UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 8
1595 WYNKOOP STREET
DENVER, CO 80202-1129
Phone 800-227-8917
http://www.epa.gov/region08

Ref: 8P-AR

OCT 31 2011

Lori Bocchino
Operating Permit Program Manager
Air Quality Division
Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Re: 2011 Third Title V Program Evaluation, Final Report

Dear Ms. Bocchino:

Enclosed is our final third round program evaluation report for Wyoming's Clean Air Act title V permitting program. This report incorporates comments submitted by your office on the draft report. The objective of the third title V program evaluation was to follow-up on issues raised during the second program evaluation, identify good practices that other agencies can learn from, document any areas needing improvement, and learn how EPA can help improve state and local title V programs and expedite permitting. We greatly appreciate the cooperation of your office in the preparation of this report.

If you have any questions or further comments, please feel free to contact me at (303) 312-6431, or Christopher Razzazian at (303) 312-6648.

Sincerely,

Deirdre Rothery

Deirdre Rothery, Chief
Air Permitting, Monitoring, and Modeling Unit

Enclosure

Final Report:
Wyoming Division of Air Quality
Title V Program Evaluation

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 8
September 2011

Table of Contents

Attachments:

1. **WAQD Responses to EPA's Title V Third Round State Program Review Questionnaire**

2. **WAQD Responses to EPA's Title V Fee Audit Questionnaire**

3. **File Review Checklist**

4. **May 26, 2011 Letter from Carl Daly, Air Program Director, US EPA Region 8 to Steven A. Dietrich, AQD Administrator, WDEQ**
   Re: EPA Information Concerning Source Determinations for Oil and Gas Sources

Executive Summary

The Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 (EPA) conducted the third round evaluation of the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality Air Quality Division's (WAQD) title V Operating Permit Program in June 2011. The first round evaluation was conducted in May 2004, with a report dated September 2005. The second round evaluation was conducted in April 2008 with a report dated August 2008. The third round evaluation (like the previous evaluations) consisted of a discussion of WAQD's responses to the program evaluation questionnaire, which was developed during the second review and revised slightly for the third round (the first round questionnaire was more expansive than the second and subsequent third round evaluation questionnaires). The evaluation also consisted of a title V program fee audit questionnaire and a review of three title V permit files. The goal of the third round evaluation was to review any concerns raised by WAQD or EPA in the prior evaluation (second round), to determine how any unaddressed concerns might be addressed, to identify any good practices developed by WAQD that may benefit other permitting authorities and EPA, document any areas needing improvement, and learn what assistance EPA can provide.

EPA Concerns from the Second Round Evaluation:

At the time of the second round evaluation WAQD had not yet submitted the unavoidable equipment malfunction rule (Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulation (WAQSR) Chapter 1, Section 5) to EPA for review. The title V petition in which this issue arose could not be considered to be completely addressed until the Administrator's Order has been carried out, which required the inclusion of the unavoidable equipment malfunction rule in WAQD's State Implementation Plan (SIP) as a federally enforceable requirement. Since the completion of the second program review, WAQD has submitted, and EPA has approved, the unavoidable equipment malfunction rule into the Wyoming SIP. The proposed SIP action was submitted to EPA on September 11, 2008, for review and approval by EPA. EPA took final action to approve this rule in the Federal Register on April 16, 2010 (the direct final rule, *see* Fed. Reg. 19886 - 19891 and the proposed rule, *see* 19920 - 19921).

Summary of Good Practices:

Good practices EPA identified during the third round program evaluation include:

- WAQD is in the process of developing protocols to allow for the acceptance of title V applications electronically;
- Making reevaluation of Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) indicators during ongoing stack testing a standard condition for sources where appropriate;
- Development and use of templates (updated on an ongoing basis) for New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) as well as National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) requirements;
- Following the finalization of title V administrative orders to citizen petitions, WAQD works with EPA to revises language as necessary for permits that contain similar issues to those raised in the petition and order;
- Use of a standard operating procedure (SOP) to create an engineer's file for each facility that includes all the information that was used to create each permit related to that facility in an easy to follow format; and
- Transmittal of the draft permit to the permittee for review prior to the public comment period.

Good practices EPA identified during the second round program evaluation that are still relevant to the third round review include:

- Posting of title V permit actions on the WAQD webpage;
- Inclusion of CAM plans as an attachment to permits, rather than just the minimal permit language required by the CAM rule at 40 CFR 64.6(c);
- Inclusion of the full text of CAM recordkeeping and reporting requirements from 40 CFR 64.9 as permit language, rather than just referencing the regulation;
- Inclusion in the Compliance Certification section of permits of not only the minimal language required by 40 CFR 70.6(c)(5);
- Structuring permits with logical divisions (i.e. separate sections for state only enforceable provisions, NSPS and/or NESHAP requirements, CAM) and effective use of tables (for emission unit identification, source potential to emit (PTE), emission limitations, and emission unit requirement summaries);
- Requiring renewal applications to include all information that would be required for an initial permit application rather than allowing permittees to submit only portions of the application that have changed since the last permit was issued; and
- Utilizing email (or verbal means of communication) to alert EPA staff of incoming proposed permits, highlighting possible controversial issues, and identifying WAQD's needs of EPA.

EPA Concerns from the Third Round Evaluation:

No issues of concern were identified during the third review of the WAQD program. WAQD's title V program has been successful at addressing EPA concerns as they have been identified through discussions on individual title V permit reviews.

Areas for Improvement:

Although no issues have been identified as a concern during this review, several aspects could be improved with minimal impact to WAQD's workload and program. These areas include:

- Statement of Basis (SOB) - identification of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) requirements/permits versus non PSD New Source Review (NSR) requirements/permits
- Source determination analysis
- Periodic monitoring rationales
- Environmental Justice (EJ)
- CAM correlations for sources that show no correlation for the parameters analyzed
- Send a final copy of SOBs to EPA with the final permit

Concerns Identified by WAQD:

WAQD identified one major concern regarding the format of NESHAPs and their interrelation to Subpart A, NESHAP General Provisions. WAQD believes that EPA could provide useful training to all Region 8 States regarding the interrelation of these provisions.

Introduction

EPA conducted this program evaluation as part of its obligation to oversee and review state programs that have been approved by EPA, and in response to recommendations from an audit conducted in July 2002 by the Office of Inspector General.

The state of Wyoming operates a fully EPA approved program that allows it to implement the requirements of title V of the Clean Air Act (CAA), including the issuance of operating permits. EPA has a statutory responsibility to oversee the programs it approved by performing oversight duties, including occasional program reviews. Such responsibilities include overseeing the activities of the State program to ensure that local, regional, and national environmental goals and objectives meet minimum requirements outlined by the federal regulation.

Objective of Program Evaluation

Following the second and first round of state program evaluations, EPA nationally committed to a third round of title V program evaluations, with the same objectives of the second program review. Those objectives are to: (1) conduct a follow-up to the second round evaluations by ensuring that any EPA or state concerns identified during the second round evaluations have been addressed or are being addressed satisfactorily; (2) identify new good practices that other permitting authorities can learn from; (3) document areas needing improvement; and (4) learn how EPA can help state and local title V programs improve the permitting process. The program evaluation was conducted for Wyoming in fiscal year (FY) 2011. One program review will be completed each FY for the remaining five Region 8 states (Colorado, Montana, North and South Dakota, and Utah), which will result in the completion of the third round review for all Region 8 states by FY 2016.

