

**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**

Phillips 66 Company  
Billings Refinery  
NW¼, Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, Yellowstone County, MT  
P.O. Box 30198  
401 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Billings, Montana 59107-0198

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

<b>Facility Compliance Requirements</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Source Tests Required	X		
Ambient Monitoring Required		X	
COMS Required	X		40 CFR Part 51
CEMS Required	X		
Schedule of Compliance Required		X	
Annual Compliance Certification and Semiannual Reporting Required	X		
Monthly Reporting Required		X	
Quarterly Reporting Required	X		In compliance with Stipulation
<b>Applicable Air Quality Programs</b>			
ARM Subchapter 7 – Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP)	X		MAQP #2619-30
New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	X		Subpart A, Subpart Db, Subpart Dc, Subpart IIII, Subpart J, Subpart Ka, Subpart Kb, Subpart UU, Subpart GGG, Subpart QQQ
National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS)	X		Subpart FF, Subpart M
Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)	X		Subpart CC, Subpart UUU, Subpart EEEE, Subpart ZZZZ, Subpart DDDDD (state-only)
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	
State Implementation Plan (SIP)	X		Billings/Laurel SIP

Applicable Air Quality Programs		
Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) Plan	X	Jupiter SRU/ATS Stack PM/PM <sub>10</sub> , Appendix F of #OP2619-08

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. PURPOSE.....	4
B. FACILITY LOCATION .....	4
C. FACILITY BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	4
D. CURRENT PERMIT ACTION.....	20
E. TAKING AND DAMAGING ANALYSIS .....	20
F. COMPLIANCE DESIGNATION .....	21
<b>SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
A. FACILITY PROCESS DESCRIPTION .....	22
B. EMISSION UNITS AND POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE IDENTIFICATION.....	22
<b>SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
A. EMISSION LIMITS AND STANDARDS .....	24
B. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS.....	24
C. TEST METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	24
D. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.....	25
E. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS .....	25
<b>SECTION IV. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>25</b>
A. MACT STANDARDS.....	34
B. NESHAP STANDARDS.....	34
C. NSPS STANDARDS.....	34
D. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	34
E. COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE MONITORING (CAM) PLAN .....	34
F. ALTERNATE OPERATING SCENARIO .....	35
<b>SECTION V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>36</b>

## 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 original application submitted by Conoco Inc. (Conoco) on June 12, 1996; subsequent settlement stipulation and order of dismissal of Conoco's Title V permit appeal, filed on July 9, 2002; two administrative amendments received December 19, 2002 and October 10, 2003 filed by ConocoPhillips Company (ConocoPhillips); the Title V Renewal application submitted January 9, 2007; an amendment request submitted on July 3, 2008; modification requests received on August 28, 2009 and December 6, 2010; a request for withdrawal of the permit action assigned Operating Permit #OP2619-04 (received on August 29, 2011); supplementary request for a modification received on September 19, 2011, and an amendment request (request for a change in company name) received on May 3, 2012 from Phillips 66 Company (Phillips66); renewal application received December 28, 2012, and supplemental information on November 19, 2013, November 26, 2013, February 5, 2014, and February 6, 2014, February 12, 2014

#### *Facility Location*

The Phillips 66 Billings Refinery is located at NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, Section 2, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, Yellowstone County. This legal description refers to physical address of 401 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Billings, Montana.

### B. Facility Background Information

#### Montana Air Quality Permit

The refinery processes over 58,000 barrels per day of crude oil and produces a wide range of petroleum products, including propane, gasoline, kerosene/jet fuel, diesel, and petroleum coke. ConocoPhillips has received several air quality permits throughout the past years for various pieces of equipment and operations. All previously permitted equipment, limitations, conditions, and reporting requirements stated in **Permits #1719, #2565, #2669, #2619, and #2619A** were included in **Permit #2619-02**.

On October 29, 1982, Conoco received an air quality permit for an emergency flare stack to be equipped and operated with steam injection. This application was given Permit #1719.

On June 2, 1989, Conoco received an air quality permit to convert an existing 5000-barrel cone roof tank (#49) to an internal floating roof with double seals. This conversion was necessary in order to switch service from diesel to aviation gasoline storage. The application was given Permit #2565.

On January 29, 1991, Conoco received an air quality permit to construct and operate two (2) 2000-barrel desalter wastewater break tanks equipped with external floating roofs and double rim seals. The new tanks are to augment the refinery's ability to control fugitive volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions and enhance recovery of oily water from the existing wastewater treatment system. The application was given Permit #2669.

On April 19, 1990, Conoco received an air quality permit to construct new equipment and modify existing equipment at the refinery and construct a sulfur recovery facility, operated by Kerley Enterprises under the control of Conoco, as part of the overall Conoco project. The application was given Permit #2619. Conoco was permitted to construct a new 13,000-barrels-per-stream-day delayed-petroleum coker unit, cryogenic gas plant, gasoline treating unit, and hydrogen system additions. Also, modifications to the existing crude and vacuum distillation units, hydrodesulfurization units, amine treating units and wastewater treatment system were permitted. The sulfur recover facility (Sulfur Recovery Unit/ Ammonium Thiosulfate unit (SRU/ATS)) is to be operated in conjunction with the new installations and modifications at the Conoco Refinery. This SRU/ATS was permitted with the capability of utilizing 109.9 long tons per day of equivalent sulfur obtained from the Conoco Refinery for the manufacture of elemental sulfur and sulfur-containing fertilizer solutions (i.e., ammonium thiosulfate).

On December 4, 1991, Conoco was issued Permit #2619A for the construction of one 1000-barrel hydrocarbon storage tank (T162). This tank will store recovered hydrocarbon product from the contaminated groundwater aquifer beneath the Conoco Refinery. Over the years, surface discharges at the refinery have contaminated the groundwater with oily hydrocarbon products. The purpose of this project is to recover hydrocarbon product (oil) from the groundwater aquifer beneath the refinery. The hydrocarbon product (oil) is pumped out of a cone of depression within the contaminated groundwater aquifer. Groundwater, less the recovered hydrocarbon product, is returned to the aquifer. The application addressed the increase in volatile VOC emissions from the storage of recovered hydrocarbon product.

On March 5, 1993, Conoco was issued Permit #2619-02 for the construction and operation of a 5.0-million standard cubic feet (MMscf)-per-day hydrogen plant and to replace their existing American Petroleum Institute (API) separator system with a corrugated plate interceptor (CPI) separator system. The natural gas feedstock to the new hydrogen plant will produce 99.9% pure hydrogen. This hydrogen and hydrogen from the existing catalytic reformers will be routed to the refinery hydrotreaters to reduce fuel product sulfur content. The hydrogen sulfide produced is, and will continue to be, routed to the SRU/ATS. The two (2) new CPI separator tanks with carbon canister total VOC controls were constructed to comply with 40 CFR 60, Subpart QQQ and 40 CFR 61, Subpart FF regulations. The CPI separators vent to two (2) carbon canisters in series. Each carbon canister shall be designed and operated to reduce VOC emissions by 95%, or greater, with no detectable emissions.

Correspondence received by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (Department) on December 22, 1992, transferred ownership of the Kerley Enterprises facility to Jupiter Sulphur, Inc. as of December 31, 1992.

On September 14, 1993, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-03** for the construction and operation of a gas oil hydrotreater and associated hydrogen plant at the Billings refinery. The new hydrotreater desulfurizes a mixture of Fluid Catalytic Cracker (FCC) feed gas oils, which allow the FCC to produce low sulfur gasoline. This low sulfur gasoline is required by January 1, 1995 to satisfy EPA's

gasoline sulfur provisions of the Federal 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. Hydrogen requirements will be met by the installation of a new hydrogen plant. Installing additional elemental liquid sulfur production facilities at the SRU/ATS plant adjacent to the refinery will provide sulfur recovery capacity. The following is a discussion of the project to accomplish this end.

The Gas Oil Hydrodesulfurizer (GOHDS) is designed to meet the primary objective of removing sulfur from the FCC feedstock. A combination of gas oils feed the Gas Oil Hydrotreater. The gas oils are mixed with hydrogen, heated, and passed over a catalyst bed where desulfurization occurs. The gas oil is then fractionated into several products, cooled, and sent to storage. A steam-methane reforming hydrogen plant produces makeup hydrogen for the unit. Any unconsumed hydrogen is amine treated for hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S) removal and recycled.

The project did not increase the refinery's capacity. The project did not constitute a major modification for purposes of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program since net emissions did not increase above significant amounts as defined by the ARM 18.8.801(20)(a).

The additional fugitive VOC emissions from this project were calculated by totaling the fugitive sources on the process units. These sources include flanges, valves, relief valves, process drains, compressor seal degassing vents and accumulator vents, and open-ended lines. The fugitive source tabulations were then used with actual refinery emission factors obtained from the Conoco Refinery in Ponca City, Oklahoma. Furthermore, it is intended that each non-control valve in VOC service will be repacked with graphite packing to Conoco standards before installation. All control valves for the GOHDS project will be Enviro-Seal valves or equivalent. The Enviro-Seal valves have a performance specification that exceeds the Subpart GGG standards. The VOC emissions will be validated by 40 CFR 60, Subpart GGG emission monitoring.

As a result of the project, the SRU/ATS facility will consist of three primary units. They are the existing ammonium thiosulfide ATS Plant, the existing Ammonium Sulfide Unit and the addition of the Claus Sulfur and Tail Gas Treating Units (TGTU). The addition of the new units did increase the total sulfur recovery capacity of the facility from 110 to 170 long tons per day (LT/D) of sulfur.

