a baghouse to minimize fugitive particulate emissions.

Paving or a dust suppressant is required on all routinely used haul roads to minimize fugitive emissions. The opacity from the haul roads shall not exceed 20%.

Roseburg is not allowed to store any contaminated floor sweepings outdoors. This requirement is intended to reduce the possibility of the material becoming airborne. Currently, Roseburg is limited to storing no more than 50 units (370 yd³) of contaminated floor sweepings in the contaminated floor sweepings building.

Roseburg is required to plant and maintain vegetation on the earthen berm to minimize emissions from the raw material storage pile.

Total particulate emissions from the raw material storage pile are limited to 928 pounds per day and 30 TPY. PM₁₀ emissions from the raw material storage pile are limited to 334 pounds per day and 9.9 TPY.

3. Dryers (DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, DRY 200, DRY 201)

Emissions from the dryers at the Roseburg facility are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The total PM and PM₁₀ emissions from each dryer are also limited. Roseburg is required to operate and maintain multiclones as part of the effort of complying with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limits. Furthermore, Roseburg is required to install and operate temperature sensors with remote readout and audible alarm on the inlet of all dryers. The alarm system shall become activated when the exhaust gas exceeds 475°F. In addition, the combined production from DRY 200 and DRY 201 is limited to 168,000 BDT per rolling 12-month period.

4. Predryer (DRY 500)

Similar to the dryers, the predryer at the Roseburg facility is limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The predryer is also limited in total PM and PM₁₀ emissions. Roseburg is required to operate and maintain a medium efficiency multiclone and a WESP as part of the effort of complying with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limits. Furthermore, Roseburg is required to install and operate temperature sensors with remote readout and audible alarm on the inlet of the predryer. The alarm system shall become activated when the dryer inlet temperature exceeds 475 °F. In addition, the production from the predryer is limited to 200,000 BDT per rolling 12-month period.

5. Baghouses (BH 50, BH 55, BH 60, BH 100, BH 101, BH 102, BH 103, BH 200, BH 201, BH 202, BH 203, BH 204, BH 300A, BH 300B, BH 301, BH 302, BH 303, BH 304, BH 400, BH 401, BH 404, BH 500)

The baghouses at the Roseburg facility are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Each baghouse is limited in total PM emissions, PM₁₀ emissions, and flow rate. The particulate limits range from grain-loading limits to the limits that were established in previous MAQPs. The flow-rate limits have been incorporated from the MAQP.

For those baghouses in the Title V permit that already contain a more stringent particulate limit, the limits established through the process weight rule were removed from the permit. When compared to the emission limits currently established for the baghouses, the regulatory limit established through the process weight rule is less stringent.

6. Press Vents (Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 on Line 1; Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 on Line 2)

The emissions from each of the press vents are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The total PM and PM₁₀ emissions from each of the press vents are also limited. The total PM and PM₁₀ limits will require Roseburg to stay below 8.0 lb/hr for Line 1 and 6.5 lb/hr for Line 2. The PM limit that would result from the process weight rule would be less stringent than the limit that is currently contained in the preconstruction permit (and the Title V permit). For this reason, the PM limit that would be based on the process weight rule was removed from this section of the Title V permit. Also, the biofilter routine control device maintenance exemption is limited to a maximum of 0.5% of the press annual operating uptime on both Line 1 and Line 2.

7. Board Cooler Vents (Line 1 Board Cooler Vents 1, 2, and 3, and Line 2 Board Cooler Vents 1 and 2)

The Board cooler vents are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes and total particulate is limited based on the process weight rule.

8. Boiler #1 (BOILER 1)

The emissions from Boiler #1 are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Furthermore, particulate from fuel combustion, total PM, and PM₁₀ emissions are also limited. The particulate from fuel combustion is limited to a pound per MMBtu value that is determined by using the heat-input capacity of the boiler. Both the total PM and PM₁₀ limits are 19.8 lb/hr of operation. The PM limit that would result from ARM 17.8.309 would be 22.18 lb/hr and would be less stringent than the limit that is currently contained in the MAQP (and the Title V permit). For this reason, the PM limit that would be based on ARM 17.8.309 was removed from this section of the Title V permit.

9. Roemmc Burner (ROEMMC)

Limitations have been placed on the Roemmc Burner for opacity, particulate from fuel combustion, sander dust combustion, NO_x emissions, CO emissions, and VOC emissions. The Roemmc Burner shall not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The particulate from fuel combustion is limited to a pound-per-MMBtu value that is determined by using the heat-input capacity of the burner. The Roemmc Burner is limited to combusting 23,000 tons or less of sander dust per rolling 12-month period. Emissions of NO_x, CO, and VOC from the Roemmc Burner shall not exceed 115.0 lb/hr, 100.0 lb/hr, and 0.35 lb/hr, respectively. The Roemmc Burner is potentially required to have an opacity monitor. Roseburg is required to install and operate an opacity monitor on the burner exhaust, as required by the Department.

10. Solagen Burner (SOLAGEN)

Limitations have been placed on the Solagen Burner for opacity, particulate from fuel combustion, sander dust combustion, natural gas combustion, NO_x emissions, CO emissions, and VOC emissions. The Solagen Burner shall not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The particulate from fuel combustion is limited to a pound-per-MMBtu value that is determined by using the heat-input capacity of the burner. The Solagen Burner is limited to combusting 23,000 tons or less of sander dust per rolling 12-month period and 352.1 MMScf or less of natural gas per rolling 12-month period. Emissions of NO_x, CO, and VOC from the Solagen Burner shall not exceed 31.5 lb/hr, 15.6 lb/hr, and 0.09 lb/hr, respectively. The Solagen Burner is potentially required to have an opacity monitor. Roseburg is required to install and operate an opacity monitor on the burner exhaust, as required by the Department.