Program Evaluation Process

The first WAQD program evaluation was conducted in May 2004. EPA sent a nationally standardized Title V Program Evaluation Questionnaire and State/Local Title V Program Fiscal Tracking Evaluation Document to WAQD to be completed and returned to EPA. This was followed by an EPA review of the questionnaire responses, and an on-site interview with the WAQD. The questionnaire responses were used as the basis for discussions during the on-site visit. The questionnaire focused on general program information and specific areas relating to permit development, public participation, compliance, resource management, and title V benefits. In addition, a review of the title V fee procedures and a review of six title V files were completed.

The second WAQD program evaluation was conducted in April 2008. Region 8 developed a revised Title V Second Round State Program Review Questionnaire. Once a draft questionnaire was prepared Region 8 gave the states the opportunity to submit comments during a three week comment period from January 22, 2008 - February 12, 2008. WAQD submitted five comments to EPA which were received on February 7, 2008. Pursuant to WAQD's comments, EPA revised the questionnaire and transmitted the final version to WAQD on February 20, 2008, requesting that the completed questionnaire be returned to EPA by March 21, 2008. In addition to the Program Review Questionnaire EPA transmitted the State/Local Title V Program Fiscal Tracking Evaluation Document to assess the fee portion of WAQD's program.

The third WAQD program evaluation was conducted in June 2011. Region 8 made minor revisions to the Title V Second Round State Program Review Questionnaire and sent the document, Title V Third Round State Program Review Questionnaire, to WAQD following the same

procedures outlined for the second program review (which included transmittal of the State/local Title V Program Fiscal Tracking Evaluation Document used in the last evaluations for the fee audit portion of the review). The questionnaire and fiscal tracking document were transmitted to WAQD by letter dated March 23, 2011. WAQD's responses were received by EPA on April 18, 2011, with a cover letter dated April 13, 2011. WAQD's submittal included responses to the questionnaire (with the title V public notice mailing list attached) and responses to the fiscal tracking document (with attachments that included a billing documentation example, timesheet instructions, a monthly budget report example, and a travel request form).

Similar to the program evaluations conducted previously, this evaluation incorporates the Region's review of three selected title V files, as well as a review of WAQD's title V fee management system. As mentioned above, a separate questionnaire was provided by EPA to WAQD for the title V fee audit (State/local Title V Program Fiscal Tracking Evaluation Document). The purpose of the fee audit is to determine whether the following are satisfied:

- Sources are being billed in accordance with fee requirements and are paying the required fees;
- Division of expenses is identified by WAQD between title V and non-title V programs;
- Features are integrated into WAQD's accounting/financial management system which will identify title V revenue and expenditures separate from other funding, and which certify the disposition of title V funds;
- Title V fees collected from sources are used by WAQD to pay for the entire title V program; and
- No such fees are used as CAA Section 105 grant matching.

Following the review of WAQD's submission, EPA conducted an on-site visit. The on-site visit was conducted on June 23, 2011. Christopher Razzazian conducted the on-site visit with Eric Wortman and Katie Romero (all from Region 8), and the entire WAQD title V program staff including Lori Bocchino (Operating Permit Program Manager), William Tillman (Operating Permit Program Supervisor), Maggie Endres (Senior Operating Permit Program Engineer), Janet Stephens (Title V Program Administrative Assistant), Jamie O'Dell (Permit Engineer), Melissa Meares (Permit Engineer), Despina Nikolova (Permit Engineer), and Brianna Chambers (Permit Engineer).

During the on-site visit, EPA and WAQD discussed EPA's follow-up questions and remarks regarding WAQD's responses to the program questionnaire and the fee questionnaire. Additionally, EPA conducted reviews of three title V source files: P4 Production - Coal Calcining Plant (permit number 3-2-135, proposed second renewal), Simplot Phosphates - Rock Springs Fertilizer Complex (permit number 3-1-125, final renewal), and General Chemical Partners - Green River Works Trona Processing Facility (permit number 3-1-123-1, final modified renewal). These files were selected to depict the similarities and differences between the most current proposed permit and earlier permits that had been renewed at least once. These sources were 123rd, 125th, and 135th sources to submit initial applications to WAQD (as indicated by their permit numbers).

Third Round Evaluation Findings

Summary of Good Practices

During the third round evaluation five good practices have been identified that were not previously, and those practices are summarized below. In addition to identifying new practices there are good practices that were previously identified during the second round evaluation, but that are still relevant to the third round evaluation. Since these practices are still relevant they have been listed in this report, but for a more detailed summary please refer to the second round evaluation report.

The following have been identified as good practices during the third round evaluation:

- WAQD is in the process of developing protocols to allow for the acceptance of title V applications electronically. This will allow the application to be posted online with the SOB and draft permit during the public comment period. This practice allows a larger audience to have all the relevant information necessary to review the action without the need for travel to the location of the application (WAQD in Cheyenne as well as the WAQD office nearest to the applicant). This practice enhances the ability of communities to participate in the permitting process. In addition, electronic applications may ease the paperwork burden for administrative and recordkeeping purposes.
- WAQD includes permit conditions related to CAM which require, if appropriate, the permittee to reevaluate existing CAM parameters as a part of any stack testing conducted during the permit term. If this reevaluation indicates a change to CAM indicators or indicator ranges is needed, the permittee is required to revise and resubmit their CAM plan.
- The development and use of permit condition templates (updated on an ongoing basis) for NSPS as well as NESHAP requirements. This promotes a thorough examination of the subparts so that permit language contains sufficient detail to determine the applicable requirements for each emitting unit within the template. For each subpart, it is necessary to determine what information is needed in the permit to be able to determine the applicability of each provision (or non-applicability) for each emitting unit. The templates allow the permitting process to move quickly once they are developed and fine-tuned.
- Following the finalization of title V administrative orders to citizen petitions (both within Region 8 and nationally), WAQD works with EPA to revise language as necessary for their permits that contain similar issues to those that were raised in the petition and order. This prevents similar petitions from being filed in Wyoming to ones that have been filed in other states within the Region and nationally. By preventing known issues from persisting, WAQD and EPA save resources that would otherwise be expended during the petition response process.
- WAQD uses a SOP to create an engineer's file for each facility that includes all of the information that was used to create each permit related to that facility in an easy to follow format. This practice enhances the ability of new engineers to understand the permit history and source history, making for better permitting decisions with clear intent. By formalizing a SOP all employees understand how to create the files so that anyone familiar with the SOP can quickly and efficiently use the information. These files contain detailed information and are in the form of a binder that covers all the title V permits for a source from initial permit issuance through each permit that followed.
- WAQD transmits the draft permit to the permittee for review prior to the public comment period. This reduces the amount of comments received from the permittee, which shortens the time period needed to address any comments received during the public comment period.

Good practices EPA identified during the second round program evaluation that are still relevant to the third round review include:

- Posting of title V permit actions on the WAQD webpage;
- Inclusion of CAM plans as an attachment to permits, rather than just the minimal permit language required by the CAM rule at 40 CFR 64.6(c);
- Inclusion of the full text of CAM recordkeeping and reporting requirements from 40 CFR 64.9 as permit language, rather than just referencing the regulation;
- Inclusion in the Compliance Certification section of permits of more detailed information than the minimal language required by 40 CFR 70.6(c)(5);
- Structuring permits with logical divisions (i.e. separate sections for state only enforceable provisions, NSPS and/or NESHAP requirements, CAM) and effective use of tables (for emission unit identification, source PTE, emission limitations, and emission unit requirement summaries);
- Requiring renewal applications to include all information that would be required for an initial permit application rather than allowing permittees to submit only portions of the application that have changed since the last permit was issued; and
- Utilizing email (or verbal means of communication) to alert EPA staff of incoming proposed permits, highlighting possible controversial issues, and identifying WAQD's needs of EPA.