The existing ATS plant consisted of a thermal Claus reaction type boiler. The exit gas from the Claus boiler is incinerated in the ATS Unit. The sulfur dioxide from the incinerator is absorbed and converted to ammonium bisulfite (ABS). The ABS is then used to absorb and react with hydrogen sulfide to produce the ATS product. Up to 110 LT/D of sulfur can be processed by the ATS plant to produce sulfur and ATS.

The ammonium sulfide unit consists of an absorption column, which absorbs the sulfur as hydrogen sulfide in the acid gas feed and reacts with ammonia and water. When the new Claus sulfur unit is added, the SRU/ATS facility will be modified to incinerate any off-gas from this unit in the TGTU and ATS plant. This will eliminate off-gas flow to and emissions from the flare. Up to 110 LT/D of sulfur can be processed by the ammonium sulfide unit to produce ammonium sulfide solution.

The new Claus sulfur unit consists of a thermal Claus reaction furnace followed by a waste heat boiler and three catalytic Claus reaction beds. The Claus tail gas is then incinerated before entering the TGTU. In this new unit, the sulfur dioxide from the incinerator is absorbed and converted to ABS. This ABS is then transferred to the ATS unit for conversion. Up to 110 LT/D of sulfur can be processed by the Claus sulfur unit to produce sulfur and ABS. The ABS from the TGTU is dilute, containing a significant amount of water that was generated from the Claus reaction. To

prevent making a dilute ATS from this "weak" ABS, a new ATS reactor was added to the ATS unit. This ATS reactor will combine "weak" ABS, additional ABS, and sulfur to make a full strength ATS solution.

An important feature of the Jupiter Sulphur, Inc. facility is its capability to process Conoco's sour gases at all times. A maximum of 170 LT/D of sulfur is planned to be recovered and each of the three units have a capacity of 110 LT/D. If any of the three is out of service, then the other two can easily handle the load. While the process has 100% redundancy, any two of the three units must be running to handle the design load. The process uses high efficiency gas filters, which employ a water-flush coalescer cartridge to reduce particulate, as well as sulfur compounds.

On November 11, 1993, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-04** to construct and operate a new compressor station and associated equipment at the Billings Refinery. The C-23 compressor station project will involve the recommissioning of an out-of-service compressor and associated equipment components having fugitive VOC emissions. The project will also involve the installation of new equipment components having fugitive VOC emissions. The recommissioned compressor was originally installed in 1948. The compressor will undergo some minor refurbishing, but will not trigger "reconstruction" as defined in 40 CFR 60.15. The purpose of the C-23 compressor station project is to improve the economics of the refinery's wet gas (gas streams containing recoverable liquid products) processing through increased yields and more efficient operation in the refinery's large and small Crude Topping

Units (CTUs) and the Alkylation unit. The project also improved safety in the operations of the two CTUs, Alkylation unit, and Gas Recovery Plant (GRP). As a result of this project, the vapor pressure of the alkylate product (produced by the Alkylation unit) will be lower.

On February 2, 1994, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-05** to construct and operate a new butane defluorinator within the alkylation unit at the refinery. Installation of an alumina ( $Al_2O_3$ ) bed defluorinator system is to remove residual hydrofluoric acid (HF) and organic fluorides from the butane stream produced by the alkylation unit. This will reduce the fluorine level of the butane from ~ 500 parts per million, weight (ppmw) to ~ 1 ppmw, which will allow the butane to be recycled back to the refinery's butamer unit for conversion into isobutane. The alkylation unit butane defluorinator project resulted in: (1) changes in operation of the alkylate stabilization train of the alkylation unit to yield defluorinated butane instead of fluorinated and lower vapor pressure alkylate products; (2) changes in operations of the refinery's gasoline blending to restructure butane blending and lower the vapor pressure of the gasoline pool; (3) minimize butane sales; (4) minimize butane burning as refinery fuel gas; and (5) economize gasoline blending of butane.

On March 28, 1994, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-06** to construct and operate equipment to support a new polymer modified asphalt (PMA) unit at the refinery. The PMA project allowed Conoco to produce asphalt that meets the new federal specifications and become a supplier of PMA for the region. A 9.5-million British thermal unit per hour (MMBtu/hr) natural gas-fired process heater, to heat an oil heat transfer fluid, was installed to bring the asphalt base to 400 °F. This allows a polymer material to be mixed with it to produce PMA. A new hot oil transfer pump was installed to circulate hot oil through the system. A heat exchanger (X-364) from the shutdown PDA unit was moved and installed to aid in the heating of the asphalt base. Two existing 5000-bbl asphalt storage tanks were converted to PMA mixing and curing tanks. This required the installation of additional agitators, a polymer pellet loading (blower) system and conversion of the tank steamcoil heating system to hot oil heated by the new process heater. New asphalt transfer line, a

new asphalt transfer pump and a new 5000 bbl PMA storage tank (replacing the demolished T-50) was installed to keep the PMA separated from other asphalt products.

On July 28, 1995, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-07** for the construction and operation of new equipment within the refinery's alkylation (alky) and gas recovery plant/No.1 Amine units. This project was referred to as the Alkylation Unit Depropanizer Project. The existing Alkylation unit was replaced with a new tower. The new depropanizer is located where the No.1 Bio-pond was located. Piping and valves were added and the new depropanizer was located next to existing equipment. The old depropanizer was retained in place and may be used in the future in a non-Hydrogen Fluoride (HF) service. The decommissioned propane deasphalting (PDA) unit evaporator tower (W-3) was converted to a water wash tower to remove entrained amine from the Alky PB (Propene/Butene) olefins upstream of the PB merox prewash. New piping, valves, and instrumentation were added around W-3. The change in air emissions associated with this project were increases in fugitive VOC emissions, as well as additional emissions of fluorides due to the installation of the new depropanizer piping and valves. The changes associated with this project did not trigger PSD review because the sum of the emission rate increases is below PSD significant emission rates for applicable pollutants. The drains installed or reused tie into parts of the refinery's wastewater sewer system that are already subject to NSPS Subpart QQQ (Wastewater Treatment System VOC Emissions in Petroleum Refineries) and NESHAP Subpart FF (Benzene Waste Operations). These drains will be equipped with tight fitting caps and have hard pipe connections to meet the required control specifications.

On July 24, 1996, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-08** to change the daily sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emission limit of the 19 existing process heaters, as well as combining the 19 heaters, the Coker heater (H-3901), and the GOHDS heaters (H-8401 and H8402) into one SO<sub>2</sub> point source within the Refinery. The project was referred to as the Existing Heater Optimization Project.

The 19 process heaters being discussed in this project are the process heaters (excluding H-3 and H-7) that were in operation prior to the construction of the Delayed Coker/Sulfur Reduction Project, which became fully operational in May of 1992. The 19 heaters are: H-1, H-2, H-4, H-5, H-10, H-11, H-12, H-13, H-14, H-15, H-16, H-17, H-18, H-19, H-20, H-21, H-22, H-23, and H-24. These 19 heaters are pooled together and regulated as one source, referred to as the "19 Heaters" source. Also included in this discussion are the Coker heater (H-3901) and the GOHDS heaters (H-8401 and H-8402).

The 19 heaters had a "bubbled" SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limit of 30.0 tons per year (tpy) (164 pounds per day (lb/day)) and a limitation of fuel gas H<sub>2</sub>S content of 160 parts per million, volume (ppmv, 0.1 grain/dry standard cubic foot (dscf)). With both these limitations intact, all these heaters could not simultaneously operate at their maximum-design firing rates. This could cause un-optimized operation of the refinery during unfavorable climatical conditions or during peak heater demand periods. To allow all 19 of the heaters to simultaneously operate at their maximum firing rates, the allowable short-term SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limit for the "bubbled" 19 heaters needed to be increased. The 19 refinery fuel gas heaters/furnaces lbs/day SO<sub>2</sub> emission limitations were based on NSPS fuel gas (160 ppm H<sub>2</sub>S), maximum heat input (MMBtu/hr) from the emission inventory database (AFS), and higher fuel heat value (1015 Btu/scf) from the 1990 Base Year Carbon Monoxide Emission Inventory. By using these parameters, the daily "bubble" SO<sub>2</sub> permit limit could be raised to 386 lb/day, as was indicated in the Preliminary Determination (PD).

Conoco requested that the daily limit be increased to 612 lb/day, which is equivalent to the rate used in the Billings SO<sub>2</sub> SIP modeling (111.7 tpy). The annual "bubble" SO<sub>2</sub> limit of 30 tpy was maintained. The Department received comments from Conoco in which Conoco contended that the maximum heat input (MMBtu/hr) from AFS did not accurately reflect the real maximum firing rates of the heaters. After further review of the files, the Department established the total maximum firing rate for the 19 refinery fuel gas heaters/furnaces to be 785.5 MMBtu/hr. ConocoPhillips identified the total maximum firing rate during the permit review of the Coker permit (Permit #2619). The maximum heat input of 785.5 MMBtu/hr and the fuel heat value of 958 Btu/scf were used to calculate the new daily "bubble" SO<sub>2</sub> permit limit of 529.17 lb/day.

The change in air emissions of other criteria pollutants (carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), particulate matter (PM), and VOC) associated with this project was zero, since the potential to emit for these pollutants did not change. With the 164-lb/day SO<sub>2</sub> limit, simultaneous maximum firing of these heaters could be accomplished if the fuel gas H<sub>2</sub>S content stayed below 49.75 ppmv. Conoco's amine systems produced fuel gas averaging (on an annual basis) about 25-ppmv H<sub>2</sub>S content or less (see the 1993 and 1994 refinery EIS's). Since the emissions of CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, and VOC produced are not a function of H<sub>2</sub>S content and Conoco's amine system could generate appropriate fuel gas to stay at or below the 164-lb/day SO<sub>2</sub> limit, the maximum potentials of these pollutants are obtainable and not affected by this project. The PM limits for these heaters are 80 times higher than the amount generated by fuel gas combustion devices (see ARM 17.8.340); therefore, the PM emissions potential is not affected as well.