11. Line 2 Oil Heater (GEKA)

Limitations have been placed on the GEKA for opacity, particulate from fuel combustion, natural gas combustion, and the potential requirement to install and operate an opacity monitor. Emissions from the GEKA shall not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The particulate from fuel combustion for the GEKA is limited to a pound per MMBtu value that is determined by using the heat-input capacity. The GEKA is limited to combusting 166.9 MMScf or less of natural gas per rolling 12-month period. The GEKA is potentially required to have an opacity monitor. Roseburg is required to install and operate an opacity monitor on the GEKA, as required by the Department.

12. Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO)

Limitations have been placed on the RTO for opacity, particulate from fuel combustion, and the potential requirement to install and operate an opacity monitor. Emissions from the RTO shall not exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The particulate from fuel combustion for the RTO is limited to 0.10 grains per scf of dry fuel gas, adjusted to 12% CO₂ and calculated as if no auxiliary fuel has been used. Roseburg is required to install, operate, and maintain the RTO to control volatile hazardous air pollutants from the wood-fired green furnish predryer and must notify the Department of actual start-up of the RTO within 15 working days. Roseburg's Routine Control Device Maintenance Exemption is limited to 3% of the green dryer annual operating uptime. The RTO is potentially required to have an opacity monitor. Roseburg is required to install and operate an opacity monitor on the RTO, as required by the Department.

13. Fugitives (FUG 50, FUG 51, FUG 52)

The fugitive emissions from FUG 50, FUG 51, and FUG 52 are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes.

14. Remanufacturing Facility (Bullnose Fugitives (FUG 400) and Paintline Fugitives (FUG 401))

The emissions from the remanufacturing facility are limited to less than 20% opacity averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. The production of painted material from Bullnose #2 is limited to 14.7-million linear feet per rolling 12-month period. Paints used on Roseburg's paintline must be water-based and fillers must be U.V. curable. The remanufacturing process is subject to all applicable requirements contained in 40 CFR 63, Subpart JJ.

B. Monitoring Requirements

ARM 17.8.1212(1) requires that all monitoring and analysis procedures or test methods required under applicable requirements are contained in operating permits. In addition, when the applicable requirement does not require periodic testing or monitoring, periodic monitoring must be prescribed that is sufficient to yield reliable data from the relevant time period that is representative of the source's compliance with the permit.

The requirements for testing, monitoring, recordkeeping, reporting, and compliance certification sufficient to assure compliance do not require the permit to impose the same level of rigor for all emission units. Furthermore, they do not require extensive testing or monitoring to assure compliance with the applicable requirements for emission units that do not have significant potential to violate emission limitations or other requirements under normal operating conditions. When compliance with the underlying applicable requirement for a insignificant emissions unit is not threatened by lack of regular monitoring and when periodic testing or monitoring is not otherwise required by the applicable requirement, the status quo (i.e., no monitoring) will meet the requirements of ARM 17.8.1212(1). Therefore, the permit does not include monitoring for insignificant emission units.

The permit includes periodic monitoring or recordkeeping for each applicable requirement. The information obtained from the monitoring and recordkeeping will be used by the permittee to periodically certify compliance with the emission limits and standards. However, the Department may request additional testing to determine compliance with the emission limits and standards.

C. Test Methods and Procedures

The operating permit may not require testing for all sources if routine monitoring is used to determine compliance, but the Department has the authority to require testing if deemed necessary to determine compliance with an emission limit or standard. In addition, the permittee may elect to voluntarily conduct compliance testing to confirm its compliance status.

Various test methods and procedures have been incorporated into this permit to assist in determining compliance with applicable limitations. Numerous limitations within the permit identify a routine time frame for conducting emission tests (e.g. every 5 years or as required by the Department). In either case, the testing that is conducted or that may be conducted must be done in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual. The Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual requires that process rates during testing must be at specific conditions that are representative of maximum operating capacity or maximum permitted capacity unless otherwise agreed upon by the Department and the source. Furthermore, the Department has the authority to require additional source testing (for example, more often than every 5 years) if necessary in accordance with ARM 17.8.105. A summary of test methods and procedures for each of the emitting units follows:

1. Facility Wide

The facility wide emission limits are intended to identify conditions that are generally applicable to the facility. The section labeled "Facility Wide" Emission Limits does not include the method of compliance monitoring or the frequency. Each of the limitations that are applicable to a specific emitting unit is identified with the conditions for that limit. The appropriate test methods and procedures are identified with the corresponding emitting unit, as well.

2. Plant Wide

Roseburg is required to conduct weekly visual surveys to verify compliance with the opacity limitation identified for the plant. If Roseburg does not conduct weekly visual surveys, Roseburg is required to conduct semiannual Method 9 Source Tests to verify compliance with the opacity limitation. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg is required to log the hours of operation of Line 1 and the production from Line 2 on a monthly basis to monitor compliance with the rolling 12 month limitations in the permit.

Roseburg is required to certify compliance and/or maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the plant wide conditions. The certifications and/or records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

Roseburg shall calculate the daily and annual total particulate and PM₁₀ emissions in accordance with the equations provided in Section III.B.25 of Operating Permit #OP2303-03.

3. Dryers Line 1 (DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the combined visible emissions from DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, and BH 200 and BH 201, if Roseburg chooses to vent the baghouses through the combined stack. Specifically, Roseburg is required to vent the emissions from DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, and DRY 103 into one common combined stack. Roseburg is allowed to route the emissions from BH 200 and/or BH 201 to the same common combined stack if they so choose. Regardless of which sources are venting to the combined stack (any combination of DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, BH 200, and BH 201), emissions from the combined stack may not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg is required to perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests once every 5 years to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations for DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, and DRY 103. When Roseburg is venting the emissions from any combination of DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, BH 200, and BH 201, the applicable emission limitation will be the sum total of the emission limits of each of the sources venting through the combined stack at the time of the source test.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the Line 1 Dryers. The recordkeeping shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

4. Dryers Line 2 (DRY 200 and DRY 201)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from DRY 200 and DRY 201 to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the stacks of DRY 200 and DRY 201. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg is required to perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests once every 5 years to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations for DRY 200 and DRY 201. Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the Line 2 Dryers. The recordkeeping shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

5. #1 Predryer (DRY 500)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from DRY 500 to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the stack of DRY 500. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests every 5-years to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the pryer. The recordkeeping shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

6. Baghouses (BH 50, BH 55, BH 60, BH 100, BH 101, BH 102, BH 103, BH 200, BH 201, BH 202, BH 203, BH 204, BH 300A, BH 300B, BH 301, BH 302, BH 303, BH 304, BH 400, BH 401, BH 404, BH 500)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the baghouses to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the baghouse stacks. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 2, Method 5, and Method 201A Source Tests as required by the Department to monitor compliance with the flow rate, total PM, and PM₁₀ emission limitations.