Fee Audit

As part of this review EPA requested that WAQD fill out the nationally standardized fee audit questionnaire (which was also used during the previous two program evaluations). WAQD completed the questionnaire, which is included in this report as Attachment 2

During the on-site review EPA discussed fee protocol with WAQD. WAQD provided the following documents as attachments to their response to the fee audit questionnaire to outline the mechanisms used to track time and costs associated with title V activities:

1. Billing documentation example - The billing documentation example was submitted by WAQD to the respective source and provides an invoice for the title V fee owed based on the emissions inventory submitted by the source. Since WAQD calculates the fee amount due, errors and miscalculations are avoided for the sources' annual fee payments. Appropriate supporting documentation for fee calculation purposes is also provided with the billing invoice.

2. Timesheet instructions - The timesheet instructions document instructs WAQD employees for entering time based on five different "function codes" that apply to work done in the Division. The function code "OPP" is used for work related to the Operating Permit Program (OPP).

3. Monthly budget report - The monthly budget report document allows WAQD to assess budget expenses and surpluses for the current biennium. In addition to listing separate totals for the Operating Permit Program, the report distinguishes among varying cost types such as personnel, equipment, travel, communications and office space.

4. Travel request form - Information on the travel request form is used to track any travel cost associated with WAQD. Codes entered on the form are used to record any cost associated with the Operating Permit Program.

Additionally, the information provided in the second program evaluation fee audit with regard to the tools and procedures WAQD uses and follows remains relevant (and to a degree,

duplicative) to this review (for further detail refer to the fee audit section of the second round report with attachments). The information provided with the second round fee questionnaire included:

1. Weekly time sheet - Includes function codes tracking leave and holidays, work for 103 Grants, 105 Grants, Southwest Wyoming (SWW) 105 Grant oil and gas work, and title V operating permit work. Time is tracked in half hour increments.

2. Air Quality Division coding - Correlates activities to the Wyoming On-Line Financial System (WOLFS) Code, time code, copy code and mail code. All copies and mailing associated with title V are paid for with title V money.

3. Accounting codes - Lists WAQD's accounting codes.

4. Monthly report - Lists costs associated with accounting codes. The second page of the report lists total available funds, total estimated expenditures, as well as the total surplus or deficit.

It is clear that Wyoming is able to account for all title V activity. As with the past fee audits, nothing was uncovered during the discussion of the fee questionnaire that warrants concern. WAQD tracks work at the function level (i.e., NSR vs. OPP) and at the activity level (i.e., mailing, copying, personnel costs). These practices continue to assure that fees are used solely for the title V program fulfilling part of the requirements in §70.9. Title V emission inventories for fee assessments are verified by WAQD District Engineers who perform site inspections. The verifications are submitted to WAQD's emission inventory group to determine annual emission fees for the permitted sources. The corresponding invoices are prepared and sent to the sources. The fees received are recorded and categorized into monthly revenue.

The following is a summary of WAQD's fee rates:

July 2002 – June 2006 – $17 per ton
July 2006 – June 2008 - $25 per ton
July 2008 – June 2010 - $28.16 per ton
July 2010 - current - $31 per ton

These rates have increased substantially from the first program review, at which time the rate was $17 per ton. Prior to that time, the fee rate was $10 per ton. In order to set the fee rate, WAQD must estimate the cost of the title V program and use the estimated billable tonnage to calculate a dollar per ton fee rate that will adequately cover the title V program. Under no circumstance can WAQD spend more than this budget estimate would allow, which makes it very important to estimate as accurately as possible. Once the Administrator of WAQD has a fee rate that will be sufficient, the rate must be approved by the governor and the state legislature. Therefore, the fee schedule continues to meet the requirements of §70.9(b) and the required minimum fee rate of $25 per ton. WAQD continues to demonstrate the ability to generate a table to outline on-going monthly revenues and expenses, fulfilling the recommendation from EPA's original evaluation and assuring that the elements of §70.9 are met. At the time the report was generated the Operating Permit Program had a projected deficit of $50,645. The reason for this deficit is that WAQD makes estimates for projected spending (including costs associated with ambient monitoring contracts, which receive funding from the 105 grant and/or the state general fund as well) that are conservative. At the time that WAQD responded to the fee audit, WAQD was nine months into their 24-month budget period. At the time of the drafting of this report, WAQD

was 13 months into the 24-month budget period and projects a surplus of over $500,000. Additionally, WAQD has always maintained Operating Permit Program expenditures below budget and has collected adequate fees to cover those expenditures. For these reasons, EPA continues to believe that WAQD's fee structure meets the regulatory requirements of §70.9 for fee determination and certification.

File Review

Three files were reviewed, which were:

- P4 Production - Coal Calcining Plant (permit 3-2-135, proposed second renewal),
- Simplot Phosphates - Rock Springs Fertilizer Complex (permit 3-1-125, final first renewal), and
- General Chemical Partners - Green River Works Trona Processing Facility (permit 3-1-123-1, final modified renewal).

P4 Production - Coal Calcining Plant: This permit is the second renewal for the facility. Everything that should be in a permit file that was listed in the standard checklist for file reviews was present or not applicable. CAM requirements continue to be found in the permit itself, rather than simply referencing Part 64, which greatly simplifies compliance for the permittee by reducing confusion. Also, CAM plans are attached to WAQD permits which helps clarify requirements and allows the public the opportunity for review during public comment proceedings.

The general permit language is the updated language (which is similar to the updated language referenced in the last program review), but now also includes greenhouse gas (GHG) reporting requirements. Although this is not an applicable requirement, WAQD has chosen to require sources to submit to them the same information being submitted to EPA for informational purposes. No concerns were identified in the review of this file. As with the previous program evaluation, permits were chosen for review that would highlight changes (improvements made) in newer permits. The continuous improvements are still evident as shown by the differences between this permit and the Simplot and General Chemical permits.

Simplot Phosphates - Rock Springs Fertilizer Complex: This permit is at the end of the period of its first renewal and has not been significantly modified since the issuance of the renewal permit. Everything that should be in a permit file that was listed in the standard checklist for file reviews was present or not applicable. The CAM plan was attached as Appendix J to the permit and CAM requirements were found directly in the permit language, which is good. However, the CAM requirements did not include the means by which an exceedance or excursion is defined. It was noted that this was an older permit and WAQD stated that this has since been corrected in the CAM language in recent permits, such as in the P4 Production permit.

NESHAP language was generally sufficient to identify applicable and non-applicable units at the source, and the regulatory requirements for applicable sources. However, the permit requirements for NESHAP Subpart ZZZZ were very broad and could use more detail. The applicability statement for Subpart ZZZZ did not specify which, if any, emission units located at the facility are subject to the rule. The permit should specify which units are affected units if the rule requirements are put into the permit. Additionally, no specific requirements are in the permit for Subpart ZZZZ. Incorporation by reference is not sufficient for ensuring adequate compliance with the regulations and the requirements for Subpart ZZZZ should be explained more thoroughly in the permit. Since this permit was drafted, WAQD has revised their templates for Subpart ZZZZ addressing the issues mentioned above in recently issued permits. The latest templates include

much of the regulatory language and specify which units at the source are affected units and whether the source is a major or area source. In some cases, the date of manufacture or the date of order of the engine are included in the SOB. However in many cases, WAQD is hesitant to include this date information since changing engines often can create a burden in updating the information. No significant issues of concern arose from the review of this file.