Even though Conoco's past annual average fuel gas H<sub>2</sub>S content had been below 37.8 ppmv, there would still be potential to run into operational limitations in peak fuel gas demand periods. The amine systems may not have been able to keep the fuel gas H<sub>2</sub>S under 49.75 ppmv, rendering the refinery to operate at un-optimal rates. This was the reason for the request to raise the daily SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limit for the 19-heater source.

Since the proposed change to the heaters' SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limit does not reflect an annual increase in potential to emit, the project did not trigger PSD permitting review (threshold for SO<sub>2</sub> is 40 tpy).

In light of the SO<sub>2</sub> problem in the Billings-Laurel air shed, any change resulting in an increase of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions must have its impact determined to see if any National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) will be violated as a result of the project. SO<sub>2</sub> modeling was completed by the Department to develop a revised SO<sub>2</sub> State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Billings-Laurel area. The "19-heater source" was modeled using an SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate equivalent to 111.7 tpy to determine its existing SO<sub>2</sub> impact on the Billings-Laurel air shed. The results of this modeling showed there were no exceedances of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS or the Montana standards resulting from its operation. Therefore, an increase in the permit limit from 164 lb/day to 612 lb/day of SO<sub>2</sub> will not result in any violations of SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS or the Montana standards. However, the daily emission limits set based on the NSPS limit of 0.1 grain/dscf (160 ppmv H<sub>2</sub>S) are more restrictive than the SIP limit. The daily emission limits set based on NSPS is 529.17 lb/day for the existing 19 heaters/furnaces.

In addition to changing the daily SO<sub>2</sub> permit limit for the "19-heater source", Conoco requested that the "19 heater source", the Coker Heater (H-3901), and the GOHDS heaters (H-8401 and H-8402) be combined into one permitted source called the "Fuel Gas Heater" source. Using the existing daily SO<sub>2</sub> permit limits for the Coker heater and GOHDS heaters, an overall SO<sub>2</sub> emissions limit "bubble" of 614 lb/day would apply to the "22-Fuel Gas Heaters" source. The annual limit for the "22-Fuel Gas Heaters" source has not changed and is 45.50 tpy (30.00 + 9.60 + 2.90 + 3.00).

On April 19, 1997, Conoco was issued **Permit #2619-09** to "bubble" or combine the allowable hourly and annual NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits for the Coker Heater, Recycle Hydrogen Heater, Fractionator Feed Heater, and Hydrogen Plant Heaters. The NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits for these heaters were established on a pounds-per-million-Btu basis and will be maintained. By "bubbling" or combining the allowable hourly and annual NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits for the Coker Heater, Recycle Hydrogen Heater, Fractionator Feed Heater, and Hydrogen Plant Heaters would allow Conoco more operational flexibility with regard to heater firing rates and heater optimization. The Coker heater will still have an hourly NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit to prevent any significant impacts. The permitting action did not allow an increase in the annual NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

On July 30, 1997, **Permit #2619-10** was issued to Conoco in order to comply with 40 CFR 63, Subpart R- National Emission Standards for Gasoline Distribution Facilities. Conoco proposed to install a gasoline vapor collection system and enclosed flare for the reduction of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) resulting from the loading of gasoline. The vapor combustion unit (VCU) was added to the bulk gasoline and distillate loading rack. The gasoline vapors are collected from the trucks during loading, then routed to an enclosed flare where combustion occurs. This project resulted in an overall reduction in the amount of actual emissions of VOCs (94.8 tpy). The reduction in potential emissions of VOCs is 899.5 tpy, while CO increases to 19.7 tpy and NO<sub>x</sub> increases to 7.9 tpy emissions.

Conoco also requested an administrative change be made to Section II.F.5, that would bring the permit requirements in alignment with the monitoring requirements specified by 40 CFR 60, Subpart QQQ and 40 CFR 61, Subpart FF.

Because Conoco's bulk gasoline and distillate loading rack VCU is defined as an incinerator under MCA 75-2-215, a determination that the emissions from the VCU will constitute a negligible risk to public health was required prior to the issuance of the permit. Conoco and the Department identified the following hazardous air pollutants from the flare, which were used in the health risk assessment. These constituents are typical components of gasoline.

1. Benzene
2. Ethyl Benzene
3. Hexane
4. Methyl Tert Butyl Ether
5. Toluene
6. Xylenes

The reference concentrations for Ethyl Benzene, Hexane, and Methyl Tert Butyl Ether were obtained from EPA's IRIS database. The risk information for the remaining hazardous air pollutants is contained in the January 1992 CAPCOA Risk Assessment Guidelines. The model performed by Conoco for the hazardous air pollutants, identified above, monitored compliance with the negligible risk requirement.

On December 10, 1997, Conoco requested a modification to allow the continuous incineration of a PB Merox Unit off gas stream in the firebox of Heater #16. **Permit #2619-11** requires the production of sulfur dioxide from the sulfur-containing compounds in the PB Merox Unit off gas stream to be calculated and counted against the current sulfur dioxide limitations applicable to the (22) Refinery Fuel Gas Heaters/Furnaces group. During a review of process piping and

instrumentation diagrams, Conoco identified a PB Merox Unit off-gas stream that is currently incinerated in the firebox of Heater #16. A subsequent analysis of this off-gas stream revealed the presence of sulfur-containing compounds in low concentrations. The bulk of this low-pressure off-gas stream is nitrogen with some oxygen, hydrocarbons, and sulfur-containing compounds (disulfides, mercaptans). Sulfur dioxide produced from the continuous incineration of this stream has been calculated at approximately 1 ton per year. This off-gas stream is piped from the top of the disulfide separator through a small knock out drum and directly into the firebox of Heater #16.

Conoco proposes to sample the PB Merox Unit disulfide separator gas stream on a monthly basis to determine the total sulfur (ppmw) present. This analysis, combined with the off-gas stream flow rate, will be used to calculate the production of sulfur dioxide. After a year of sampling time, and with the approval of the Department, Conoco proposes to reduce the sampling frequency of the PB Merox disulfide separator off-gas stream to once per quarter if the variability in the sulfur content is small ( $\pm 250$  ppmw).

In addition, to be consistent with the wording as specified by 40 CFR 63, Subpart R, the Department replaced all references to "tank trucks" with "cargo tank" and all references to "truck-loading rack" with "loading rack". Also, the first sentence in Section II.F.5 of the preconstruction permit was deleted from the permit. Conoco had requested an administrative change be made to Section II.F.5, during the permitting action of #2619-10, which would bring the permit requirements in alignment with the monitoring requirements specified by 40 CFR 60, Subpart QQQ, and 40 CFR 61, Subpart FF. The Department had approved the request and the correction was made; however, the first sentence was inadvertently left in the permit. Permit #2619-11 replaced Permit #2619-10.

On June 6, 2000, the Department issued **Permit #2619-12** for replacement of the B-101 thermal reactor at the Jupiter Sulphur facility. The existing B-101 thermal reactor had come to the end of its useful life and had to be replaced. The replacement B-101 thermal reactor was physically located approximately 50 feet to the north of the existing thermal reactor, due to the excessive complications that would be encountered to dismantle the old equipment and construct the new equipment in the same space. Once the piping was rerouted to the new equipment the old equipment was incapable of use and will be demolished. Given this construction scenario, the Department determined that a permit condition limiting the operation to only one thermal reactor at a time was necessary. There was no increase in emissions due to this action. Permit #2619-12 replaced Permit #2619-11.

Conoco submitted comments on the Preliminary Determination (PD) of Permit #2619-12. The following is the result of these comments:

- In previously issued permits, Section II.A.4 listed storage tanks #4510 and #4511 as having external floating roofs with primary seal, which were liquid mounted stainless steel shoes and secondary seal equipped with a Teflon curtain or equivalent. Conoco stated that these two tanks were actually equipped with internal floating roofs with double-rim seals or a liquid-mounted seal system for VOC loss control.
- Section II.A.7.g.ii always listed the CPI separators as primary separators, when in fact they are secondary.

The Department accepted the comments and made the changes, accordingly, in the Department decision version of the permit.

On March 1, 2001, the Department issued **Permit #2619-13** for the installation and operation of 19 diesel-powered, temporary generators. These generators are necessary because of the high cost of electricity and supplement 18 megawatts (MW) of the refinery's electrical load, and 1 MW of Jupiter's electrical load. The generators are located south of the coke loading facility along with two new above ground 20,000-gallon diesel storage tanks. The operation of the generators will not occur beyond 2 years and is not expected to last for an extended period of time, but rather only for the length of time necessary for Conoco to acquire a permanent, more economical supply of power.

Because these generators are only to be used when commercial power is too expensive to obtain, the amount of emissions expected during the actual operation of these generators is minor. In addition, the installation of these generators qualified as a "temporary source" under the PSD permitting program because the permit limited the operation of these generators to a time period of less than 2 years. Therefore, Conoco was not required to comply with ARM 17.8.804, 17.8.820, 17.8.822, and 17.8.824. Even though the portable generators were considered temporary, the Department required compliance with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and public notice requirements; therefore, compliance with ARM 17.8.819 and 17.8.826 was ensured. In addition, Conoco is responsible for complying with all applicable ambient air quality standards. Permit #2619-13 replaced Permit #2619-12.

On April 13, 2001, the Department issued **Permit #2619-14** for the 1982 Saturate Gas Plant Project, submitted by Conoco as a retroactive permit application. During an independent compliance awareness review that was performed in 2000, Conoco discovered that the Saturate Gas Plant should have gone through the permitting process prior to it being constructed. At the time of construction, the project likely would have required a PSD permit. However, the current potential to emit for the project facility is well below the PSD VOC significance threshold. In addition, the Saturate Gas Plant currently participates in a federally-required leak detection and repair (LDAR) program, which would meet any BACT requirements, if PSD applied. The Department agreed that a permitting action in the form of a preconstruction permit application for the Saturate Gas Plant Project was necessary and sufficient to address the discrepancy. Permit #2619-14 replaced Permit #2619-13.