Specifically for BH 200 and BH 201, Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the combined visible emissions from DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, and BH 200 and BH 201, if Roseburg chooses to vent the baghouses through the combined stack. Regardless of which sources are venting to the combined stack (any combination of DR Y100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, BH 200, and BH 201), emissions from the combined stack may not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg is required to perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests once every 5 years to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations for DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, and DRY 103. When Roseburg is venting the emissions from any combination of DRY 100, DRY 101, DRY 102, DRY 103, BH 200, and BH 201, the applicable emission limitation will be the sum total emission limit of each of the sources venting through the combined stack at the time of the source test.

7. Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 1 (PRESS 100) and Press Vents 1, 2, 3, and 4 Line 2 (PRESS 200)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the press vents to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the press vents. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations.

8. Line 1 Board Cooler Vents 1, 2, and 3, and Line 2 Board Cooler Vents 1 and 2

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the board cooler vents to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the board cooler vents. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5 Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the total PM emission limitations.

9. Boiler #1 (Boiler 1)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the boiler to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the boiler. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5 and Method 201A Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the total PM and PM₁₀ emission limitations.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the boiler. The records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

10. Roemmc Burner (ROEMMC)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the Roemmc Burner to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the Roemmc Burner stack. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5, Method 7E, Method 10, and Method 18, Method 25, or Method 25A Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the particulate from fuel combustion, NO_x, CO, and VOC emission limitations.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the Roemmc Burner. The records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

11. Solagen Burner (SOLAGEN)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the Solagen Burner to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the Solagen Burner stack. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5, Method 7E, Method 10, and Method 18, Method 25, or Method 25A Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the particulate from fuel combustion, NO_x, CO, and VOC emission limitations.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the Solagen Burner. The records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

12. Line 2 Oil Heater (GEKA)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the GEKA to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the GEKA stack. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg must perform Method 5 Source Tests, as required by the Department, to monitor compliance with the particulate from fuel combustion emission limitation.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the GEKA. The records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

13. Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO)

Roseburg shall perform a Method 9 source test on the RTO within 180 days of initial startup to monitor compliance with the 10% opacity limitation. Thereafter, Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the RTO. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg shall monitor compliance with the particulate limitations for the RTO by conducting EPA Method 5 source testing within 180 days of initial start up of the RTO and thereafter, as required by the Department.

14. Fugitives (FUG 50, FUG 51, FUG 52)

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the fugitive emission sources to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the fugitive emissions sources. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

15. Remanufacturing Facility (Bullnose Fugitives (FUG 400) and Paintline Fugitives (FUG 401))

Roseburg shall conduct weekly visual surveys on the visible emissions from the remanufacturing process to monitor compliance with the 20% opacity limitation. If weekly visual surveys are not conducted, Roseburg shall conduct semiannual Method 9 visual emission observations on the remanufacturing process. The Method 9 Source Tests must be performed in accordance with the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

Roseburg is required to maintain records to monitor compliance with several requirements in Operating Permit #OP2303-03 for the remanufacturing process. The records shall indicate whether or not Roseburg is in compliance with the particular limit.

16. Miscellaneous

An alternative operating scenario was added to the permit for the Line 1 Dryers, BH 200, and BH 201 to allow Roseburg to disconnect the combined stack should there occur a violation of an applicable emission limit. While engineering to date does not indicate that the combined stack would lead to a violation of any emissions limitation applicable to those sources venting from the combined stack, Roseburg has asked the Department to account for such a circumstance. Therefore, the Department acknowledges the possibility of violations attributed to the combined stack. The Department also acknowledges that construction of the combined stack was undertaken to address monitoring compliance with the opacity limit for the Line 1 Dryers. Should Roseburg establish that a violation of a mass emissions limit occurred due solely to the combined stack (i.e., the violation abates upon de-coupling the combined stack and venting the sources individually), the Department will consider that fact in exercising its enforcement discretion. In that situation, Roseburg would be expected to undertake immediate corrective action to abate the violation.

D. Recordkeeping Requirements

The permittee is required to keep all records listed in the operating permit as a permanent business record for at least 5 years following the date of the generation of the record.

E. Reporting Requirements

Reporting requirements are included in the permit for each emissions unit and Section V of the operating permit "General Conditions" explains the reporting requirements. However, the permittee is required to submit semiannual and annual monitoring reports to the Department and to annually certify compliance with the applicable requirements contained in the permit. The reports must include a list of all emission limit and monitoring deviations, the reason for any deviation, and the corrective action taken as a result of any deviation.

F. Public Notice

In accordance with ARM 17.8.1232, a public notice was published in the *The Missoulian* newspaper on or before March 14, 2008. The Department provided a 30-day public comment period on the draft operating permit from March 14, 2008, to April 14, 2008. ARM 17.8.1232 requires the Department to keep a record of both comments and issues raised during the public participation process. The comments and issues received by April 14, 2008, are summarized, along with the Department's responses, in the following table. All comments received during the public comment period were promptly forwarded to Roseburg so that they had an opportunity to respond to these comments as well.

Summary of Public Comments

Person/Group Commenting	Comment	Department Response
	No public comments received.	