General Chemical Partners - Green River Works: This permit is for a minor modification to the first renewal permit. Everything that should be in a permit file that was listed in the standard checklist for file reviews was present or not applicable. The CAM plan was attached and CAM requirements were found directly in the permit language, which is good. However, the CAM indicator does not show a correlation between electrostatic precipitator (ESP) power, opacity and mass PM emissions. It is believed that for certain trona processing facilities that use ESPs for PM control that the oil shale that may be mined with the trona can affect opacity and PM emissions. Since dry mined trona is most often calcined, if there is oil shale present, the shale will volatilize and partially oxidize to form a blue smoke that seems to have an effect on the CAM correlation. Although these trona sources were once thought to emit HAPs below major source thresholds, permits have now been updated (following comments from citizens that worked in the trona industry and WAQD investigation) to reflect much larger amount of HAPs (approximately 20 tpy previously versus 200 tpy currently), which are emitted during this process if oil shale is present, signified in some cases by a blue plume. To understand the correlation, EPA reviewed the testing data and it was clear that higher ESP voltage/current does not necessarily yield lower mass PM emissions. In this unique case, it may be appropriate to generate a more robust method for testing to discern if there may be a correlation when more factors are considered. Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) and NSPS language was sufficient to identify applicable and non-applicable units at the source and the regulatory requirements for applicable sources. No issues of concern arose from the review of this file.

Areas for Improvement Identified by EPA

- Statement of Basis - SOBs should identify PSD requirements/permits versus non PSD NSR requirements/permits, as well as identify any limits on PTE to avoid major source status for PSD or HAP major source status. WAQD prepares a SOB for each permit that includes an introduction of the source, permit history, applicable requirements, and proposed periodic monitoring. One aspect of the permit history section that would be helpful for EPA and other reviewers would be to document if a NSR permit is major for PSD. EPA recognizes that NSR permits do not stipulate whether the permit was issued under, not only Chapter 6, Section 2, but in addition Chapter 6, Section 4 (for PSD). Since it is not possible to discern whether a permit (included in a title V application) is a PSD permit it is appropriate to include that information in the SOB. In addition, it is not clear whether a NSR permit includes a limit on PTE unless the technical analysis for the NSR permit is provided (which it is not through the title V process), or the SOB specifies if any synthetic minor limits were created in the NSR permit. In both cases, there may be reason to impose different compliance provisions than for permits that do not include limits on PTE or have PSD requirements. For more information, you may wish to refer to a December 20, 2001, letter from Stephen Rothblatt to Robert Hodanbosi (available on the EPA Region 7 policy and guidance database) that states, "the [SOB] should discuss the purpose of any limits on potential to emit…". You may also wish to review the Order for the title V petition for Onyx Environmental Services (petition number V-2005-1, February 1, 2006), which states that the SOB, "should highlight elements that U.S. EPA and the public would find important to review" (Onyx, page 13). PSD permit requirements are just one example of elements that EPA and the public would find important for the review process.

- Source Determination Analysis - Source determinations, particularly for the oil and gas industry, are becoming more and more common across the country. EPA has stated that source determinations for oil and gas facilities should be made on a case-by-case basis (*see,* Attachment 4, May 26, 2011 Letter from Carl Daly, Air Program Director, US EPA Region 8 to Steven A. Dietrich, AQD Administrator, WDEQ; Re: EPA Information Concerning Source Determinations for Oil and Gas Sources). This is apparent by the determinations made in the recent permits issued by Region 8 (BP – Florida River) and Region 5 (Summit Petroleum - Mount Pleasant Operations). Source determinations have become increasingly scrutinized by the public and WAQD should consider developing a protocol to screen applications that may require a source determination analysis.
- Periodic monitoring rationales - In situations where no further testing (or once in five year testing) are proposed as periodic monitoring the SOB should explain why that level of monitoring is appropriate. Information could include the margin of compliance during any past testing, how long ago the last test was conducted, historically how much variation existed from test to test, how much a source operates throughout the year, the level of emissions from the unit (with respect to the source as a whole), and whether the uncontrolled emissions have the potential to be above any emission limit, or not (as is the case with small fuel burning equipment that have a potential to emit that in many cases is less than 50% of the NO_x emission limit in Wyoming regulation). We wish to commend WAQD for presenting a logical rationale for fuel burning equipment that makes clear why no further testing is economical for these small sources.
- Environmental Justice - We encourage WAQD to develop a standard operating procedure for addressing EJ in its permit program. EPA is available to provide assistance with these efforts. Where appropriate, we encourage WAQD to consider means, both voluntary and regulatory, to reduce disproportionate impacts to communities.
- CAM correlations - Trona ore is unique to Wyoming geology and as such seems to have created a unique issue for the creation of CAM indicators that are indicative of compliance with mass PM emissions. It seems that oil shale found with trona ore is sometimes calcined with the ore. Since the oil shale is volatile, it produces a variety of emissions in addition to what was assumed to be emitted from the process and may have the potential to affect the ability of a CAM indicator to be indicative of compliance with a mass PM limit. As discussed in the review of the General Chemical permit, a review of stack test results and ESP power settings shows that higher power settings do not necessarily result in lower opacity or PM emissions. For sources like this that show no real correlation between the CAM indicator and emissions, we suggest WAQD continue to encourage companies to examine alternative metrics that may allow for a more complete understanding of the combustion characteristics.
- Transmittal of final SOBs with the final permits - We suggest sending a final copy of the SOB to the EPA permitting oversight contact along with final permit. This will provide EPA the opportunity to review all changes that were made as a result of discussions with WAQD during the 45-day EPA review period for proposed permits. When discussions are held between EPA and WAQD regarding proposed permits, an addendum to the SOB is often drafted to document the issues and resolutions, which is helpful documentation for future reference. If the SOB is not sent out with the final permit, that record remains at a state level only.

Concerns identified by WAQD

WAQD identified one major concern regarding the format of NESHAPs and their interrelation to Subpart A, NESHAP General Provisions. WAQD emphasized the difficulty to merge the overlapping requirements for monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting from Subpart A with the corresponding requirements in the various NESHAP subparts as new rules are promulgated. To help address the concern regarding applicability of the general provisions, above, WAQD requested region-wide training from EPA staff on the recently promulgated Boiler MACT.

Conclusion

In conclusion, WAQD implements an effective title V program that continues to evolve as challenges arise. During the permit file reviews all the standard language contained in the nationally developed checklist (Attachment 3) were found in each permit. Additionally, WAQD permits show continuous improvements across all aspects of the permit language and issuance process. WAQD has greatly improved the level of communication with EPA staff to address issues in proposed permits. The title V fee review demonstrates WAQD's ability to continue to operate a program that meets the fee requirements of Part 70. WAQD's title V program continues to meet the requirements of Part 70 regulation and no deficiencies were discovered during this review. However, EPA has provided the suggestions in this report for possible areas that could continue to be improved.

Summary of the Title V Third Round State Program Review Questionnaire

I. General Questions and Responses to First and Second Round Reviews

A. Resolution of Second Round Review

Unavoidable Equipment Malfunction Rule: On November 1, 2002 the EPA Administrator ordered the State to make changes to Section 19 of Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations (WAQSR) [now Chapter 1, Section 5 of WAQSR]. WAQD replaced the "malfunction exemption rule" referred to here with an "unavoidable equipment malfunction" regulation. The new regulation was adopted by the State on January 30, 2006. WAQD submitted the rule as a part of Chapter 1, Section 5 of the WAQSR to EPA and EPA approved the SIP revision on April 16, 2010, in the Federal Register. The SIP revision became effective on June 15, 2010. EPA would like to thank WAQD for resolving this issue.

B. What key EPA comments on individual title V permits remain unresolved? (EPA to determine this) What is the State's position on these unresolved comments?