On June 29, 2002, the Department issued **Permit #2619-15** to clarify language regarding the Appendix F Quality Assurance requirements for the fuel gas H<sub>2</sub>S measurement system and to include certain limits and standards associated with the Consent Decree lodged on December 20, 2001, respectively. In addition, the Department modified the permit to eliminate references to the now repealed odor rule (ARM 17.8.315), to correct the reference on conditions improperly referencing the incinerator rule (ARM 17.8.316), and to eliminate the limits on the main boiler that were less stringent than the current limit established by the Consent Decree. Permit #2619-15 replaced Permit #2619-14.

The Department received a request from Conoco on August 27, 2002, for the alteration of air quality Permit #2619-15 to incorporate the Low Sulfur Gasoline (LSG) Project into the refinery's equipment and operations. The LSG Project was being proposed to assist in complying with EPA's Tier 2 regulations. The project included the installation of a new storage vessel and minor modifications to the No.2 hydrodesulfurization (HDS) unit, GOHDS unit, and hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) unit in order to accommodate hydrotreating additional gasoline and gas oil streams that were currently not hydrotreated prior to being blended or processed in the FCC unit. The new storage vessel was designed to store offspec gasoline during occasions when the GOHDS unit was offline.

In addition, on August 28, 2002, Conoco requested to eliminate the footnote contained in Section II.B.1.b of Permit #2619-15 stating, "Emissions [of the SRU Flare] occur only during times that the ATS unit is not operating." Further, Conoco requested to change the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limitations of 25 pounds per hour (lb/hr) for each of the SRU Flare and SRU/ATS Main Stack to a 25-lb/hr limit on the combination of the SRU Flare and SRU/ATS Main Stack. Following discussion between Conoco and the Department regarding comments received within the Department and from EPA, Conoco requested an extension to delay issuance of the Department Decision to December 9, 2002. Following additional discussion, Conoco and the Department agreed to leave the footnote in the permit for the issuance of **Permit #2619-16** and to revisit the issue at another time. Permit #2619-16 replaced Permit #2619-15.

A letter from ConocoPhillips dated December 9, 2002, and received by the Department on December 10, 2002, notified the Department that Conoco had changed its name to ConocoPhillips. In a letter dated February 3, 2003, ConocoPhillips also requested the removal of the conditions regarding the temporary power generators because the permit terms for the temporary generators were "not to exceed 2 years" and the generators had been removed from the facility. The permit action changed the name on this permit from Conoco to ConocoPhillips and removed permit terms regarding temporary generators. **Permit #2619-17** was also updated to reflect current permit language and rule references used by the Department. Permit #2619-17 replaced Permit #2619-16.

On December 11, 2003, the Department received a Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) Application from ConocoPhillips to modify Permit #2619-17 to replace the existing 143.8-MMBtu/hr boilers, B-5 and B-6, with new 183-MMBtu/hr boilers equipped with low NO<sub>x</sub> burners (LNB) and flue gas recirculation (FGR) commonly referred to as ultra-low NO<sub>x</sub> burners (ULNB), new B-5 and new B-6 (previously referred to as B-7 and B-8), to meet the NO<sub>x</sub> emission reduction requirements stipulated in the EPA Consent Decree. On December 23, 2003, the Department deemed the application complete. This permitting action contained NO<sub>x</sub> emissions that exceeded PSD significance levels. The replacement of the boilers resulted in an actual NO<sub>x</sub> reduction of approximately 89 tons per year. However, the EPA Consent Decree stipulated that reductions were not creditable for PSD purposes. Permit #2619 was also updated to reflect current permit language and rule references used by the Department. **Permit #2619-18** replaced Permit #2619-17.

On February 3, 2004, the Department received a MAQP Application from ConocoPhillips to modify Permit #2619-18 to add a new HDS Unit (No.5), a new sour water stripper (No.3 SWS), and a new H<sub>2</sub> Unit. On March 1, 2004, the Department deemed the application complete upon submittal of additional information. The addition of these new units added three new heaters, 41, 42, and 43, each equipped with low LNB FGR commonly referred to as ULNB. Additionally, ConocoPhillips proposed to retrofit existing external floating roof tank T-110 with a cover to allow nitrogen blanketing of the tank, to install a new storage vessel (No.5 HDS Feed storage tank) under emission point 24 above, to store feed and off-specification material for the No.5 HDS Unit, and to provide the No.1 H<sub>2</sub> Unit with the flexibility to burn refinery fuel gas (RFG). The new equipment was added to meet the new EPA-required highway Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) fuel sulfur standard of 100% of highway diesel that meets the 15 parts per million (ppm) highway diesel fuel maximum sulfur specification by June 1, 2006. By meeting the June 1, 2006, deadline, ConocoPhillips may claim a 2-year extension for the phase-in of the requirements of the Tier Two Gasoline/Sulfur Rulemaking. This permitting action resulted in NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC emissions that exceed PSD significance levels. Other changes were also contained in this permit. Previously in permit condition II.A.1 it was stated that the emergency flare tip must be based at 148-feet

elevation. After a physical survey of the emergency flare it was determined that the actual height of the flare tip is 141.5-foot elevation. After verifying that the impacts of the height discrepancy were negligible, the Department changed permit condition II.A.1 from 148-feet of elevation to 142-foot plus or minus 2 feet of elevation and changed the reference from ARM 17.8.752 to ARM 17.8.749. **Permit #2619-19** was updated to reflect current permit language and rule references used by the Department. Permit #2619-19 replaced Permit #2619-18.

On June 15, 2004, the Department received an Administrative Amendment request from ConocoPhillips to modify Permit #2619-19 to correct the averaging time for equipment subject to the 0.073 gr/dscf H<sub>2</sub>S content of fuel gas burned limit. The averaging time was corrected from a rolling 3-hour time period to a rolling 12-month time period. The heaters subject to the 0.073 gr/dscf limit per rolling 12-month time period are subject to the Standards of Performance for NSPS, Subpart J limit of 0.10 gr/dscf per rolling 3-hour time period. **Permit #2619-20** replaced Permit #2619-19.

On March 15, 2005, the Department received a complete MAQP Application from ConocoPhillips to modify Permit #2619-20 to update the HDS Unit (No.5), sour water stripper (No.3 SWS), and H<sub>2</sub> Unit added in ULSD Permit Modification #2619-19. Due to the final project design and vendor specifications, and further review of the EPA compiled emission factor data, the facility's emission generating activities, and Permit #2619-19, ConocoPhillips proposed the following changes:

1. Deaerator Vent (44) at the No.2 H<sub>2</sub> Unit is to be deleted;
2. No.2 H<sub>2</sub> Unit PSA Off-gas Vent (45) is to be added;
3. CO emission factors for the three new heaters to be changed from AP-42 Section 1.4 (October 1996) to vendor guaranteed emission factors;
4. Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM<sub>10</sub>) exhaust emission factors for the combustion of PSA vent gas in the No.1 H<sub>2</sub> Heater and the No.2 H<sub>2</sub> Reformer Heater to be changed from AFSCF, EPA 450/4-90-003 p.23 to AP-42, Section 1.4 (July 1998);
5. The dimensions, secondary rim seal, and specific deck fittings data for the No.5 HDS Feed Tank to be updated. The tank is proposed to store material with a maximum true vapor pressure of 11.1 pounds per square inch at atmosphere (psia).
6. Specific deck fittings for existing Tank-110 to be revised. The tank is proposed to store material with a maximum true vapor pressure of 11.1 psia.
7. The existing No.1 H<sub>2</sub> Unit PSA Off-gas Vent (46) to be added to the permit. This unit is not affected by the ULSD project, but is included with this submittal as a reconciliation issue.
8. The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions limitations cited for each of the three new ULSD Project heaters are requested to be clarified as "per rolling 12-month time period."
9. The CO emissions limitations cited for each of the three new ULSD Project heaters be replaced and cited with the appropriate updated values and associated averaging periods.

10. The nomenclature for Boilers B-7 and B-8 be changed to new B-5 and new B-6 respectively.
11. In accordance with Paragraph 54 of the Consent Decree the FCC UNIT became subject to the SO<sub>2</sub> portions of 40 CFR 60, Subpart J on February 1, 2005.
12. 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers and Process Heaters) has been finalized. The regulatory applicability analysis has been updated for the three new heaters.

**Permit #2619-21** replaced Permit #2619-20.

On January 15, 2007, the Department received a complete application which included the request to incorporate the following permit conditions, which were requested in separate letters:

- Refinery Main Plant Relief Flare – to clarify that the flare is subject to 40 CFR 60, Subparts A and J (as requested September 28, 2004);
- FCC – to clarify that the FCC is subject to CO and SO<sub>2</sub> portions of Subpart J (requested September 26, 2003, and February 8, 2005, respectively, and partly addressed in Permit #2619-21);
- FCC - to clarify that the FCC was subject to an SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit of 25 parts per million, on a volume, dry basis (ppmvd), corrected to 0% oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>), on a rolling 365-day basis, and subject to an SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit of 50 ppmvd, corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 7-day basis, and clarify the 7-day SO<sub>2</sub> 50 ppmvd emission limit established for the FCC Unit shall not apply during periods of hydrotreater outages (requested February 1, 2006); and
- Temporary Boiler Installation – to allow the installation and operation, for up to 8 weeks per year, of a temporary natural gas-fired boiler not to exceed 51 MMBtu/hr, as requested January 4, 2007.