G. Draft Permit Comments

Summary of Permittee Comments

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
III.B – AA, CC - EE	<i>“The permit includes tables for all emission units that are given alternate opacity compliance demonstrations to either take weekly visual surveys or semiannual method 9 opacity readings. However, the table format does not clearly reflect the permit language that the scenarios are alternates. RFP requests that the word “or” is inserted between the rows in the tables that reflect this language.”</i>	The Department has added language to the appropriate tables to clearly reflect the required compliance demonstration(s) for each emission unit.
III.C.8, C.9, C.15, C.18, D.7, D.8, D.15, D.18, DD.5, DD.6, DD.11, DD.14	<i>“The draft permit contains several new independent conditions requiring monthly documentation that only pipeline quality natural gas is used in order to demonstrate compliance with limits on particulate from fuel combustion and sulfur compounds in gaseous fuel. RFP has a single natural gas pipeline that conveys natural gas to all combustion units that burn natural gas. Accordingly, RFP request that these individual conditions be removed and replaced with one general condition requiring that only pipeline quality natural gas is combusted in natural gas combustion units. This proposed change is consistent with the current permit and will reduce the number of repetitive recordkeeping requirements.”</i>	Since the particulate from fuel combustion and the sulfur compounds in fuel limits are already contained in Section III.A., Facility-Wide conditions of the operating permit, the Department has removed these individual requirements from the specified sections. Although Roseburg requested that the individual conditions be replaced with one general condition requiring that only pipeline quality natural gas be combusted in the natural gas combustion units, there is no underlying applicable requirement, as specified in ARM 17.8.1211 that would allow the Department to include this new limitation.
II, III.E	<i>“EU008 #1 Predryer (DRY 500) during a current permit action, RFP Missoula reduced the number of predryers from two to one. In an effort to minimize potential confusion surrounding dryer designation we request the Department refer to the #1 Predryer as simply ‘Predryer’”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect this request.
II, III.DD.5, DD.6, DD.14	<i>“EU052, EU053 and EU054 Paint Drying Ovens #1, #2, and #3, (S400, 401 and 402) RFP erroneously listed these units as non-insignificant sources in the renewal application dated January 5, 2007. However, the potential to emit for these three emission units are individually and in the aggregate below 5 tpy. Accordingly, RFP requests that these units be included in the table listing the Categorically Insignificant Sources/Activities and removed from Section II Summary of Emission Units.”</i>	In response to this comment, the Department requested additional information from Roseburg regarding the potential to emit of hazardous air pollutants and any applicable requirements which may apply to these emitting units. Based on the information submitted, the Department concurs that the emitting units are considered ‘insignificant’. As such, the permit was modified as requested.
III.A.11	<i>“Section III.A.11 disallows loading of gasoline into any stationary tank larger than 250 gallons without a vapor loss control device. RFP has one gasoline tank at the facility that is listed as an insignificant emission unit. Accordingly, RFP requests that this condition be removed since it does not apply.”</i>	Given the presence of a gasoline tank at the Roseburg facility, the Department prefers to leave this language in the permit in order to provide flexibility. Therefore, no change to the permit was made in response to this comment.

III.A.12	<i>“Section III.A.12 pertains to vapor loss from containers greater than 65,000 gallons. RFP has no containers that fall into this category. Accordingly, in an effort to minimize unnecessary reporting we request that this condition be removed since it does not apply.”</i>	The Department has removed this condition from the permit.
III.A.13	<i>“Section III.A.13 pertains to vapor loss from oil-effluent water separators greater than 200 gallons that receive petroleum products with volatility equal to or greater than kerosene. RFP has no oil-effluent water separators that fall into this category. Accordingly, in an effort to minimize unnecessary reporting we request that this condition be removed since it does not apply.”</i>	The Department has removed this condition from the permit.
III.A.14	<i>“Section III.A.13 [sic] pertains to SSM plans required pursuant to 40 CFR 63.6. To clarify, RFP is subject to the PCWP MACT (Subpart DDDD). The Department extended the compliance deadline of 10/1/07 until 10/1/08. Therefore, the SSM plan for the PCWP MACT will be due to the Department by 10/30/08.”</i>	The Department has modified the permit language to reflect approved extensions to compliance deadlines.
III.B.4, B.19, B.32	<p><i>“Section III.B.4, B.19 and B.32 pertain to equipment that was to be installed under a prior permit action. The specific equipment that these conditions refer to includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Cover and Curtains over the Line 2 Reject Dump</i> <i>2) Cover over the Reclaim Hopper</i> <i>3) Cover over the lift portion of the outside truck dump</i> <i>4) A baghouse on the M&D Refiner Loops.</i> <p><i>All of the equipment listed above is already addressed in other permit conditions. Therefore, RFP request that this condition be removed.”</i></p>	MAQP #2303-14 specifically requires that Roseburg “install, operate, and maintain control equipment as specified in application for Permit #2303-07.” Since this permit condition remains an applicable requirement as specified in ARM 17.8.1201(10) and ARM 17.8.1211, no change to the operating permit will be made. Roseburg may request, however, that MAQP #2303-14 be modified to remove this requirement. If this requirement is removed, the Department may modify Roseburg’s operating permit pursuant to ARM 17.8.1226.
III.B.4, B.5, B.7, B.8, B.12, B.13, B.14, B.19, B.20, B.22, B.23, B.26, B.27, B.28, B.32, C.6, C.7, C.13, C.14, C.18, D.4, D.5, D.12, D.13, D.18, E.4, E.5, E.11, E.12, E.17, G.5, G.10, G.13, X.9, X.10, X.13	<i>“...The recordkeeping requirement for this condition is new as it is not required under the current permit (Permit #OP2302-02). According to the Department, for permit conditions requiring recordkeeping as the method of demonstrating compliance, the Department is adding language requiring monthly documentation that the permit condition is being met and maintained. In many cases, the Department is also requiring maintenance logs listing the date, time, person and activity of all maintenance and repair activities. This new recordkeeping requirement and the need to create and maintain additional logs will result in a substantial amount of time and effort required by the maintenance department. As stated, the current permit does not require recordkeeping as the method of demonstrating compliance, rather, the facility must certify compliance on a semi-annual basis. Therefore, RFP request that these requirements be removed from the Draft Permit.”</i>	ARM 17.8.1212 requires that each air quality operating permit contain recordkeeping provisions sufficient to meet the requirements of this section where an applicable requirement does not require periodic testing or monitoring. Although the current permit only requires Roseburg to certify compliance semi-annually, the Department has recognized that certification does not meet the monitoring and recordkeeping requirements as stated in the ARM. In addition, the Department does not believe that monthly recordkeeping for these activities are overly burdensome. Therefore, monthly recordkeeping requirements will remain in the permit.
III.B.6, B.21 and B.32	<i>“Section III.B.6, B.21 and B.32 pertain to paving or applying dust suppressant on all routinely used haul roads. All routinely used haul roads at the facility have been paved; therefore, this condition may no longer be necessary. Alternatively, the recordkeeping requirement for this condition is new as it is not required under the current permit (Permit #OP2302-02). According to the Department, for permit conditions requiring recordkeeping as the method of demonstrating compliance, the Department is adding language</i>	Although routinely used haul roads at Roseburg’s facility are paved, there are other areas at the site that are not. Therefore, the Department prefers to leave this language in the permit in order to provide flexibility. In addition, ARM 17.8.1212 requires that each air quality operating permit contain recordkeeping provisions sufficient

