# MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OPERATING PERMIT TECHNICAL REVIEW DOCUMENT

Air, Energy & Mining Division 1520 E. Sixth Avenue P.O. Box 200901 Helena, Montana 59620-0901

City of Billings Billings Regional Landfill Section 29 & 30, Township 1 South, Range 26 East 4848 Midland Road Billings, MT 59101

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

Facility Compliance Requirements	Yes	No	Comments
Source Tests Required	X		40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc
Ambient Monitoring Required		X	
COMS Required		X	
CEMS Required		X	
Schedule of Compliance Required	X		40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc
Annual Compliance Certification and Semiannual Reporting Required	X		40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc
Monthly Reporting Required		X	
Quarterly Reporting Required		X	
Applicable Air Quality Programs			
ARM Subchapter 7 – Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP)		X	
New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)	X		40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc
National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS)	X		40 CFR 61, Subpart M
Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT)		X	
Major New Source Review (NSR) – includes Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and/or Non-attainment Area (NAA) NSR		X	
Risk Management Plan Required (RMP)		X	
Acid Rain Title IV		X	
Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM)		X	
State Implementation Plan (SIP)	X		General SIP

OP5176-01 1 Date of Decision: 4/18/2019 Effective Date: 5/21/2019

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECT	TION I. GENERAL INFORMATION	•••••	3
Α.	Purpose	3	
В.	FACILITY LOCATION		
C.	FACILITY BACKGROUND INFORMATION		
D.	CURRENT PERMIT ACTION	3	
E.	TAKING AND DAMAGING ANALYSIS	3	
F.	COMPLIANCE DESIGNATION	4	
SECT	TION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSIONS UNITS	•••••	5
Α.	FACILITY PROCESS DESCRIPTION	5	
В.	EMISSIONS UNITS AND POLLUTION CONTROL DEVICE IDENTIFICATION	5	
C.	CATEGORICALLY INSIGNIFICANT SOURCES/ACTIVITIES	5	
SECT	TION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS	•••••	6
Α.	EMISSION LIMITS AND STANDARDS.	6	
В.	MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	6	
C.	TEST METHODS AND PROCEDURES	6	
D.	RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS	7	
E.	REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	7	
SECT	TION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS	•••••	8
SECT	TION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS	•••••	11
Α.	MACT STANDARDS (PART 63)	11	
В.	NESHAP STANDARDS (PART 61)		
C.	NSPS STANDARDS		
D.	RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.	11	
E.	CAM APPLICABILITY		
F.	PSD AND TITLE V GREENHOUSE GAS TAILORING RULE	12	

#### 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 City of Billings – Billings Regional Landfill on March 14, 2017, July 28, 2017, and December 28, 2017. City of Billings – Billings Regional Landfill submitted an Administrative Amendment on February 8, 2019.

# **B.** Facility Location

The facility is located at 5240 Jellison Road, in Billings, Montana. The legal description of the site is Sections 28 and 29, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, Yellowstone County, Montana. The approximate latitude/longitude coordinates are latitude 45.7254 decimal degrees and longitude -108.545 decimal degrees. The site elevation is approximately 3,120 feet.

# C. Facility Background Information

The City of Billings (COB) owns and operates the Billings Regional Landfill (BRL), a municipal solid waste landfill. The landfill receives municipal solid waste from several locations near the Billings area. A gas extraction system collets landfill gas and associated liquid condensate. The gas is processed and injected into a natural gas distribution line for sale.

#### <u>Title V Operating Permit</u>

The initial Title V Operating Permit #OP5176-00 was issued to COB-BRL on July 15, 2018, for the operation of the municipal solid waste landfill.

## D. Current Permit Action

On February 2, 2019, the Department received an Administrative Amendment request from the COB to update the Responsible Official from Bruce McCandless to Chris Kulkulski. **Operating Permit #OP5176-01** replaces Operating Permit #OP5176-00.

## 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.

OP5176-01 3

YES	NO	
X		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation
Λ		affecting private real property or water rights?
	X	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private
	$\Lambda$	property?
	X	3. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? (ex.: right to exclude others,
	A	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
	Λ	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
	Λ	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,
	$\Lambda$	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

No formal inspection of the facility has been completed by Department staff. Prior to the issuance of #OP5176-01, BRL was not subject to inspection by Air Quality Bureau staff.

OP5176-01

Date of Decision: 4/18/2019 Effective Date: 5/21/2019

# SECTION II. SUMMARY OF EMISSIONS UNITS

# A. Facility Process Description

The City of Billings (COB) owns and operates the BRL located in Billings, MT. COB began using the landfill in the late 1960's for disposal of municipal solid waste (MSW). The landfill currently accepts yard, wood, and inert waste as well as construction and demolition waste, asbestos, clean and contaminated dirt and industrial waste.

# B. Emissions Units and Pollution Control Device Identification

The emitting unit is the landfill itself, which is subject to 40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc.

Emissions Unit ID	Description	Pollution Control Device/Practice
EU001	Municipal Solid Waste Landfill	None
EU002	Fugitive Dust	Reasonable Practices

# C. Categorically Insignificant Sources/Activities

Emissions Unit ID	Description	
EU001	Shop Heater	
EU002	Scale House Heaters	
EU003	Used Oil Heaters	

5

Date of Decision: 4/18/2019 Effective Date: 5/21/2019

#### **SECTION III. PERMIT CONDITIONS**

#### A. Emission Limits and Standards

Emissions from the Municipal Waste Landfill (MSW) are regulated under Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Subpart Cc.