The permit was also updated to reflect the current style that the Department issues permits. **Permit #2619-22** replaced Permit #2619-21.

The Department has received two requests from ConocoPhillips for modifications to the permit in conformance with requirements contained in their consent decree (Civil Action #H-01-4430):

- 5/31/07 – request to clarify that the Jupiter Sulfur Plant Flare (Jupiter Flare) is subject to 40 CFR 60, Subparts A and J; and
- 8/29/07 – request to clarify that the Fluid Catalytic Cracking (FCC) Unit is subject to a Particulate Matter (PM) emission limit of 1 lb per 1000 lb of coke burned, and that it is an affected facility subject to 40 CFR 60, Subparts A and J, including the 30% opacity limitation. The requirement to maintain less than 20% opacity was then removed, since the FCC Unit became subject to the 30% Subpart J opacity limit which supersedes the ARM 17.8.304 opacity limit.

The Department amended the permit, as requested. In addition, the references to 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD were changed to reflect that this regulation has become “state-only” since, although the federal rule was vacated on July 30, 2007, this MACT was incorporated by reference in ARM 17.8.342. Lastly, reference to Tank T-4524 was corrected to T-4523 (wastewater surge tank) and regulatory applicability changed from 40 CFR 60, Subpart Kb to Subpart QQQ, and the LSG tank identification was corrected to T-2909. **MAQP #2619-23** replaces MAQP #2619-22.

On August 21, 2008, the Department received a complete NSR-PSD permit application from ConocoPhillips. ConocoPhillips proposed to replace the existing Small and Large Crude Units and the existing Vacuum Unit with a new, more efficient Crude and Vacuum Unit. This project was referred to as the New Crude and Vacuum Unit (NCVU) project. The NCVU project enabled ConocoPhillips’ Billings refinery to process both conventional crude oils and SynBit/oil sands crude oils and increase crude distillation capacity about 25%. The NCVU project required modifications and optimization of the following existing process units: No. 2 HDS Unit, Saturate Gas Plant, No. 2 and No. 3 Amine Units, No. 5 HDS Unit, Coker Unit, No. 1 and 2 H<sub>2</sub> Plants, Hydrogen Purification Unit (HPU), Raw Water Demineralizer System, Jupiter SRU/ATS Plant, and the FCCU. The primary objectives of the NCVU Project were to improve crude fractionation and energy efficiency of the refinery, and to increase crude processing capacity and crude feed flexibility to reduce feed costs. As a result of the NCVU Project, the Jupiter Plant feed rate capacity needed to be increased to approximately 235 LTD of sulfur. With the submittal of this complete application, the minor source baseline dates for SO<sub>2</sub>, PM, and PM<sub>10</sub> was triggered in the Billings area as of August 21, 2008. The minor source baseline date for NO<sub>x</sub> was already established by Yellowstone Energy Limited Partnership (formerly Billings Generation Inc.) on November 8, 1991. In addition, the Department clarified the permit language for the bulk loading rack VCU regarding the products that may be loaded in the event the VCU is inoperable. **MAQP #2619-24** replaced MAQP #2619-23.

On June 12, 2009, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to administratively amend MAQP #2619-24 to include certain limits and standards. This amendment was in response to requirements contained in the Consent Decree (CD) that ConocoPhillips has entered into with EPA along with the Department. The CD was set forth on December 20, 2001.

As a result of the requirements set forth within the CD, ConocoPhillips had requested the following limits and standards (agreed to by EPA) to be included in the MAQP:

The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the FCCU shall have a limit of 49.2 parts per million, volumetric dry (ppmvd), corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 365-day average and 69.5 ppmvd, corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 7-day average. Per Paragraph 27 of the above-referenced CD, the 7-day NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit established for the FCC shall not apply during periods of hydrotreater outages at the refinery, provided that ConocoPhillips is maintaining and operating its FCC (including associated air pollution control equipment) in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions in accordance with the EPA-approved good air pollution control practices plan.

As a result of this request, **MAQP #2619-25** replaced MAQP #2619-24.

On December 6, 2010, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to administratively amend MAQP #2619-25 to include certain limits, standards, and obligations in response to agency requests and the requirements of Paragraph 210(a) contained the ConocoPhillips CD. ConocoPhillips also requested to include conditions pertaining to facility-related Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP), although not specifically required by the ConocoPhillips CD. ConocoPhillips later rescinded the

request to include these SEP conditions within this permit action. ConocoPhillips additionally requested removal of references to Tank #162 (Ground Water Interceptor System (GWIS) Recovered Oil Tank) as this tank has been taken out of service. With knowledge of forthcoming additional information and administrative amendment requests, in concurrence with ConocoPhillips, the Department withheld preparation and issuance of a revised MAQP; however, this action was assigned MAQP #2619-26.

On July 28, 2011, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to administratively amend MAQP #2619-25 to include the following language (underlined):

NO<sub>x</sub> emissions shall not exceed 49.2 ppmvd corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 365-day average and 69.5 ppmvd, corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 7-day average. The 7-day NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit shall not apply during periods of hydrotreater outages, provided that ConocoPhillips is maintaining and operating the FCCU (including associated air pollution control equipment) consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions in accordance with the EPA-approved good air pollution control practices plan. For days in which the FCCU is not operating, no NO<sub>x</sub> value shall be used in the average, and those periods shall be skipped in determining the 7-day and 365-day averages (ConocoPhillips Consent Decree, Paragraph 27, as amended).

ConocoPhillips requested this addition in language as a result of an April 29, 2011 letter from EPA, which contained the formal approval of the FCC NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits required by the CD. The letter included EPA's expectations as to how these NO<sub>x</sub> emission concentration averages are to be calculated.

This amendment to MAQP #2619-25 included the requested changes from the December 6, 2010 and July 28, 2011 administrative amendment requests.

As a result of both of these requests, **MAQP #2619-27** replaced MAQP #2619-25.

On September 13, 2011, October 7, 2011, October 25, 2011, and October 31, 2011, the Department received elements to fulfill a complete air quality permit application from ConocoPhillips. ConocoPhillips requested a modification to their existing air quality permit to incorporate conditions and limitations associated with the proposed installation of a Backup Coke Crusher. A Backup Coke Crusher was necessary to ensure crushed coke is available at all times for the facility, particularly during instances when the main Coke Crusher was not operational as a result of mechanical failure and/or maintenance activities. The components of the Backup Coke Crusher include the coke crushing unit as well as a diesel fired engine and compressor.

This permit action incorporated all limitations and conditions associated with the proposed Backup Coke Crusher. **MAQP #2619-28** replaced MAQP #2619-27.

On May 3, 2012, the Department of Environmental Quality (Department) received a request to administratively amend MAQP #2619-28 to incorporate a change in the ConocoPhillips Company name. On May 1, 2012, the downstream portions of the ConocoPhillips Company were spun-off as a separate company named Phillips 66 Company (Phillips 66). As a result of the spin-off, the former ConocoPhillips Billings Refinery is now the Phillips 66 Billings Refinery. The permit action incorporated the name change throughout. **MAQP #2619-29** replaced MAQP #2619-28.

## Title V Operating Permit

**Operating Permit #OP2619-00** was issued final and effective on July 9, 2002.

A letter from ConocoPhillips dated December 9, 2002, and received by the Department on December 10, 2002, notified the Department that Conoco had changed its name to ConocoPhillips. On October 10, 2003, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips for an administrative amendment of OP2619-00 to update Section V.B.3 of the General Conditions incorporating changes to federal Title V rules 40 CFR 70.6(c)(5)(iii)(B) and 70.6(c)(5)(iii)(C) (to be incorporated into Montana's Title V rules at ARM 17.8.1213) regarding Title V annual compliance certifications. The permit action changed the name on this permit from Conoco to ConocoPhillips and updated Section V.B.3 of the General Conditions. **Operating Permit #OP2619-01** replaced Operating Permit #OP2619-00.

On January 9, 2007, the Department received an application for renewal of Operating Permit #OP2619-01. The submittal included the request to remove the ConocoPhillips Pipe Line Company operations from this operating permit and establish a new operating permit for these transportation operations (Operating Permit #OP4056-00). In addition, the renewal application requested the inclusion of numerous modifications made since the issuance of the original Title V permit application. **Operating Permit #OP2619-02** replaced Operating Permit #OP2619-01.

On July 3, 2008, ConocoPhillips requested an amendment to **Operating Permit #OP2619-02** on the basis of the inclusion of the entire Consent Decree (H-01-4430 as lodged on April 30, 2002 and as subsequently amended) in that permit. It is ConocoPhillips' position that ARM 17.8.1211(2) only allows consent decree requirements to be included that are as a result of non-compliance with a specific rule or regulatory requirement. The Department included the Consent Decree because it considered the Consent Decree requirements as relevant terms and conditions required to be included in the Title V Operating Permit. The following language (and changes to the permit as described below), as requested by ConocoPhillips, satisfy both ConocoPhillips and the Department with respect to inclusion of Consent Decree requirement into the Title V Operating Permit:

*“ConocoPhillips Company (a successor to Conoco Inc.) has entered into a Consent Decree (Civil Action H-01-4430 as lodged on April 30, 2002 and as subsequently amended). Certain consent decree emission limits, standards and schedules have been incorporated as terms and conditions of the permit, into the appropriate sections of this permit. Other consent decree requirements are considered program enhancements and are not included as terms or conditions of the permit. These requirements found in Appendix H of the permit, may be enforced by the State of Montana and the United States Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to the provisions of the consent decree.”*

In addition to the amendment regarding the Consent Decree, the permit also reflected a requested change in Responsible Official (also submitted on July 3, 2008). **Operating Permit #OP2619-03** replaced Operating Permit #OP2619-02.