	<p>requiring monthly documentation that the permit condition is being met and maintained. In many cases, the Department is also requiring maintenance logs listing the date, time, person and activity of all maintenance and repair activities. This new recordkeeping requirement and the need to create and maintain additional logs will result in a substantial amount of time and effort required by the maintenance department. As stated, the current permit does not require recordkeeping as the method of demonstrating compliance, rather, the facility must certify compliance on a semi-annual basis. Therefore, RFP requests that these requirements be removed from the Draft Permit.”</p>	<p>to meet the requirements of this section where an applicable requirement does not require periodic testing or monitoring. Although the current permit only requires Roseburg to certify compliance semi-annually, the Department has recognized that certification does not meet the monitoring and recordkeeping requirements as stated in the ARM. In addition, the Department does not believe that monthly recordkeeping for these activities are overly burdensome. Therefore, no changes to the permit will be made in response to this comment.</p>
III.B.8, B.23, and B.32	<p>“Section III.B.8, B.23 and B.32 requires the facility to document monthly that vegetation has been planted and is being maintained on the earthen berm. The requirement to plant vegetation is a one-time event and maintenance would consist of leaving the vegetation in place. Requiring the facility to document monthly that the vegetation was planted and that it is not being removed is not practical in this case. Therefore, RFP requires that this recordkeeping requirement be removed.”</p>	<p>MAQP #2303-14 specifically requires that Roseburg “plant and maintain vegetation on the sides and trees along the top of the earthen berm constructed around the raw material pile to reduce dust emissions.” Since this permit condition remains an applicable requirement, no change to the operating permit will be made. Additionally, the Department disagrees with Roseburg’s assertion that planting vegetation is a one-time event and that maintenance would consist solely of leaving the vegetation in place. Any vegetation that is not properly maintained (i.e. watered, fertilized, etc.) can die. If Roseburg determines, through routine inspections, that the vegetation has in fact died, re-planting would be necessary.</p>
III.C.8	<p>“Section III.C.8 limits particulate matter from new fuel burning equipment utilized by Dryers 1-4. The combustion units associated with the dryers are existing units and are therefore subject to the existing unit limit of the same rule.”</p>	<p>This condition has been removed from the permit (see response above).</p>
III.C.11 and 12	<p>“Section III.C.11 and 12 these conditions pertain to testing the combined dryer stack. Included in each condition is a clause stating “(and BH200 and BH201 if Roseburg chooses to vent the baghouses through the combined stack).” These baghouses will not be vented to the combined stack; therefore, this condition should be removed.”</p>	<p>Given Roseburg’s ability to vent BH200 and BH201 to the combined stack, the Department prefers to leave this language in the permit in order to provide flexibility. Therefore, no change to the permit was made in response to this comment.</p>
III.D.7	<p>“Section III.D.7 limits particulate matter from new fuel burning equipment utilized by Dryers 5 and 6. The combustion units associated with the dryers are existing units and are therefore subject to the existing unit limit of the same rule.”</p>	<p>This condition has been removed from the permit (see response above).</p>
III.E and BB	<p>“Section III.E Table and associated condition numbers As with the Line 1 and Line 2 Press Vents and Biofilter, the RTO is a control unit to control VHAP emission from the Predryer and is required by PCWP MACT. In order to maintain consistency, RFP requests that the permit conditions associated with the RTO (Section III.BB) be combined with the conditions associated with the Predryer. In addition, language similar to that found in</p>	<p>Unlike the Biofilter, the RTO has specific applicable requirements listed in MAQP #2303-14. For that reason, the Department does not feel that the permit conditions associated with the RTO should be combined with the conditions associated with the Predryer. In addition, the</p>

