

**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**

SSP-SiMatrix, Inc.
SW¹/₄ of Section 31, Township 7 North, Range 20 West, Ravalli County
1131 North U.S. Highway 93
Victor, MT 59875

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

Facility Compliance Requirements	Yes	No	Comments
Source Tests Required	XX		Method 9
Ambient Monitoring Required		XX	
COMS Required		XX	
CEMS Required		XX	
Schedule of Compliance Required		XX	
Annual Compliance Certification and Semiannual Reporting Required	XX		
Monthly Reporting Required		XX	
Quarterly Reporting Required		XX	
Applicable Air Quality Programs			
ARM Subchapter 7 – Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP)	XX		MAQP #3237-01
New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)		XX	
National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS)		XX	
Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)		XX	
Major New Source Review (NSR) – includes Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and/or Non-attainment Area (NAA) NSR		XX	
Risk Management Plan Required (RMP)		XX	
Acid Rain Title IV		XX	
Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM)		XX	
State Implementation Plan (SIP)	XX		General SIP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION.....	3
A. PURPOSE.....	3
B. FACILITY LOCATION	3
C. FACILITY BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	3
D. CURRENT PERMIT ACTION.....	4
E. TAKING AND DAMAGING ANALYSIS	4
F. COMPLIANCE DESIGNATION	4
SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS.....	5
A. FACILITY PROCESS DESCRIPTION	5
B. EMISSION UNITS AND POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE IDENTIFICATION.....	5
C. CATEGORICALLY INSIGNIFICANT SOURCES/ACTIVITIES	5
SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS.....	6
A. EMISSION LIMITS AND STANDARDS	6
B. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS.....	6
C. TEST METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	6
D. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.....	6
E. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	7
F. PUBLIC NOTICE.....	7
G. DRAFT PERMIT COMMENTS	7
SECTION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS.....	8
SECTION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS.....	9
A. MACT STANDARDS.....	9
B. NESHAP STANDARDS.....	9
C. NSPS STANDARDS.....	9
D. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	9
E. CAM APPLICABILITY.....	9
F. PSD AND TITLE V GREENHOUSE GAS TAILORING RULE	9

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 emissions units affected by the operating permit proposed for this facility. The document is intended for reference during review of the proposed permit by the 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 SSP including subsequent information submitted, information received by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department) on October 28, 2003, regarding addition of a processing room, information received January 14, 2004, regarding addition of the 1.2 MMBtu/hr gas fired boiler, the request to change the name of the facility received on April 18, 2008, and the renewal application received on March 25, 2009. A renewal application was also received on February 25, 2015.

B. Facility Location

The SSP facility is located in the SW¹/₄ of Section 31, Township 7 North, Range 20 West, Ravalli County, Montana, approximately 3 miles north of Hamilton. The physical street address is 1131 North US Highway 93, Victor, MT 59875.

C. Facility Background Information

Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP)

MAQP #3237-00 was issued to Specialty Surgical Products on April 12, 2003, for the operation of a manufacturing facility producing silicon-based devices used in medical procedures.

On April 18, 2008, the Department received a request for an Administrative Amendment to change the owner name from Specialty Surgical Products, Inc. to SSP. The permit was also amended to include the de minimis changes requested by Specialty Surgical Products in 2003. **MAQP #3237-01** replaced MAQP #3237-00.

Title V Operating Permit

The initial **Title V Operating Permit #OP3237-00** was issued to Specialty Surgical Products on September 4, 2004.

On April 18, 2008, the Department received a request for an Administrative Amendment to change the owner name from Specialty Surgical Products, Inc. to SSP. **Operating Permit #OP3237-01** replaced Operating Permit #OP3237-00.

On March 25, 2009, the Department received a Title V Operating Permit Renewal Application from SSP. No changes were requested. **Operating Permit #OP3237-02** replaced Operating Permit #OP#3237-01.

D. Current Permit Action

On February 25, 2015, the Department received a Title V Operating Permit Renewal Application from SSP. No changes were requested. **Operating Permit #OP3237-03** replaces Operating Permit #OP#3237-02.

E. Taking and Damaging Analysis

HB 311, the Montana Private Property Assessment Act, requires analysis of every proposed state agency administrative rule, policy, permit condition or permit denial, pertaining to an environmental matter, to determine whether the state action constitutes a taking or damaging of private real property that requires compensation under the Montana or U.S. Constitution. As part of issuing an operating permit, the Department is required to complete a Taking and Damaging Checklist. As required by 2-10-101 through 2-10-105, MCA, the Department conducted the following private property taking and damaging assessment.

YES	NO	
XX		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	XX	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	XX	3. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? (ex.: right to exclude others, disposal of property)
	XX	4. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	XX	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?
	XX	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? (consider economic impact, investment-backed expectations, character of government action)
	XX	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?
	XX	7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
	XX	7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged or flooded?
	XX	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?
	XX	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

All compliance certification reports submitted to the Department has indicated compliance with all conditions of the permit. The Department completed a Full Compliance Evaluation for the period from April 29, 2011, to August 30, 2013. The full evaluation indicated compliance with all permit requirements.

SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSION UNITS

A. Facility Process Description

The facility includes two process buildings where silicon-based devices used in medical procedures such as plastic surgery are produced. Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) emissions, primarily xylene and some ethyl benzene, result from the product manufacturing process. Xylene and ethyl benzene are listed Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs). Mandrels are dipped in a xylene/silicon mixture and allowed to partially dry. The process is repeated until the desired product thickness is obtained. Formed products are then placed in curing ovens to complete the drying process. Isopropyl alcohol is used to clean the products. A spray paint hood is used for product coating on an as-needed basis. Both buildings contain natural gas-fired heating equipment.

B. Emission Units and Pollution Control Device Identification

The emission units regulated by this permit are the exhaust fans at Buildings A and B. Currently, SSP is not required to install or operate any air pollution control equipment.

C. Categorically Insignificant Sources/Activities

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

Emissions Unit ID	Description
IEU01	Building A Heater (F-1)
IEU02	Building A Heater (F-2)
IEU03	Building A Heater (F-3)
IEU04	Building A Unit Heater (UHA-01)
IEU05	Building A Unit Heater (UHA-02)
IEU06	Building A Comfort Heater (FCA-01)
IEU07	Building A Alcohol Fume Hoods (Two hoods) (AV-01)
IEU08	Building A Paint Hood (PH-01)
IEU09	Building A Fugitive Emissions
IEU10	Building B Boiler #1 (B-01)
IEU11	Building B Boiler #2 (B-02)
IEU12	Building B Curing Oven (CO-01)
IEU13	Building B Curing Oven (CO-02)
IEU14	Building B Fugitive Emissions
IEU15	Building A Extension Boiler (1.2 MMBtu/hr)

SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS

A. Emission Limits and Standards

The VOC emissions from the facility are limited to 52.3 tons during any rolling 12-month time period. This is a plant-wide limit and is applicable to the sum of all VOC emissions from the facility.

B. Monitoring Requirements

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

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

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

C. Test Methods and Procedures

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

D. Recordkeeping Requirements

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

E. Reporting Requirements

Reporting requirements are included in the permit for each emissions unit and Section V of the operating permit "General Conditions" explains the reporting requirements. However, the permittee is required to submit 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.

F. Public Notice

In accordance with ARM 17.8.1232, a public notice was published in the *Ravalli Republic* newspaper on July 15, 2015. The Department provided a 30-day public comment period on the draft operating permit from July 15, 2015, to August 14, 2015. ARM 17.8.1232 requires the Department to keep a record of both comments and issues raised during the public participation process. The comments and issues received by August 14, 2015, are summarized, along with the Department's responses, in the following table. All comments received during the public comment period will be promptly forwarded to SSP so they may have an opportunity to respond to these comments as well.

Summary of Public Comments

Person/Group Commenting	Comment	Department Response
	None received	

G. Draft Permit Comments

Summary of Permittee Comments

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
	None received	

Summary of EPA Comments

Permit Reference	EPA Comment	Department Response

SECTION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS

SSP did not request a shield from any of the air quality Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) or federal regulations (pursuant to ARM 17.8.1214). Therefore, no further analysis of non-applicable requirements is necessary.

SECTION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

A. MACT Standards

As of the date of this permit, the Department is unaware of any currently applicable or future MACT Standards that may be promulgated that will affect this facility.

B. NESHAP Standards

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

C. NSPS Standards

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

D. Risk Management Plan

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

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

E. CAM Applicability

CAM requirements apply to a pollutant-specific emissions unit at a major source that is required to obtain an air quality operating permit if the unit is subject to an emission limitation or standard for the applicable regulated air pollutant, the unit uses a control device to achieve compliance with any such emission limitation or standard, and the unit has potential pre-control device emissions of the applicable regulated air pollutant that are equal to or greater than 100% of the amount, in tons per year, required for a source to be classified as a major source.

SSP does not have any control devices; therefore, CAM is not applicable to any emissions unit or pollutant at this facility.

F. PSD 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 (CO₂e) 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 are not considered PSD major sources based on criteria pollutant emissions would become subject to PSD review if their facility-wide potential emissions equaled or exceeded 100,000 TPY of CO₂e and 100 or 250 TPY of GHG on a mass basis depending on their listed status in ARM 17.8.801(22) and they undertook a permitting action with increases of 75,000 TPY or more of CO₂e and greater than 0 TPY of GHG on a mass basis. 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 CO₂e and 100 TPY of GHG on a mass basis would be required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit.

SSP's potential emissions fall below the GHG major source threshold of 100,000 TPY of CO₂e for both Title V and PSD under the Tailoring Rule.

The Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS), in its *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA* decision on June 23, 2014, ruled that the Clean Air Act neither compels nor permits EPA to require a source to obtain a PSD or Title V permit on the sole basis of its potential emissions of GHG. SCOTUS also ruled that EPA lacked the authority to tailor the Clean Air Act's unambiguous numerical thresholds of 100 or 250 TPY to accommodate a CO₂e threshold of 100,000 TPY. SCOTUS upheld that EPA reasonably interpreted the Clean Air Act to require sources that would need PSD permits based on their emission of conventional pollutants to comply with BACT for GHG. As such, the Tailoring Rule has been rendered invalid and sources cannot become subject to PSD or Title V regulations based on GHG emissions alone. Sources that must undergo PSD permitting due to pollutant emissions other than PSD may still be required to comply with BACT for GHG emissions.