On August 21, 2008, the Department received a complete NSR-PSD permit application from ConocoPhillips. ConocoPhillips proposed to replace the existing Small and Large Crude Units and the existing Vacuum Unit with a new, more efficient Crude and Vacuum Unit. This project is referred to as the New Crude and Vacuum Unit (NCVU) project and was ultimately assigned Operating Permit #OP2619-04. Due to difficulties associated with preparation of an Operating Permit (including conditions, limitations, and associated compliance demonstrations) for an unconstructed facility, this permit was put on hold until construction.

As a result of the requirements set forth within the CD, on August 28, 2009, the Department received from ConocoPhillips a request to include the following limits and standards (agreed to by EPA) to be included in Operating Permit #OP2619-03:

The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the FCCU shall have a limit of 49.2 parts per million, volumetric dry (ppmvd), corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 365-day average and 69.5 ppmvd, corrected to 0% O<sub>2</sub>, on a rolling 7-day average. Per Paragraph 27 of the above-referenced CD, the 7-day NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit established for the FCC shall not apply during periods of hydrotreater outages at the refinery, provided that ConocoPhillips is maintaining and operating its FCC (including associated air pollution control equipment) in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions in accordance with the EPA-approved good air pollution control practices plan.

This action was ultimately put on hold until Operating Permit #OP2619-04 was issued; however, was assigned **Operating Permit #OP2619-05**.

On December 6, 2010, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to modify Operating Permit #OP2619-03 to include certain limits, standards, and obligations in response to agency requests and the requirements of Paragraph 210(a) contained the ConocoPhillips CD. ConocoPhillips also requested to include conditions pertaining to facility-related Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEP), although not specifically required by the ConocoPhillips CD. ConocoPhillips later rescinded the request to include these SEP conditions within this permit action. ConocoPhillips additionally requested removal of references to Tank #162 (Ground Water Interceptor System (GWIS) Recovered Oil Tank) as this tank has been taken out of service. With knowledge of forthcoming additional information and modification requests, in concurrence with ConocoPhillips, the Department withheld preparation and issuance of a revised Operating Permit; however, this action was assigned **Operating Permit #OP2619-06**.

Ultimately, the NCVU project was never implemented and the three-year time frame for construction to commence per ARM 17.8.762 lapsed. On August 29, 2011, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to withdraw Operating Permit #OP2619-04, including all requested conditions pertaining to the New Crude and Vacuum Unit.

**Operating Permit #OP2619-04** has been withdrawn.

On September 19, 2011, the Department received a request from ConocoPhillips to incorporate the language from its July 28, 2011 MAQP modification request into Operating Permit #OP2613-03. No permit number was assigned as this was treated as supplementary to previous modification requests.

Modifications associated with ConocoPhillips' August 28, 2009, December 6, 2010, September 19, 2011 requests have been incorporated under one permit action as has the acknowledgment of the withdrawal of Operating Permit #OP2619-04.

**Operating Permit #OP2619-06** replaced Operating Permit #OP2619-03.

On May 3, 2012, the Department received a request to amend Operating Permit #OP2619-06 to incorporate a change in the ConocoPhillips Company name. On May 1, 2012, the downstream portions of the ConocoPhillips Company were spun-off as a separate company named Phillips 66 Company

(Phillips 66). As a result of the spin-off, the former ConocoPhillips Billings Refinery is now the Phillips 66 Billings Refinery. The current permit action incorporates the name change throughout. Additionally, Phillips 66 requested the operating permit be corrected to include Mr. Julian R. Stoll as the facility's Responsible Official.

**Operating Permit #OP2619-07** replaced Operating Permit #OP2619-06.

### **C. Current Permit Action**

On December 28, 2012, the Department received a Title V Renewal Application from Phillips 66. The current action renews the Title V permit, and is assigned Operating Permit #OP2619-08. Changes include but are not limited to updates to applicability of 40 CFR 60 Subpart Ja, GGG, and GGGa, various updates as needed to include MAQP condition language as stated in the MAQP, update to prompt deviation language, minor administrative updates and updates to reporting requirements throughout the permit.

### **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 2-10-105, MCA, the Department conducted the following private property taking and damaging assessment.

YES	NO	
X		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	X	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	X	3. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? (ex.: right to exclude others, disposal of property)
	X	4. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	X	5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? [If no, go to (6)].
		5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests?
		5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?
	X	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? (consider economic impact, investment-backed expectations, character of government action)
	X	7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally?
	X	7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
	X	7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged or flooded?
	X	7c. Has government action lowered property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question?
	X	Takings or damaging implications? (Taking or damaging implications exist if YES is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if NO is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b; the shaded areas)

Based on this analysis, the Department determined there are no taking or damaging implications associated with this permit action.

## F. Compliance Designation

A Full Compliance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring Report (FCE/CMR) of the Phillips 66 Billings Refinery was completed on August 19, 2010. Phillips 66 was found in compliance with permit limitations and conditions. On July 16, 2013 the Department conducted an on-site visit as part of an FCE/CMR for the period of September 17, 2010 to September 6, 2013. The Refinery appeared to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of Operating Permit #OP2619-07 and the references of applicable rules and regulations.

## SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS

### A. Facility Process Description

The Billings Refinery consists of the main refinery area, where crude is broken down into various petroleum products; a wastewater treatment facility; a tank farm; a coker unit; and the sulfur recovery facility. The truck loading rack, where gasoline and distillate is loaded into tank trucks, has been separated into a stand-alone Title V permit (OP4056-00).

### B. Emission Units and Pollution Control Device Identification

Emission Unit 001 is the Boilers. The main boiler house stack brings together the emission gas streams from Boilers #1, #2, B-5, and B-6. This stack does not have control equipment, but it does have a CEMS for SO<sub>2</sub> and a volumetric flow rate monitor on the main stack, and NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and O<sub>2</sub> CEMS for boilers B-5 and B-6. In addition, Phillips 66 is permitted to operate a temporary boiler, which is included in this emitting unit.

Emission Unit 002 is the Fluid Catalytic Cracking Unit (FCCU) Stack. This stack carries emissions from the FCCU, which includes a regenerator. The FCCU does not have SO<sub>2</sub> control equipment, but does have a SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and O<sub>2</sub> CEMS, volumetric flow rate monitor and an opacity monitor.

Emission Unit 003 is a combination of the fuel gas combustion units at the refinery. The control on some of these units is Low and Ultra-Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners. These units are also required to have a H<sub>2</sub>S CEMS on the refinery fuel gas.

Emission Unit 004 was the PMA Unit which included a Process Heater (H-3201). The PMA Storage Tank was included in UE008. Due to the dismantling and removal of the PMA unit from the facility, the associated conditions were removed with the issuance of Operating Permit #OP2619-06.

Emission Unit 005 is the Refinery Flare. This unit is actually considered a "control device" in and of itself. This particular flare is equipped with a steam injection system.

Emission Unit 006 is the Refinery Fugitive Emissions. This includes numerous units and is, for the most part, concerned with leaks. Controls are the seals, gaskets, packing, and plugs.

Emission Unit 007 is the SRU and associated equipment. This includes the Jupiter SRU flare, Claus units, and SRU incinerator. The flare is steam injected and the incinerator is equipped with low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners. These units have a SO<sub>2</sub> CEMS, O<sub>2</sub>, and volumetric flow rate monitor.

Emission Unit 008 is Storage Tanks. These tanks must meet requirements of floating roofs with seal systems, or fixed roofs with rooftop vacuum breaker vents. These units undergo regular inspections.

Emission Unit 009 was the Product Bulk Loading, which has been removed from the refinery's and moved to the Transportation Operation's permit (OP4056-00).

Emission Unit 010 is the Wastewater Treatment. This unit consists of various units and requires a CPI Separator with carbon canisters to reduce VOC emissions by 95%.

Emission Unit 011 is Miscellaneous Process Vents. This includes various units. Controls depend on the type of vent and include the use of a flare or combustion device, if controls are used.

Emission Unit 012 is the Catalytic Reforming Units #1 & #2.

Emissions Unit 013 is the Backup Coke Crusher

Emissions Unit 014 is the following Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines: Backup Coke Crusher Engine, Cryo Backup Air Compressor Engine, Boiler House Air Compressor Engine, Storm Water to Holding Pond Pump Engine, and the Boiler House Backup Air Compressor

## SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS

### A. Emission Limits and Standards

Emission limits and standards in the Title V permit were established from the preconstruction permit, the Billings/Laurel SIP, NSPS requirements, NESHAP requirements, MACT requirements, and Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs). Section III.A.14 was added to the final Title V permit (the following conditions in that section were renumbered) and Section III.I.20(e) was clarified per the Settlement Stipulation and Order of Dismissal ordered on July 9, 2002 by the Board of Environmental Review. The Settlement Stipulation and Order of Dismissal were associated with Conoco's appeal of Title V permit OP2619-00.

### B. Monitoring Requirements

ARM 17.8.1212(1) requires that all monitoring and analysis procedures or test methods, required under applicable requirements, be 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, it does 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 an insignificant emission 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 emissions 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.

In the case of CEMS, and required back-up or alternative methods when the CEMS are not running, the permit states "the Department shall approve such contingency plans." When such contingency plans are in use and have been submitted, the source will be considered to be in compliance with the contingency plan requirement until the Department informs Phillips 66 otherwise.

### 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.

## 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 emission unit and Section V of the operating permit "General Conditions" explains the reporting requirements. However, the permittee is required to submit semi-annual 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.

To eliminate redundant reporting, a source may reference previously submitted reports (with at least the date and subject of the report) in the semi-annual and annual reports instead of resubmitting the information in quarterly, and/or other reports. However, a source must still certify continuous or intermittent compliance with each applicable requirement annually.