WAQD responded that they were not aware of any unresolved comments. During the on-site portion of the evaluation EPA raised a broad issue regarding the rationale presented in WAQD's SOBs for situations when assumptions are used to reduce the need for actual measurements (or for situations that do not permit actual monitoring, i.e. for open flares with destruction efficiency requirements). It is important for the permit record to document why WAQD feels that its monitoring meets the requirements of §70.6(c) and/or §70.6(a)(3)(i)(B). By fully explaining WAQD's rationale many questions that could arise for sources with minimal testing requirements (or no further testing) may be averted.

C. Have any procedures in title V changed since the second round program review?

The WAQD mentioned that most draft permits are now transmitted informally to the permittee for their review prior to final internal review within the program. WAQD has found that this minimizes comments from the permittee during the formal public comment period. EPA believes this is a useful practice and has included it in the Summary of Good Practices section above.

D. What does the state think it's doing especially well in the title V program?

WAQD responded that they feel they prepare permits that are effective tools to assist permittees in meeting all their compliance obligations by being clear and well organized. EPA applauds WAQD for preparing clear and usable permits and for delving into NSPS and NESHAP subparts to help remove ambiguity surrounding the regulatory language.

E. Important current issues affecting the title V program

1. **Top issue:** WAQD identified inclusion of new and revised NESHAPs in title V permits as a difficulty affecting the program. During the period when WAQD was answering the questionnaire for this report they were revising language for Subpart ZZZZ to be followed by updates to their NESHAP templates for DDDDD and JJJJJJ for boilers (which will affect nearly all title V facilities in the state).

Other issues: Determinations of how new NESHAP standards apply are usually laborious and time consuming. WAQD mentions that the complicated flow charts/tables used to navigate new NESHAPs (specifically Subpart ZZZZ) are a testament to their overly complex language.

WAQD is uncertain how GHG permitting will be performed within the state. WAQD does not have the authority to regulate GHGs and will not gain that authority until (at the earliest) the next legislative session in spring 2012. WAQD wishes to be able to give permittees and permit applicants accurate and complete information so that they can plan for their businesses' futures. EPA will continue to give guidance on how to proceed as a national process is developed to address states that are not positioned to regulate GHGs in title V.

WAQD listed monitoring for insignificant sources as an issue. WAQD believes that the NSR program is very rigorous in setting limits and that state regulations cover very small sources resulting in situations where units have limits that will likely not ever be exceeded. In these instances, WAQD has not typically required monitoring due to the relatively high cost of monitoring a source that they believe will not likely exceed an applicable limitation, or create an impact on the environment. WAQD believes that monitoring for sources like these is an inefficient use of resources as well as an unnecessary source of contention between the permit program and permit applicants/permittees. EPA wishes to reiterate that §70.6(c) requires provisions exist that assure compliance with all limits. EPA has strived to ask WAQD to explain why the proposed testing schedule meets the requirements of §70.6(a)(3)(i)(B) and §70.6(c), and by and large WAQD has had rationales that are appropriate, but until being engaged on the subject the permit record did not include that relevant information. Often inclusion of the full rationale has been sufficient to justify the proposed testing/monitoring. However, in certain instances the information

presented seems to suggest a level of trust that the source fits into assumptions provided without justifications for the validity of such assumptions. In these cases further information is needed, and may warrant more testing/monitoring than was originally required. EPA wishes to thank WAQD for working collaboratively to assure that all permit terms have sufficient compliance assurance provisions. Also, in the event that limits are discovered to be extraneous, or unneeded/unwarranted,

EPA encourages WAQD to amend the underlying applicable NSR permit through the appropriate permitting action to remove limits that were never intended to be a limit.

2. **EPA policy or regulation causing concern:** WAQD listed the same issue as was listed during the second round evaluation, that being the new and revised NESHAPs, and their related lawsuits, which create a great deal of uncertainty and burden on WAQD's program. Often it is not clear to WAQD which parts of which standards are or are not in effect due to all the litigation surrounding these regulations. WAQD feels that NESHAPs, as currently written, are difficult to address in an operating permit, and are even more difficult for sources to understand. It is impossible to read a MACT standard without having a number of different documents available and open at the same time. The cross references within and out of the subpart, in addition to definitions and terminology that are subpart specific seems unnecessarily confusing. Creating a "road map" for permittees with the permit is becoming increasingly difficult, if not impossible. WAQD remarks, if professional permit writers cannot navigate the standards, how can permittees or compliance inspectors do so? EPA applauds WAQD's efforts to make the permit a useful document that provides clear information for both the permittee and any WAQD compliance staff.

   WAQD also listed aggregation of oil and gas sources (source determinations) as an area of concern. We are attaching the recent letter (Attachment 4) sent to the state on this topic and will work with the state as source determinations are made.

3. **How can EPA help:** WAQD requests timely guidance and direction for permit writing whenever there is a stay or vacatur of standards.

   WAQD also mentions that preparing flowcharts and spreadsheets for NESHAPs is very useful. Subparts could be made even clearer by breaking the standards into sections for each type of affected unit (e.g. Subpart ZZZZa for compression ignition engines, ZZZZb for 4-stroke rich burn engines, etc.).

   WAQD strongly recommends that more thought and care be put into clarifying how the NESHAP General Provisions apply in each subpart. While the applicability tables used to be adequate, now each standard has so much information on monitoring, notification, recordkeeping, and reporting in the subpart as to make it impossible to discern how those requirements mesh with the General Provisions. WAQD believes it would be much better to not use the General Provisions at all, unless there is little or no language in the specific subpart regarding a particular aspect within the General Provisions (such as notifications of compliance). Otherwise, it is better to include all requirements within the specific subpart.

II. Permit Issuance

A. Since the second round program review, what percent of title V initial permits have you issued within the regulatory timeframe specified in 40 CFR 70.7(a)(2)?

WAQD continues to issue a vast majority (94%) of initial permits within the regulatory timeframe.

B. Since the second round program review, what percent of title V significant permit modifications have you issued within the regulatory timeframe specified in 40 CFR 70.7(a)(2) and (e)(4)(ii)?

As with initial permits WAQD issues a vast majority of significant permit modifications within the regulatory timeframe (79% within 18 months, 50% within nine months).

C. What percent of title V permits expire before they can be renewed (since the second program review)?

WAQD stated that between April 1, 2008, and March 31, 2011, that 37 renewed permits were issued. Thirty three of these permits expired before they could be renewed. The WAQD gave two reasons for the difficulty related to the issuance of permit renewals, which have not changed since the second review:

- Wyoming regulation requires submittal of the title V application between six and eighteen months before the initial permit will expire. In general, applicants submit their applications six months in advance. Accounting for the public participation requirements, coordination with EPA, and several weeks for preparation and mailing of draft and proposed permits, the renewed permit must be written within 90 days of application submittal (including the inclusion of a CAM plan, for the first renewal of applicable sources, and a response to comments if necessary).

- Each renewal must address the inclusion of new MACT requirements, inclusion of new permits or waivers issued recently, and any updates to incorporate the latest general permit language.

So it is not surprising to EPA that 89% of renewal permits issued since the second program review were not issued before the previous permit expired. Furthermore, in discussion EPA confirmed that even though the permit expires, the requirement to comply with all applicable requirements does not expire with the permit.

Compliance is not a concern because in most cases the applicant would have submitted a timely application, therefore receiving an application shield. EPA continues to believe that WAQD is doing everything within its power to issue permits as quickly as possible while maintaining a high level of quality.

The long term solution to this still seems to be a change to Wyoming rules that would require submission at least 12 months in advance, which EPA agrees, should address the issue of not having enough time to draft the permit language.