Under 40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc, a designated facility to which the guidelines apply is each existing MSW for which construction, reconstruction, or modification was commenced before May 30, 1991.

Under 40 CFR 61, Subpart M, the provisions are applicable to those sources specified in 40 CFR 61.154 – standard of active waste disposal sites.

Since BRL has made modifications to the facility after May 30, 1991, it is subject to both 40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc, and 40 CFR 61, Subpart M.

## **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 emissions units. Furthermore, they do not require extensive testing or monitoring to assure compliance with the applicable requirements for emissions 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 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.

#### 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.

OP5176-01 6

# D. Recordkeeping Requirements

The permittee is required to keep all records listed in the operating permit as a permanent business record for at least five 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.

OP5176-01 7

# SECTION IV. NON-APPLICABLE REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS

The following table outlines those requirements that BRL identified as non-applicable in the permit application but will not be included in the operating permit as non-applicable. The table includes both the applicable requirement and reason that the Department did not identify this requirement as non-applicable.

OP5176-01 8 Date of Decision: 4/18/2019

Applicable Requirements		
State	Federal	Reason
ARM 17.8.403 Exemptions		
ARM 17.8.604 Prohibited Open		
Burning - When Permit Required		
ARM 17.8.605 Special Burning		
Periods		
ARM 17.8.606 Minor Open Burning		
Source Requirements		
ARM 17.8.611 Emergency Open		
Burning Permits		
ARM 17.8.612 Conditional Air		
Quality Open Burning Permits		
ARM 17.8.613 Christmas Tree		
Waste Open Burning Permits		
ARM 17.8.614 Commercial Film		These are procedural rules that
Production Open Burning Permits		have specific requirements that
ARM 17.8.615 Firefighter Training		may become relevant to a major
ARM 17.8.828 Innovative Control		source during the permit span
Technology		
ARM 17.8.1005 Additional		
Conditions of Air Quality		
Preconstruction Permit		
ARM 17.8.1006 Review of Specified		
Sources for Air Quality Impact		
ARM 17.8.1007 Baseline for		
Determining Credit for Emissions		
and Air Quality Offsets		
ARM 17.8.1108 Notification of		
Permit Application		
ARM 17.8.1109 Adverse Impact and		
Federal Land Manager		

9 OP5176-01 Date of Decision: 4/18/2019

Applicable Requiremen		
State Federal		Reason
	40 CFR 50 National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards 40 CFR 51 Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans 40 CFR 64 Compliance Assurance Monitoring 40 CFR 65 Delayed Compliance Orders 40 CFR 67 Federal Approval of State Noncompliance Penalty Program 40 CFR 71 Federal Operating Permits Program 40 CFR 81 Non- Attainment Designations	These rules do not have specific requirements for major sources because they are requirements for EPA or state and local authorities. Furthermore, these rules can be used as authority to impose specific requirements on a major source.
	40 CFR 52 Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans  40 CFR 61 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants	These rules contain requirements for regulatory authorities and not major sources; these rules can be used to impose specific requirements on a major source.
	40 CFR 66 Assessment and Collection of Noncompliance Penalties 40 CFR 70 State Operating Permit Programs	These rules do not have specific requirements and may or may not be relevant to a major source and should never be listed in the applicable requirements or non-applicable requirements.

OP5176-01 10 Date of Decision: 4/18/2019

#### SECTION V. FUTURE PERMIT CONSIDERATIONS

## A. MACT Standards (Part 63)

As of the issuance of the draft #OP5176-00, the Department is unaware of any new or future MACT standards that may be promulgated that will affect this facility. However, BRL may become subject to 40 CFR 63, Subpart AAAA - National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills if the Non-Methane Organic Compound (NMOC) emissions surpass 50 megagrams per year (Mg/yr) emission limit as described in 40 CFR 63.1935(a)(3). If 40 CFR 63, Subpart AAAA becomes applicable, BRL will be obligated to submit the appropriate permit application to have OP#5176-00 updated to reflect applicable requirements.

# B. NESHAP Standards (Part 61)

As of the issuance of the draft #OP5176-00, the Department is unaware of any new or future NESHAP Standards that may be promulgated that will affect this facility. The facility is currently subject to 40 CFR 61, Subpart M.

#### C. NSPS Standards

As of the issuance of the draft #OP5176-00, BRL may be subject to future NSPS regulations, more specifically 40 CFR 60, Subpart Cf and 40 CFR 60, Subpart XXX. The facility is currently subject to 40 CFR 60, Subpart Cc.

# D. Risk Management Plan

As of this date (08/14/17), 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; three 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

OP5176-01

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 (unless the limitation or standard that is exempt under ARM 17.8.1503(2));
- The emitting unit uses a control device to achieve compliance with such limit; and
- The emitting unit has potential pre-control device emission of the applicable regulated air pollutant that is greater than major source thresholds.

This facility does not trigger any CAM requirements, therefor CAM is not applicable.

11 Effective Date: 5/21/2019

# 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 (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 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 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) and they undertook a permitting action with increases of 75,000 TPY or more of CO<sub>2</sub>e 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 CO<sub>2</sub>e and 100 TPY of GHG on a mass basis would be required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit.

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 CO<sub>2</sub>e 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 GHG may still be required to comply with BACT for GHG emissions.

12 OP5176-01 Date of Decision: 4/18/2019