## F. Public Notice

In accordance with ARM 17.8.1232, a public notice was published in *The Billings Gazette* newspaper on February 13, 2014. The Department provided a 30-day public comment period on the draft operating permit. 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 will be summarized, along with the Department's responses, in the following table. All comments received during the public comment period will be promptly forwarded to Phillips 66 so they may have an opportunity to respond to these comments as well.

## G. Draft Permit Comments

### Summary of Public Comments

Person/Group Commenting	Comment	Department Response

### Summary of Comments – Randall Richert, Phillips 66

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
Throughout	Throughout the permit, there are conditions that require submittal of reports to the Billings Regional Office. Because the DEQ contact with compliance oversight for our facility is located in Butte, we suggest hanging each of these conditions to	The Department has incorporated this comment. The Department intends that 'the appropriate Regional Office' be the regional office that the compliance inspector is based from, and changes to the permit were made reflecting this.

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
	"the appropriate DEQ Regional or Branch Office	Currently, Phillips 66's compliance officer is based out of the Butte office. Thank you for your diligent comment.
Throughout	Throughout the permit, there are requirements to "log" information and to keep "logs". The term "log" could be interpreted to require manual entry, in written form. Because much of our information is entered automatically and kept in electronic form, we suggest replacing both the noun and verb usage of the term "log" with the term "record" throughout the permit.	The Department has removed the word "log" throughout the permit, at Phillips 66's request. The Department has not, and does not, intend the word "log" to infer that handwritten, manual entry methodologies are the only acceptable format. However, the Department agrees that the term "record" is an appropriate choice of terminology. The Department has incorporated the comment throughout the permit.
Multiple Locations (i.e. – B.40, D.46, E.24, G.62, H.22, I.22, J.8)	In multiple locations in the permit, there are requirements for the semi-annual monitoring report to contain "reports of any required monitoring" (see B.40, D.46, E.24, G.62, H.22, I.22, and J.8 as examples). This obligation is extremely vague and is not supported by the regulations. We are concerned that the vague nature of the obligation will lead to challenges of compliance status. Further, the underlying regulation generally has specific monitoring reporting obligations, which are already being fulfilled. We recommend that these obligations be removed, due to the compliance risk and redundant nature of the obligation.	The Department has updated the Semiannual reporting language throughout the permit to specify what shall be included in the semiannual reports
Multiple Locations (i.e. – B.40, D.46, E.24, G.62, H.22, I.22, J.8)	In multiple locations in the permit, there are requirements for the semi-annual monitoring report to contain a "summary of the records" (see B.40, G.62, L.6, and M.15 as examples). This obligation is extremely vague and is not supported by the regulations. We are concerned that the vague nature of the obligation will lead to challenges of compliance status. The DEQ already has the authority to request any compliance records required	The Department has updated the Semiannual reporting language throughout the permit to specify what shall be included in the semiannual reports

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
	under the regulations contained within the permit. We recommend that these obligations be removed, due to the compliance risk and unnecessary nature of the obligation.	
Multiple Locations throughout permit	In multiple locations in the permit, there are requirements for the semi-annual monitoring report to contain a summary of compliance with 40 CFR 63 Subpart CC (Refinery MACT 1 rule). See F.31, H.22, and J.8 for examples. This obligation is not supported by the regulations, and is stricter than the federal regulation (Refinery MACT 1 rule). The Refinery MACT 1 rule requires submittal of the relevant compliance reports within 60 days after the end of the semi-annual period. Having to report this information more than two weeks earlier is stricter than the federal requirements set by the Refinery MACT 1 rule, and is therefore not supported by state and federal regulations. We suggest replacing with the following language: “Statement of compliance report submittal status during the semi-annual period for 40 CFR 63, Subpart CC. Nothing in the subparagraph requires the permittee to submit its MACT compliance report earlier than is required by the MACT regulations found in 40 CFR 63 Subpart CC.”	The intent of the language was not to require more stringent timeframes for any reporting, rather, to provide the compliance status at semiannual report time with compliance determinations or report timeframes in regards to as required by the MACT itself. The Department understands MACT CC has reporting deadlines that extend beyond the normal Title V semiannual reports due date. However, the Department has incorporated language throughout the permit to clarify the intent of this reporting requirement language.
III.B.8	Condition B.8: All of the heaters and boilers at the Phillips 66 Billings Refinery are collectively an existing source under the current rule at 40 CFR 63 Subpart DDDDD (Heater/Boiler MACT). Note that the Heater/Boiler MACT rule excludes temporary boilers.	The Department deleted reference to Boilers B-5 and B-6.
III.B.13	Condition B.13: We suggest changing “per rolling 12-month period” to “per calendar year”. Recordkeeping for rolling 12-month periods is cumbersome, and	This condition originates from the Montana Air Quality Permit, which includes a rolling 12 month period basis. Most rolling 12 month limitations provide more environmental benefit than calendar

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
	<p>produces no environmental benefit. In addition, most regulations within the Title V permit such as the PSD program and emission inventory requirements are based on a calendar year.</p>	<p>year only limits, as ambient air quality does not reset at zero on January 1st. Further, there is long history behind the use of 12 month rolling limits, which includes not only an ambient air quality impact basis, but also, a practical enforceability / more frequent compliance demonstration basis. For this particular limit, the process of revising this limit would originate through the Montana Air Quality Permit Modification process, and the intent and basis of the condition would need to be reviewed.</p> <p>In general, the Department would view a departure from a rolling 12 month limitation to a calendar year limitation as less stringent. Such changes would not be acceptable for BACT conditions, for example.</p>
III.B.17.	<p>Condition B.17: In order to avoid confusion, “Compliance with the emission limitations” needs to be changed to “Compliance with the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limitations”, because of the SO<sub>2</sub> SIP Stipulation context and basis for the condition.</p>	<p>The intent of this language is to provide for a compliance demonstration condition which applies not only to SO<sub>2</sub>, but to other pollutants as well, and is in line with previously existing compliance demonstration language in previous permits. In cases of pre-existing language in a permit which Phillips 66 would like revised, the Department would suggest a request within the application as the most appropriate process to request such changes.</p>
III.B.17	<p>Condition B.17.e: Planned maintenance needs to be listed as an acceptable reason for the CEM system to be temporarily out of operation. Planned maintenance is a recognized obligation of operating the CEM system.</p>	<p>The Department has incorporated the requested change.</p>
III.B.40	<p>Condition B.40.c: The obligation to submit this information on a semi-annual frequency is not supported by regulation, and is stricter than federal requirements. This condition needs to be removed.</p>	<p>Condition B.12 requires that VOC emissions from boilers B-5 and B-6 shall each not exceed 4.32 tons/rolling 12 calendar month total. ARM 17.8.1212(3)(a) requires submittal of reports of any required</p>

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
		<p>monitoring at least every six months, with all instances of deviations identified. The monitoring method for Condition B.12 is through use of emissions calculations. The intent of Condition B.40.c is to clarify that all details of all calculations need not be reported. Rather, a summarizing presentation can be made, with any deviations from permit requirements clearly identified. This condition was further clarified in response to previous comments regarding vagueness of reporting requirements in general.</p>
III.C	<p>Table C: In order to be consistent with previously submitted test protocols, the Compliance Demonstration Method for PM needs to be listed as “Method 5B (or equivalent)”.</p>	<p>The table has been generalized to indicate that PM testing is required. The associated permit language indicates that Method 5 or "other Department approved testing" can be utilized. This language is consistent with previous versions of the permit as well. Due to the evolving nature of PM testing, the Department is intentional in indicating no one specific test method which must be used. Every source test used for compliance must be approved in advance by the Department.</p>
III.C.17	<p>Condition C.17.d: “CEMS data and calculations shall be submitted to the Department on a quarterly basis.” needs to be changed to “SO<sub>2</sub> CEMS data shall be submitted to the Department of a quarterly basis.” The quarterly submittal of SO<sub>2</sub> CEMS data is an obligation of the SO<sub>2</sub> SIP Stipulation. All other CEMS data have to be submitted on a semi-annual basis, in accordance with the respective regulation (i.e. NSPS, MACT, Consent Decree). We are not aware of any regulatory requirement to periodically submit calculations in addition to emissions data, quality assurance data, etc.</p>	<p>The Department has incorporated the requested change.</p>

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
III.C.30	Condition C.30: The obligation to report “the daily NOx rolling 365-day average” should be changed to “the maximum daily NOx rolling 365-day average value”. This would provide information in a summary format that is easier to review. The DEQ continues to have the authority to request more detailed calculation results, in addition to the data summaries that are reported on a routine basis.	The Department agrees and has incorporated the requested change.
III.D.16	Condition D.16: The CO emission limitations of 0.015 lb/mmBtu on a rolling 365-day average for H-9401 and H-9701 were originally taken as part of the New Crude and Vacuum Unit (NCVU) permit. Both of these heaters were in existence at the time of the NCVU permit application development, and these limits were accepted along with other emission limits on other sources as part of the permit application package. Because the NCVU project was subsequently cancelled, most of the additional permit limits reverted back to their previous form or level. However, the above CO limits for H-9401 and H-9701 were overlooked when the NCVU-related permit conditions were edited after the project was cancelled. Previously, the CO limit for H-9701 was 0.025 lb/mmBtu on a rolling 12-month time period. H-9401 did not have a CO limit. Please see the attached documents. The attachments contain the original permit conditions for the pre-NCVU permit, the NCVU permit, and the NCVU application text that discusses the CO limits for H-9401 and H-9701. We are requesting that the CO limits for these two heaters revert to their previous pre-NCVU limits.	The limits reflected in the current Title V are taken directly from the current Montana Air Quality Permit. The Department will update the Title V permit following appropriate update of the Montana Air Quality Permit.
III.D.44	Condition D.44: In order to avoid confusion, please change “said monitors” to “SO <sub>2</sub> -related monitors”. In addition, in the last sentence in this condition please	The Department incorporated the requested change