D. Unresolved violations – delay of permit renewal issuance

Previously standardized WAQD procedure stipulates that any unresolved issues/violations will be resolved before any permitting action can move forward. Additionally, in the past WAQD has delayed the issuance of renewals if compliance plans in the previous operating permit have not been resolved. The resolution generally has involved the issuance of a Chapter 6, Section 2 (NSR) permit or modification. WAQD has also delayed renewals when violations result in significant changes to emission control systems and associated NSR permits or modifications are in process.

E. Have permittees requested a hold in renewal for any reason?

WAQD has delayed work on permits when a source is in the process of gaining synthetic minor or true minor status, or when NSR permitting will result in significant changes to applicable requirements.

F. CAM

1. – 3. Are CAM plans slowing renewals; if so why? What main types of inadequacies have caused difficulties or delays? What difficulties are experienced in getting better submissions.

WAQD has shown improvement in developing CAM plans that meet the requirements of Part 64. However, there are some sources that do not fit well into the CAM correlation approach (ESP controlled sources that processes materials that vary in composition, i.e. trona calciners).

4. Have you had to supplement the CAM technical guidance document (TGD) with state-issued guidance?

Yes - this response has remained the same since the second round evaluation.

5. Is CAM training adequate?

Since WAQD has already developed most of the CAM plans that will be necessary in their source universe, they feel that further federal training would not be of much use. WAQD's difficult CAM sources typically show no correlation between the indicator, opacity, and mass PM emissions, necessitating very specific training/analysis of specific sources within WAQD's permit universe.

6. Are CAM applicability determinations resource-intensive or difficult?

Not since the initial determinations.

G. What improvements does the state believe it has made to the management of the title V permit program, since the first round program review, that could be described as best practices and could be of interest to other states?

WAQD stated that they continue to refine their permitting process to make it as straightforward as possible for permit applicants. WAQD continuously reviews their permit organization and writing standards. In the future, WAQD hopes to allow for electronic

submissions, but are currently in the preliminary stages. Improvements identified by EPA include periodic monitoring rationales and frequency for sources that previously did not present a full rationale or have sufficient frequency.

H. Improvements planned for the management of the title V program within the next five years

WAQD plans on developing mechanisms for the submission of reports, emission inventories, and permit applications electronically. EPA feels this is a good use of technological resources reducing paper consumption and the carbon cost associated with the transport of large applications. While still in the development phase, EPA suggests that mechanisms for submission not only via electronic format on CD or DVD, but rather by fully electronic means. Thereby completely eliminating the need for transportation of anything physical from the applicant to WAQD. Additionally, WAQD reports that they normally do not have a set period of time for planning cycles. However, if there is a budget impact, WAQD would follow the biennium budget cycle from July to June for their planning purposes.

III. Public Participation

A. What forms of news media do you use to fulfill public participation - 40 CFR 70.7(h)?

WAQD continues to use the county or local newspaper(s) to reach the largest audience in the location of the source. The website still posts the permit information, as was highlighted by the second evaluation report. A state-wide publication is not used due to cost constraints.

B. Mailing list for title V public participation – 40 CFR 70.7(h)(1)

WAQD still maintains a title V mailing list, which was provided as an attachment to their response to the third round questionnaire and is included with this report as part of Attachment 1.

C. Policy outlining the response to comments procedure or process

WAQD's response did not differ from the second round evaluation. WAQD does not have a written policy, but summarized their policy in the questionnaire. All parties are appropriately responded to within a reasonable amount of time.

IV. Petitions

WAQD states that there have been no changes in the way permits are written and no re-openings as the result of a petition. The only title V petition since the second round program review was withdrawn (for the Pavillion Compressor Station). However, following the submission of WAQD's responses to this questionnaire, a petition has been submitted to EPA for the WYGEN II power plant in Gillette, WY. Since WildEarth Guardians submitted their comments to WAQD outside of the comment period, WAQD has not responded to those comments or included the comments in the record for the permit. EPA wishes to note that although no petitions have been filed for any WAQD permits since the last review, there have been conversations between EPA and WAQD that have resulted in changes to both SOBs and permits that were actually relevant to petitions EPA has responded to elsewhere in

the country. EPA thanks WAQD for working through these issues to prevent them from appearing in future petitions within WAQD's permit universe.

V. EPA Relationship

A. EPA title V policy that is causing problems or confusion?

WAQD did not identify any problems with EPA's title V policies.

B. Has the state developed any tools, strategies, or best practices that have assisted in the inclusion of MACT subparts in title V permits?

WAQD prepares MACT condition templates for every MACT that affects multiple sources within the state and updates these as needed when a template is being used for inclusion into a specific permit.

C. Is the issue of startup-shutdown-malfunction (SSM) emissions causing problems or confusion in title V permit writing?

WAQD responded that this is rarely a problem.

D. Do you have any unaddressed training needs? What can EPA do to help?

WAQD listed two possibly useful topics for training: (1) preparing enforceable permit language (both for NSR and title V); and (2) navigation of new NESHAP/MACT standards and applicability of the General Provisions to those subparts.

Attachment 1:
WAQD Responses to EPA's Title V Third Round State Program Review Questionnaire

Title V Third Round State Program Review Questionnaire
Wyoming 2011

I. General Questions and Responses to First and Second Round Program Reviews

A. What has been done in response to EPA recommendations for improvements from the second round program review?

There was only one recommendation for improvement. This was to submit a SIP revision to EPA regarding the State's unavoidable equipment malfunction rule. This was completed; EPA approved the SIP revision on 4/16/10 in the Federal Register. The revision became "effective" under their rules on 6/15/10.

B. What key EPA comments on individual Title V permits remain unresolved (EPA to determine this)? What is the State's position on these unresolved comments?

We are not aware of any unresolved comments.

C. Have any procedures in Title V changed (e.g., public participation, petitions, communication with EPA) since the second round program review?

1. If so, which ones?

Most draft permits are transmitted informally to the permittee for their review prior to final internal review within the program. We have found that this minimizes comments from the permittee during the formal public comment period.

D. What does the state think it's doing especially well in the Title V program?

We place a strong emphasis on preparing permits that are effective tools to assist permittees in meeting all their compliance obligations by being clearly written and well-organized. Where practicable, we clarify and streamline all applicable requirements, including federal NSPS and NESHAP standards

E. Are there any issues affecting the Title V program in your state right now that you consider particularly important?

- Being able to keep up with new and revised MACT rules. Every time a MACT rule/revision is finalized that affects sources in the state, we have to evaluate which facilities with a remaining permit term of 3 or more years may have units with new applicable requirements and work with permittees to open and modify their permit appropriately, within 18 months of promulgation of the rule. We are currently dealing with Subpart ZZZZ and are about to evaluate the impact of Subparts DDDDD and JJJJJJ. As these rules are for boilers, process heaters, and engines, they affect nearly every Title V facility in the state, resulting in a significant burden to the program.
- In addition to the above, being able to determine how new MACT standards apply to facilities is typically laborious and time-consuming as the standards are incredibly complicated. A testament to this is the multiple-page, very large spreadsheets that

EPA has provided to assist sources to navigate the engine MACT (ZZZZ). While these spreadsheets are a godsend, they give some indication of how difficult it is to write permits for facilities with recently issued MACT standards.

- Uncertainty about how greenhouse gas permitting will be dealt with in Wyoming. The state does not currently have the authority to regulate greenhouse gases and will not gain that authority until the state legislature approves it, which may not happen (and won't happen at the soonest until the next session in 2012). Sources need direction and certainty to be able to plan their business in the future, and right now we are unable to tell them how to proceed.
- Monitoring of insignificant sources. Due to a very rigorous new source review program in Wyoming as well as state rules which can apply to very small sources, many facilities have very small, uncontrolled sources with emission limits. Wyoming's Title V program has not typically required monitoring for such sources in the past due to the relatively high cost of monitoring something that has a very low risk of exceeding its limit or creating an impact on the environment. In response to petitions in other states, EPA has been pushing to include more and more monitoring for such sources. Such monitoring is, in our view, an inefficient use of resources as well as an unnecessary source of contention between the permit program and the permit applicants.