	<i>Section III.V.8 should be added to the requirements associated with the Predryer/RTO.”</i>	language found in Section III.V.8 is already listed in Section III.BB.10 of the permit. The plant-wide applicable limit listed in Section III.B.15 has been modified to include compliance with applicable monitoring requirements of the PCWP MACT (40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDD); therefore, no additional requirements specific to the predryer need to be included.												
III.E.1, E.8, E.15	<i>“Section III.E.1, E.8 and E.15 pertain to opacity from the Predryer stack. RFP would like to clarify that by 10/1/08 visual surveys and opacity reads will be taken from the RTO stack.”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect the change in stacks.												
III.E.4, E.11, E.17	<i>“...the ESP is subject to compliance monitoring for which a CAM plan is proposed. Accordingly, the compliance demonstration will be met with the CAM and the additional maintenance record keeping required in the draft permit should be removed.”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect this request.												
III.F.2 and F.3	<i>“Section III.F.2 and F.3 would be more accurately worded to read ‘outside truck dump baghouse’.”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect this request.												
III.K	<i>“Section III.K pertains to the Face and Core Baghouses. Included in this Section is an alternative operating scenario that describes ducting the baghouses into the single dryer stack. The baghouses have not been ducted into the stack and this alternative scenario can therefore be removed from the draft permit.”</i>	Given Roseburg’s ability to vent BH200 and BH201 to the combined stack, the Department prefers to leave this language in the permit in order to provide flexibility. Therefore, no change to the permit was made in response to this comment.												
III.V.1, V.5, V.9	<i>“Section III.V.1, V.5, and V.9 pertain to opacity limits for the Line 1 Press. RFP would like to clarify that the opacity readings will take place at the outlet of the Biofilter by 10/1/08.”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect the change in stacks.												
III.W.1, W.5, W.9	<i>“Section III.W.1, W.5, and W.9 pertain to opacity limits for the Line 2 Press. RFP would like to clarify that the opacity readings will take place at the outlet of the Biofilter by 10/1/08.”</i>	The Department has made changes to the permit to reflect the change in stacks.												
III.Z.13	<p><i>“Section III.Z.13 pertains to the frequency of required NO_x and CO source testing of the Solagen Burner. RFP request that the testing frequency for the Solagen Burner be extended to once every five years. A five-year testing frequency is consistent with the testing requirements for other RFP emission units. The 2006 test on the Solagen Burner resulted in emission rates as follows:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Pollutant</i></th> <th><i>Tested Rate (lb/hr)</i></th> <th><i>Permitted Rate (lb/hr)</i></th> <th><i>% of Permitted Allowable</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>CO</i></td> <td><i>10.05</i></td> <td><i>15.6</i></td> <td><i>64%</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>NO_x</i></td> <td><i>18.54</i></td> <td><i>31.5</i></td> <td><i>59%</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Due to the low tested emission rates, RFP believes it is reasonable to test every five years rather than every two years.”</i></p>	<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Tested Rate (lb/hr)</i>	<i>Permitted Rate (lb/hr)</i>	<i>% of Permitted Allowable</i>	<i>CO</i>	<i>10.05</i>	<i>15.6</i>	<i>64%</i>	<i>NO_x</i>	<i>18.54</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>59%</i>	Given the limited amount of test data available for the Solagen Burner at this time, the Department is denying Roseburg’s request for a reduced testing frequency. Section III.Z.13 of the operating permit specifically says, “The testing... shall take place every two years, or according to another testing/monitoring schedule as may be approved by the Department.” Therefore, upon further testing, Roseburg may submit to the Department another request to reduce the testing frequency. Should the Department approve this request, no permit modifications would be required.
<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Tested Rate (lb/hr)</i>	<i>Permitted Rate (lb/hr)</i>	<i>% of Permitted Allowable</i>											
<i>CO</i>	<i>10.05</i>	<i>15.6</i>	<i>64%</i>											
<i>NO_x</i>	<i>18.54</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>59%</i>											
III.BB.2, BB.7, BB.13	<i>“Section III.BB.2, BB.7 and BB.13 pertains to the RTO that is being installed on the predryer. This unit is being installed pursuant to the Plywood and Composite Wood Product MACT (Subpart DDDD). Compliance demonstrations will be made pursuant with the requirements of that program and therefore the conditions to install, operate and maintain with monthly recordkeeping requirements should not be necessary as the PCWP MACT includes more stringent requirements.</i>	MAQP #2303-14 specifically requires that Roseburg “install, operate, and maintain an RTO to control VHAP emissions from the wood-fired green furnish predryer.” Since this permit condition remains an applicable requirement as specified in ARM 17.8.1201(10) and ARM 17.8.1211, no change to the												

	<i>As such, a condition similar to that found in Section II.V.8 [sic] should be added to the RTO Section and condition III.BB.7 and the reference in III.B.13 be removed. Additionally, RFP requests that this Section be combined with the Predryer Section since the RTO is the Predryer emission control equipment required by the PCWP MACT.”</i>	operating permit will be made. In addition, unlike the Biofilter, the RTO has specific applicable requirements listed in MAQP #2303-14. For that reason, the Department does not feel that the permit conditions associated with the RTO should be combined with the conditions associated with the Predryer.
III.BB.8	<i>“Section III.BB.8 pertains to testing particulate emissions from the RTO stack within 180 days of initial startup. The PCWP MACT requires VOC/VHAP testing on the RTO within 180 days after the compliance deadline which is 10/1/08. RFP requests that the Department adopt similar language in this condition in order to conduct all required initial compliance stack tests concurrently.”</i>	MAQP #2303-14 specifically requires that Roseburg “conduct initial source testing on the RTO within 180 days of initial start up...”. Since this permit condition remains an applicable requirement as specified in ARM 17.8.1201(10) and ARM 17.8.1211, no change to the operating permit will be made.
Appendix E	<i>“Appendix E – Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) RFP requests that the Department approve and integrate the CAM plan submitted by RFP in its March 6, 2007 response to the Department’s request for information. The proposed CAM plan was drafted with guidance from the Department and is consistent with other CAM plans approved by the Department and incorporated into other facilities (sic) Title V Permits. Specifically, the proposed CAM plan mirrors the plan found in Plum Creek’s Columbia Falls MDF Title V Permit whose process is nearly identical to that which RFP’s WESP is controlling.”</i>	The Department agrees that the CAM plan should be consistent with other CAM plans approved by the Department. The CAM plan included in the draft permit is similar to the plan found in Holcim’s Title V permit, a permit issued after Plum Creek’s Columbia Falls MDF Title V Permit. The Department believes that the CAM plan included in the draft permit provides better assurance of compliance because it includes specific stack testing in order to determine the suitable minimum power indicator value, rather than using an assumed indicator value for voltage.

Summary of EPA Comments

Permit Reference	EPA Comment	Department Response
	EPA completed their review of the permit on 5/21/08. EPA does not object to the issuance of this renewal permit. However, EPA did advise that any citizen may petition the EPA administrator within 60 days after the expiration of EPA’s 45 day review period to object to the issuance of this permit.	The Department understands that, although the Department’s Decision is being issued prior to the end of EPA’s 45-day review period, citizens may still petition the EPA administrator within 60 days after the expiration of EPA’s 45-day review period.