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
	change “quarterly emission reports” to “quarterly SO <sub>2</sub> emission reports”	
III.D.46	Condition D.46.f: In order to avoid confusion, please change “quarterly reports of CEMS data” to “quarterly reports of SO <sub>2</sub> CEMS data”.	The Department incorporated the requested change
III.E.18	Condition E.18: The obligation to inspect and perform maintenance on process unit flow rate metering devices is not supported by any air regulation. This condition needs to be removed.	This recordkeeping requirement fulfills part of the compliance demonstration requirements related to the condition requiring that any flow rate metering shall use approved standards, methods, accounting procedures, and engineering data. The Department is required to ensure an appropriate compliance demonstration method is identified. If not present elsewhere, compliance demonstration, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements must be created in a Title V permit. Because this condition was an accepted condition of previous Title V permits for this facility, the Department considers it part of the approved and agreed upon methods to be used for flow rate metering. The Department would review alternative compliance demonstration methods made by Phillips 66. It seems most appropriate that alternative compliance demonstration requests that differ from existing conditions be made in an application. Further, no alternative was suggested. No change has been made.
III.F.2	Condition F.2: Compressors C-9401 and C-9701 have been determined to be in VOC service, and not in hydrogen service. Because of this, C-9401 and C-9701 are listed as such in Condition F.1, and should be removed from Condition F.2.	The Department has deleted reference to the C-9401 and C-9701 from Condition F.2.

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
III.G	Table G: The Compliance Determination Method for PM/PM <sub>10</sub> for the SRU/ATS main stack should be changed to “Method 201A or equivalent” to be more consistent with the equivalent condition in the MAQP.	Due to the evolving nature of PM testing, the Department has updated the language such that a specific test method is not required by terms of the permit. Each compliance source test must be approved by the Department, and appropriate test methods can be determined on an ongoing basis.
III.G.50	Condition G.50: The obligation to inspect and perform maintenance on process unit flow rate metering devices is not supported by any air regulation. This condition needs to be removed.	This recordkeeping requirement fulfills part of the compliance demonstration requirements related to the condition requiring that any flow rate metering shall use approved standards, methods, accounting procedures, and engineering data. The Department is required to ensure an appropriate compliance demonstration method is identified or created in a Title V permit. Because this condition was an accepted condition of previous Title V permits for this facility, the Department considers it part of the approved and agreed upon methods to be used for flow rate metering. The Department would review alternative compliance demonstration methods made by Phillips 66. It seems most appropriate that alternative compliance demonstration requests that differ from existing conditions be made in an application to provide for appropriate review time. Further, no alternative was suggested.
III.G.62	Condition G.62.d: This condition apparently requires the semi-annual submittal of “a summary of records” of the as-built design of the TGTU equipped on the SRU. We see no environmental benefit of semi-annually submitting this information and believe that there is no regulatory basis for the condition. In addition, please see the comment on “summary of records” in the General Comments section.	Title V requires that every condition contain an associated compliance demonstration, recordkeeping, and reporting requirement. The Department has updated the requirement to clarify that a submission is required only if there is a change to the design of the TGTU.

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
III.M	Condition M: The Boiler House Air Compressor Engine should be listed as the “Boiler House Backup Air Compressor Engine”. Also, “Boiler House Backup Air Compressor” should be deleted from the list.	The Department has incorporated these changes.
III.M.11	Condition M.11: This condition does not appear to be supported by an air regulation. If it is, the appropriate air regulation needs to be referenced. If it is not supported by an air regulation, the condition needs to be removed.	This condition is part of the compliance demonstration referred to in condition M.7. The Department is required to identify, or create if needed, compliance demonstrations, recordkeeping, and reporting for all conditions. Appropriate compliance demonstration, recordkeeping, and reporting are required in part to provide practical enforceability of a limit, and is required by the Title V program.
V.E.1	Section V, General Permit Condition E.1: Although referencing ARM 17.8.1212(3)(b), Conditions 1.a and 1.b are not contained within the referenced regulation. Consequently, they appear to not be supported by regulation, and should be removed.	This condition is fulfilling the requirement that each air quality operating permit shall incorporate prompt reporting of deviations. These conditions fulfill this requirement, and further, define what the Department will consider prompt reporting. This is a standard condition which the Department has intended to make part of every Title V Renewal action in this round of Title V renewals. ARM 17.8.1212(3)(b) requires the Department to provide this condition. Further, Phillips 66 has not provided an alternative condition to consider. The Department has maintained the language as proposed, consistent with other permits issued by the Department.

### Summary of EPA Comments

Permit Reference	EPA Comment	Department Response

## SECTION IV. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

### A. MACT Standards

As of the date of the Date of Decision, 40 CFR 63, Subpart CC, UUU, EEEE, DDDDD (State-only) are applicable to the Phillips 66 Refinery. The Department is not aware of any proposed or pending MACT standard that may be applicable.

### B. NESHAP Standards

As of the date of the Date of Decision, 40 CFR 61, Subparts M and FF, are applicable at the Phillips 66 Refinery. The Department is not aware of any proposed or pending NESHAP standards that may be applicable.

### C. NSPS Standards

The Department is not aware of any proposed or pending NSPS standards, in addition to those already listed, that may be applicable at this time.

### D. Risk Management Plan

As of the date of the Date of Decision, this facility does exceed the minimum threshold quantities for any regulated substance listed in 40 CFR 68.115 for any facility process. Consequently, this facility is 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.

### E. Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) Plan

An emitting unit located at a Title V facility that meets the following criteria listed in ARM 17.8.1503 is subject to Subchapter 15 and must develop a CAM Plan for that unit:

- The emitting unit is subject to an emission limitation or standard for the applicable regulated air pollutant (other than emission limits or standards proposed after November 15, 1990, since these regulations contain specific monitoring requirements);
- The emitting unit uses a control device to achieve compliance with such limit; and
- The emitting unit has potential pre-control device emissions of the applicable regulated air pollutant that are greater than major source thresholds.

Phillips 66 currently has one emitting unit that meets all the applicability criteria in ARM 17.8.1503: EU007 (Jupiter Sulfur Plant). The SRU/ATS unit is required to meet PM<sub>10</sub> emission limitations. Filters on the SRU and ATS are used for PM<sub>10</sub> control. Phillips 66 proposes to use pressure drop across the filters as the on-going method of assuring compliance. The CAM plan for EU007 can be found in Appendix F of Operating Permit #OP2619-08.

## **F. Alternate Operating Scenario**

In accordance with the Consent Decree between Phillips 66 and the EPA (Civil Action H-01-4430, as amended and entered on August 2, 2003), Phillips 66 submitted Gas Oil Hydrotreater (GOH) outage plans for the Billings Refinery to minimize emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> during GOH outages from the FCC Unit.

Appendix G of the Title V permit contains the Gas Oil Hydrotreater Outage Plan, Revision 5.1, dated March 15, 2006. This plan is incorporated into the Title V operating permit as an alternate operating scenario.

## **G. Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule**

On May 7, 2010, EPA published the “light duty vehicle rule” (Docket # EPA-HQ-OAR- 2009-0472, 75 FR 25324) controlling greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from mobile sources, whereby GHG became a pollutant subject to regulation under the Federal and Montana Clean Air Act(s). On June 3, 2010, EPA promulgated the GHG “Tailoring Rule” (Docket # EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0517, 75 FR 31514) which modified 40 CFR Parts 51, 52, 70, and 71 to specify which facilities are subject to GHG permitting requirements and when such facilities become subject to regulation for GHG under the PSD and Title V programs.

Under the Tailoring Rule, any PSD action (either a new major stationary source or a major modification at a major stationary source) taken for a pollutant or pollutants other than GHG that would become final on or after January 2, 2011, would be subject to PSD permitting requirements for GHG if the GHG increases associated with that action were at or above 75,000 TPY of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) and greater than 0 TPY on a mass basis. Similarly, if such action were taken, any resulting requirements would be subject to inclusion in the Title V Operating Permit. Facilities which hold Title V permits due to criteria pollutant emissions over 100 TPY would need to incorporate any GHG applicable requirements into their operating permits for any Title V action that would have a final decision occurring on or after January 2, 2011.

Starting on July 1, 2011, PSD permitting requirements would be triggered for modifications that were determined to be major under PSD based on GHG emissions alone, even if no other pollutant triggered a major modification. In addition, sources that have not been considered PSD major sources based on criteria pollutant emissions would become PSD major sources if their facility-wide potential emissions equaled or exceeded 100,000 TPY of CO<sub>2</sub>e and 100 or 250 TPY of GHG on a mass basis depending on their listed status in ARM 17.8.801(22). With respect to Title V, sources not currently holding a Title V permit that have potential facility-wide emissions equal to or exceeding 100,000 TPY of CO<sub>2</sub>e and 100 TPY of GHG on a mass basis would be required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit.

Based on information provided by Phillips 66, the Billings Refinery potential emissions for the current listed emitting units exceed the GHG major source threshold of 100,000 TPY of CO<sub>2</sub>e for both Title V and PSD under the Tailoring Rule. Therefore, Phillips 66 may be subject to GHG permitting requirements in the future.

## **H. Other Considerations**

The Department has reviewed the refinery (OP2619) and the bulk marketing terminal (OP4056) and has determined that for the purposes of MACT and New Source Review permitting, these facilities are one source. The refinery and the bulk marketing terminal are contiguous and adjacent, under common ownership and control and the terminal is a support facility to the refinery. Because the facilities meet these criteria, they meet the definition of source and will be considered one source under the requirements of ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.801(7). The emissions from both facilities will need to be considered when either facility makes a change.