1. *Which one would you rate as the most important?*

   At the moment, incorporation of new MACT standards. Greenhouse gas permitting could overtake that.

2. *Are there any EPA policies or regulatory issues that are causing concern?*

   As just mentioned, the onslaught of new and revised MACT standards, as well as related lawsuits, causes a great deal of burden and uncertainty for the program. MACT standards as currently written are difficult to address in an operating permit, and are even more difficult for sources to understand. It is impossible to read a MACT standard without having a number of different documents available and open at the same time. The cross references within and outside the subpart, along with specific definitions and terminology that may change in different subparts, seem unnecessarily confusing. Trying to determine what a facility must do to comply with the standards and give companies some kind of "road map" via the permit is increasingly difficult, if not impossible. If permit writers, who deal with applicable requirements such as MACT standards as a part of their daily job, cannot navigate the standards, how can we expect sources or compliance inspectors to do so?

   Lawsuits and the resulting stays/vacatures within NSPS and NESHAP standards also create significant problems for writing permits, as it often is not clear to us which parts of which standards are or are not in effect.

   Another very significant concern for our program is the direction being taken regionally and nationally for aggregation of oil and gas sources. We fundamentally disagree with considering "interdependence" as a factor when determining what is a

major source. According to language in the original PSD rulemaking, there are three factors to be considered when evaluating what is part of a major source: ownership/control, facility type (SIC code); and contiguous/adjacency. Recent EPA determinations make the assertion that interdependency is related to contiguous/adjacent; we do not feel that is appropriate or supported by statute and regulations. It appears that EPA is using aggregation as means to regulate emissions from small oil and gas sources through major source programs, although those programs are a poor fit for regulating this category. Treating oil & gas sources aggregated over large distances as one source is not practical, nor will it result in environmental benefits in Wyoming as we already regulate these sources on an individual basis.

3. *How can EPA help?*

Timely EPA guidance and direction for permit writing would be helpful whenever there is a stay or vacatur of standards.

Preparing flowcharts and spreadsheets for MACT standards, similar to that prepared for Part 63 Subpart ZZZZ, is also very useful – although breaking down the standards into sections for each type of unit would be even better (for example, Subpart ZZZZa could be for compression ignition engines: ZZZZb for 4-stroke rich burn engines; etc.).

We strongly recommend that more thought and care be put into clarifying how the NESHAP General Provisions apply in each MACT standard; while the applicability tables in use to date were adequate several years ago, each MACT standard now has so much information on monitoring, notification, recordkeeping, and reporting that it is nearly impossible to understand how those requirements in the subpart mesh with the associated requirements in the General Provisions. It would be much better to not use the General Provisions at all – unless there is little or no language on a particular type of requirement in the individual subpart - and put ALL such requirements in the subpart itself.

II. Permit Issuance

A. Since the second round program review, what percent of Title V initial permits have you issued within the regulatory timeframe specified in 40 CFR 70.7(a)(2)?

Between 4/1/2008 and 3/31/2011, the Division issued 16 initial permits. 15 of these permits were issued within 18 months for a percentage of 94%.

B. Since the second round program review, what percent of Title V significant permit modifications have you issued within the regulatory timeframe specified in 40 CFR 70.7(a)(2) and (e)(4)(ii)?

Between 4/1/2008 and 3/31/2011, the Division issued 14 significant permit modifications. 11 permits, or 79 percent, were issued within 18 months; and 7 permits, or 50 percent, were issued within 9 months.

C. *What percent of Title V permits expire before they can be renewed?*

Between 4/1/2008 and 3/31/2011, the Division issued 37 renewed permits. 33 permits expired before they were renewed.

1. *For those permits that could not be renewed before they expired, what are the reasons they could not be renewed prior to their expiration?*

Renewal applications are due no earlier than 18 months and no later than 6 months prior to permit expiration. Almost all applicants elect to submit their renewal applications on or near the 6 month deadline. There is a required 30 day public comment period and a 45 day EPA review period associated with the renewal of the permit. Allowing a couple of weeks turnaround time for preparation and mailing of draft and proposed permits, this means that the renewed permit must be written within 90 days of application submittal including negotiation of periodic and compliance assurance monitoring, and a response to comments, if necessary. Each permit often also requires the addition of new MACT requirements, inclusion of new permits or waivers issued recently, and must be updated to include the latest general permit language. We don't believe it's too surprising that most permits expire before they can be renewed.

D. *Have unresolved violations created any delay in issuing Title V renewals?*

Yes. We have delayed the issuance of renewals if compliance plans in the previous operating permit have not been resolved; this generally has involved the issuance of a Chapter 6, Section 2 permit or modification. We have also delayed renewals when violations result in significant changes to emission control systems and associated Chapter 6, Section 2 permit or modifications are in process.

E. *Have permittees requested a hold in renewal for any reason?*

Yes. When the issuance of a Chapter 6, Section 2 permit is imminent (on or nearing public notice) and that action will result in significant changes in applicable requirements for existing equipment OR make the source either minor or a synthetic minor, we have delayed work on the permit renewal.

F. *CAM*

1. *Are CAM plan requirements slowing the renewal process?*

In some cases.

a. *If so, what is it about CAM that's problematic?*

There are some sources that do not "fit" well into CAM – typically, ESP-controlled particulate sources where the materials being handled vary in composition. Trying to find an operating parameter that correlates with actual measured particulate during stack tests has been very difficult in some cases.

2. *Where CAM plans have been inadequate, what have been the main types of inadequacies that have caused difficulties or delays in permit issuance?*

   CAM plans sometimes contain inadequate data or information to assure proper parameter monitoring selection, plans have data which does not support proposed parameter ranges, and plans can be overly complicated to address unlikely or unusual circumstances.

3. *What difficulties have you had in getting better plans to be submitted?*

   Often, it takes time (sometimes including additional stack testing) to develop a new CAM plan if the original submittal is found lacking.

4. *Have you had to supplement the CAM technical guidance document (TGD) with state-issued guidance?*

   Yes.

5. *Is CAM training adequate?*

   Several people attended early training courses for CAM, including the APTI televised course in August of 2002. As we are beginning our third-round permit renewals, most facilities have had CAM in place for several years at this point. Our remaining issues are at facilities where CAM doesn't fit well, and I doubt any federal training would help – these situations are too individualized.

6. *Are CAM applicability determinations resource-intensive or difficult?*

   Not since the initial determinations.

G. *What improvements does the State believe it has made to the management of the Title V permit program, since the second round program review, that could be described as best practices and could be of interest to other States?*

   We are continuing to refine our permitting process to make it as straightforward as possible for sources to prepare operating permit applications. We also continuously review our permit organization and writing standards to make permits "user friendly" for inspectors and permittees. In the future we hope to allow for electronic submittal of applications and support documentation, but we are only in the very preliminary stages of this effort.

H. *What improvements does the state plan to make, if any, in the management of the Title V permit program within the next five years?*

   Development of mechanisms for electronic submissions of reports, emission inventories, and permit applications.

1. *Does the state have a set period of time for planning cycles?*

   No, unless there is a budget impact – in which case, the state is on a biennium budget cycle from July to June (2 years).