SECTION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS

Applicable Requirement	Reason
Subchapter 1 – General Provisions	
ARM 17.8.101 Definitions ARM 17.8.103 Incorporation by Reference	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.
ARM 17.8.105 Testing Requirements ARM 17.8.106 Source Testing Protocol	These rules are applicable to the facility and any compliance source testing conducted at the facility.
ARM 17.8.120 Variance Procedures – Initial Application ARM 17.8.121 Variance Procedures – Renewal Exemption Application ARM 17.8.130 Enforcement Procedures—Notice of Violation—Order to Take Corrective Action ARM 17.8.131 Enforcement Procedures—Appeal to Board ARM 17.8.140 Rehearing Procedures—Form and Filing of Petition ARM 17.8.141 Rehearing Procedures—Filing Requirements ARM 17.8.142 Rehearing Procedures—Board Review	These are procedural rules that have specific requirements that may become relevant to a major source during the permit span.
Subchapter 2 – Ambient Air Quality	
ARM 17.8.201 Definitions	This rule consists of regulatory definitions. This rule does not have specific requirements associated with it.
ARM 17.8.204 Ambient Air Monitoring ARM 17.8.205 Enforceability ARM 17.8.206 Methods and Data ARM 17.8.214 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Hydrogen Sulfide ARM 17.8.230 Fluoride in Forage	These rules are always applicable to a major source and may contain specific requirements for compliance.
Subchapter 3 – Emission Standards	
ARM 17.8.301 Definitions ARM 17.8.302 Incorporation by Reference	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.
ARM 17.8.326 Prohibited Materials for Wood or Coal Stoves ARM 17.8.340 Standard of Performance for New Stationary Sources ARM 17.8.341 Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants	The following regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit.
ARM 17.8.330 Definitions	This rule consists of regulatory definitions. This type of rule does not have specific requirements associated with it.
Subchapter 4 - Stack Heights	
ARM 17.8.401 Definitions	This rule consists of regulatory definitions. This type of rule does not have specific requirements associated with it.
ARM 17.8.403 Exemptions	This is a procedural rule that has specific requirements that may become relevant to the source during the permit span.
Subchapter 5 - Air Quality Permit Application, Operation and Open Burning Fees	
ARM 17.8.501 Definitions	This rule consists of regulatory definitions. This type of rule does not have specific requirements associated with it.
ARM 17.8.510 Annual Review ARM 17.8.511 Permit Fee Assessment Appeal Procedures ARM 17.8.514 Air Quality Open Burning Fees ARM 17.8.515 Air Quality Open Burning Fees for Conditional, Emergency, Christmas Tree Waste, and Commercial Film Production Open Burning Permits	These are procedural rules that have specific requirements that may become relevant to the source during the permit span.

Applicable Requirement	Reason
Subchapter 6 - Open Burning	
ARM 17.8.601 Definitions	This rule consists of definitions for open burning. This rule does not have specific requirements associated with it.
ARM 17.8.611 Emergency Open Burning Permits ARM 17.8.612 Conditional Air Quality Open Burning Permits ARM 17.8.613 Christmas Tree Waste Open Burning Permits ARM 17.8.614 Commercial Film Production Open Burning Permits ARM 17.8.615 Firefighter Training	The following regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit.
Subchapter 7 – Permit, Construction and Operation of Air Contaminant Sources	
ARM 17.8.740 Definitions ARM 17.8.767 Incorporation by Reference	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.
ARM 17.8.748 New or Modified Emitting Units – Permit Application Requirements ARM 17.8.756 Compliance with Other Statutes or Rules ARM 17.8.762 Duration of Permit ARM 17.8.763 Revocation of Permit ARM 17.8.765 Transfer of Permit	These regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable to the source during the life of the permit.
Subchapter 8 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration	
ARM 17.8.801 Sources Impacting Federal Class 1 Areas -- Additional Requirements ARM 17.8.802 Public Participation	These are procedural rules that have specific requirements that may become relevant to the source during the permit span.
ARM 17.8.804 Ambient Air Increments ARM 17.8.807 Exclusion from Increment Consumption ARM 17.8.809 Stack Heights ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Sources and Major Modifications—Source Applicability and Exemptions ARM 17.8.819 Control Technology Review ARM 17.8.820 Source Impact Analysis ARM 17.8.821 Air Quality Models ARM 17.8.822 Air Quality Analysis ARM 17.8.823 Source Information ARM 17.8.824 Additional Impact Analysis ARM 17.8.827 Source Obligation ARM 17.8.828 Innovative Control Technology	These regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit
ARM 17.8.806 Restriction on Area Classifications ARM 17.8.808 Redesignation ARM 17.8.825 Sources Impacting Federal Class 1 Areas -- Additional Requirements ARM 17.8.826 Public Participation	These rules do not have specific requirements for major sources because they are requirements for EPA or state and local authorities. Furthermore, these rules can be used as authority to impose specific requirements on a major source.
Subchapter 9 – Permit Requirements for Major Stationary Sources or Major Modifications Located Within Nonattainment Areas	
ARM 17.8.901 Definitions ARM 17.8.902 Incorporation by Reference	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.

Applicable Requirement	Reason
ARM 17.8.904 When Air Quality Preconstruction Permit Required ARM 17.8.905 Additional Conditions of Air Quality Preconstruction Permit ARM 17.8.906 Baseline for Determining Credit for Emissions and Air Quality Offsets	These regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit.
Subchapter 10 - Preconstruction Permit Requirements for Major Stationary Sources or Major Modifications Located Within Attainment or Unclassified Areas	
ARM 17.8.1001 Definitions ARM 17.8.1002 Incorporation by Reference	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.
ARM 17.8.1004 When Air Quality Preconstruction Permit Required ARM 17.8.1005 Additional Conditions of Air Quality Preconstruction Permit ARM 17.8.1006 Review of Specified Sources for Air Quality Impact ARM 17.8.1007 Baseline for Determining Credit for Emissions and Air Quality Offsets	These regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit.
Subchapter 11 – Visibility Impact Assessment	
ARM 17.8.1101 Definitions ARM 17.8.1103 Applicability –Visibility Requirements	These rules consist of regulatory definitions and a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.
ARM 17.8.1106 Visibility Impact Analysis ARM 17.8.1107 Visibility Models ARM 17.8.1110 Visibility Monitoring ARM 17.8.1111 Additional Impact Analysis	These regulations may not be applicable to the source at this time. However, these regulations may become applicable during the life of the permit.
ARM 17.8.1108 Notification of Permit Application ARM 17.8.1109 Adverse Impact and Federal Land Management	These rules do not have specific requirements for major sources because they are requirements for EPA or state and local authorities. Furthermore, these rules can be used as authority to impose specific requirements on a major source.
Subchapter 12 – Operating Permit Program	
ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions ARM 17.8.1202 Incorporation by Reference ARM 17.8.1203 Air Quality Operating Permit Program Overview ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operations Permit Program Applicability ARM 17.8.1210 General Requirements for Content	These rules consist of either a statement of purpose, applicability statement, regulatory definitions or a statement of incorporation by reference. These types of rules do not have specific requirements associated with them.

Applicable Requirement	Reason
ARM 17.8.1211 Emission Limitation Requirements ARM 17.8.1212 Monitoring, Recordkeeping, and Reporting Requirements ARM 17.8.1213 Compliance Requirements ARM 17.8.1214 Permit Shield & Emergency Requirements ARM 17.8.1215 Operational Flexibility Requirements ARM 17.8.1220 Permit Issuance, Renewal, Reopening, and Modifications ARM 17.8.1221 Operation without Permit and Application Shield ARM 17.8.1222 General Air Quality Operating Permits ARM 17.8.1223 Temporary Air Quality Operating Permits ARM 17.8.1224 Operational Flexibility ARM 17.8.1225 Requirements for Amendments ARM 17.8.1226 Requirements for Additional Permit Modifications ARM 17.8.1227 Requirements for Significant Modifications ARM 17.8.1228 Requirements for Permit Revocation, Reopening, and Revision ARM 17.8.1231 Notice of Termination, Modification, or Revocation and Reissuance for Cause ARM 17.8.1232 Public Participation ARM 17.8.1233 Permit Review by Administrator and Affected States ARM 17.8.1234 Acid Rain – Permits Regulation	Roseburg is currently being permitted in accordance with Subchapter 12 of the Administrative Rules of Montana. Most of these requirements currently apply to the Roseburg facility. Those rules in Subchapter 12 that do not currently apply may become applicable during the life of the permit.
ARM 17.80 Tax Certification for Pollution Control	
ARM 17.80.101 Definitions ARM 17.80.102 Application for Certification as Air or Water Pollution Equipment ARM 17.80.103 Eligibility Criteria ARM 17.80.104 Apportionment Procedures ARM 17.80.105 Compliance ARM 17.80.106 Informal Conference	These rules do not have specific requirements for major sources because they are requirements for EPA or state and local authorities. Furthermore, these rules can be used as authority to impose specific requirements on a major source.
Federal Requirements	
40 CFR 50 National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards 40 CFR 51 Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans 40 CFR 58 Ambient Air Quality Surveillance	These rules do not have specific requirements for major sources because they are requirements for EPA or state and local authorities. Furthermore, these rules can be used as authority to impose specific requirements on a major source.
40 CFR 52 Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans 40 CFR 62 Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants	These rules contain requirements for regulatory authorities and not major sources, these rules can be used to impose specific requirements on a major source.
40 CFR 61 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants 40 CFR 63 Maximum Achievable Control Technology Standards	Roseburg is subject to both a NESHAP and a MACT.

SECTION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

A. MACT Standards

On June 8, 2007, the courts issued a decision of a full vacatur regarding 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD - National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters. Depending on the outcome of the court's decision, Roseburg may have affected facilities as defined in Subpart DDDDD and therefore be subject the Subpart DDDDD. In addition, 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD remains incorporated by reference in Montana's administrative rules. Until that changes, 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD may remain a "state only" provision.

On January 8, 2007, the Department received a letter from Roseburg requesting a one year extension for complying with 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDD – Plywood and Composite Wood Panels MACT. Roseburg explained that they were intending to rely on the Low Risk Determination (LRD) subcategory to demonstrate compliance with Subpart DDDD; however, on June 19, 2007, a federal appeals court issued an opinion vacating the LRD option contained in Subpart DDDD. In addition, the federal appeals court's opinion vacated the EPA's February 16, 2006, categorical extension of the Subpart DDDD compliance deadline from October 1, 2007, to October 1, 2008. Therefore, Roseburg requested that the Department make a case-specific determination for a one year compliance extension.

The Department reviewed the information submitted by Roseburg and determined that Roseburg provided the facility-specific information required to obtain an extension. Further, the Department determined that Roseburg demonstrated that an extension is necessary to complete the design and installation of controls that will now be required to comply with Subpart DDDD. Therefore, the Department included a condition in the renewed Title V Operating Permit #OP2303-03 requiring Roseburg to comply with Subpart DDDD by October 1, 2008.

B. NESHAP Standards

As of the date of permit issuance, the Department is unaware of any future NESHAP Standards that may be promulgated that will affect this facility.

C. NSPS Standards

As of the date of permit issuance, the Department is unaware of any future NSPS Standards that may be promulgated that will affect this facility.

D. Risk Management Plan

As of the date of permit issuance, this facility does not exceed the minimum threshold quantities for any regulated substance listed in 40 CFR 68.115 for any facility process. Consequently, this facility is not required to submit a Risk Management Plan.

If a facility has more than a threshold quantity of a regulated substance in a process, the facility must comply with 40 CFR 68 requirements no later than June 21, 1999; 3 years after the date on which a regulated substance is first listed under 40 CFR 68.130; or the date on which a regulated substance is first present in more than a threshold quantity in a process, whichever is later.