III. Public Participation

A. *What forms of news media do you use to maximize public participation, for implementation of 40 CFR 70.7(h)?*

WDEQ uses the county or local newspaper(s) as appropriate to reach the largest audience possible where the sources are located to notify the public of permit actions. WDEQ generally does not use a State-wide publication for the public notification process because it is neither cost effective nor has the maximum effect of reaching the local community in which the sources operate. The average cost of publishing a standard public notice in one of the counties' or local newspapers is approximately $200 per publication and the overall price ranges from $75 to $450 across the State. Also, the Division maintains an operating permit website which includes information on draft permits on public notice and at EPA for review.

1. *How is the form of media chosen?*

The combination of local newspapers and WDEQ website best meet the needs of our citizens based on our assessment of the types of media they typically use.

2. *How do you believe public participation should be improved?*

We believe the mechanisms we use to give the public opportunity for participation are appropriate.

B. *Do you have a mailing list for Title V public participation for implementation of 40 CFR 70.7(h)(1)? If so, please provide it.*

Attached.

C. *Is there a policy which outlines the response to comments procedure or process, such as which comments are responded to, the time-frame for responding, how the permitting authority will respond, to whom, etc.?*

1. *If written, can you provide a copy? If not written, could you describe the policy?*

We do not have a written policy regarding the response to comments. We do respond to all written comments. The comments are addressed to the person or group making the comments. All comments are addressed as expeditiously as possible to provide for timely issuance of the permit.

IV. Petitions

A. *Since the second round program review, to what extent have Title V petitions:*

1. *Changed how permits are written;*
2. *Resulted in re-openings of other permits;*
3. *Resulted in an amended permitting process, to address any issues settled through petitions granted in full or in part?*

There have been no changes in the way permits are written, and no re-openings as the result of a petition process. The only Title V petition since the first round program review was withdrawn.

V. EPA Relationship

A. Is there any EPA policy, on Title V, that is causing problems or confusion?

***NOTE:** Answer may or may not be the same as I.E.2.*

We are unaware of any problems or confusion.

B. Has the state developed any tools, strategies, or best practices that have assisted in the inclusion of MACT subparts in Title V permits?

We prepare MACT condition templates for every MACT standard that affects multiple facilities in the state, for each permit writer to use as a starting point in preparing conditions for an individual facility.

C. Is the issue of startup-shutdown-malfunction (SSM) emissions causing problems or confusion in Title V permit writing?

Rarely.

1. Has the state developed any tools, strategies, or best practices that have alleviated problems or confusion if either exist?

N/A

D. Do you have any unaddressed training needs? What can EPA do to help?

At this point in the process, worthwhile training for permit writing could focus on preparing enforceable permit language (both for NSR and Title V) and wading through new MACT standards, including how the General Provisions and individual standards intersect so that we can write clear "road maps" in our permits regarding monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. This is often incredibly challenging.

Enclosure: Title V Public Notice Mailing List

BRIAN MITCHELL
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
PO BOX 25287
DENVER CO 80225-0287

CHARLIE WARE, ECEC. V.P.
ASSOC. GENERAL CONTRACTORS
PO BOX 965
CHEYENNE WY 82003

GEORGE PARKS
WY ASSOC OF MUNICIPALITIES
315 W 27th Street
CHEYENNE WY 82001

WYO. WILDLIFE FEDERATION
PO BOX 106
CHEYENNE WY 82003

MARION LOOMIS
WYOMING MINING ASSOC.
PO BOX 866
CHEYENNE WY 82003

USDA FOREST SERVICE
MEDICINE BOW NATIONAL FOREST
2468 JACKSON STREET
LARAMIE WY 82070-6535

Bruce Pendery
Wyoming Outdoor Council
444 E 800 N.
Logan, UT 84321-3434

STATE CONSERVATIONIST
USDA-SOIL CONSERVATION
100 E. B ST. ROOM 3124
CASPER WY 82601

POWDER RIVER BASIN
RESOURCES CNCL
934 NORTH MAIN
SHERIDAN WY 82801

TAMARA BLETT
USDA FOREST SERVICES
740 SIMMS STREET
GOLDEN CO 80401-4790

ANN MEBANE
PINEDALE RANGER DISTRICT
PO BOX 220
PINEDALE WY 82941

FOREST SUPERVISOR
BRIDGER TETON NTL FOREST
PO BOX 1888
JACKSON WY 83001

GREATER YELLOWSTONE COALITION
PO BOX 1874
BOZEMAN MT 59771

SIERRA CLUB-WYOMING
45 East Loucks, Suite 109
SHERIDAN WY 82801

DOLLY POTTER
SOLVAY MINERALS
PO BOX 1167
GREEN RIVER WY 82935

PAUL HOWARD
WYO BUSINESS COUNCIL
214 W 15TH STREET
CHEYENNE WY 82002

RICK SCHULLER
BUREAU OF LAND MNGT
PO BOX 1828
CHEYENNE WY 82003

BIGHORN ENVIRONMENTAL
AIR QUALITY LLC
1324 N LIBERTY LAKE RD STE 266
LIBERTY LAKE WA 99019

CHARLES COLLINS
GEMMA POWER SYSTEMS
2461 MAIN STREET
GLASTONBURY CT 06033

JOHN BARTH
BOX 409
HYGIENE CO 80533

DAN HEILIG
WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES
262 LINCOLN STREET
LANDER WY 82520

Attachment 2:
WAQD Responses to EPA's Title V Fee Audit Questionnaire

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
I. Title V Fee Revenue		
Can the Permitting Authority show that sources are being billed in accordance with its fee requirement(s), and that sources are paying fees as required? Yes.	*Where are the fee collection authority and the fee rate(s) specified? Is the Permitting Authority including reference to these fee requirements in its Title V permits?* Wyoming Environmental Quality Act 35-11-211 Fees; WAQSR Chapter 6, Section 3(f) Fees All Title V Permits: Condition G8 Annual Fee Payment *List the fee rate(s) formulae applicable for the time period being reviewed. (Include emission based fees, application fees, hourly processing fees, etc.)* Fees are on a per ton emissions basis, with a minimum of $500 per facility per year and a maximum of 4000 tons billable pollutant (by pollutant). Rates are based on a state fiscal year (July to June): FY09/10 - $28.16/ton FY11/12 - $31/ton *Does the Permitting Authority anticipate any significant changes to its fee structure?* The fee structure is reviewed at the beginning of each biennium to determine any need for change. This process will begin this summer for the FY12/13 biennium. *What is the current status in States/locals with requirements to balance income & expenditures of the Title V program annually (i.e., must rebate any overage of fees, etc.)?* N/A	*Req's/Auth.: State/local Title V program legislation & regulations* *Permit ref's: Permits state has written/ submitted to EPA* *Fee Rate(s): State/local Title V program submittal, and then verify w/ Permitting Authority that info is up-to-date* *Billing/Payments: Permitting Authority records. Emission data may be in AIRS. If some fees are hourly, there should be some direct labor tracking mechanism (see accounting system, below).*

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
1. Title V Fee Revenue - Continued		
	Examine documentation of how the annual fees for sources are determined. Audit several sources' bills for accuracy. • *Are appropriate (actual or potential) emission records used for $/ton based fees? How are the Permitting Authority and its sources determining actual emissions for fee purposes?* See attached example of billing documentation • *Are records kept (and used) for any hourly based fees?* See attached example of billing documentation • *Review similar documentation for other types of fee mechanisms.* *Billing...* • *How is the Permitting Authority notifying sources of the fees owed and due dates for payment?* Bill, emission summary, and review documents are mailed to the permittee. Bill is due upon receipt. • *Discuss how incoming payments are recorded to the appropriate accounts (receivings tracking).* Recorded on receipt. Tracking system is queried until all payments are received. Bills are considered late and require follow-up after 60 days. *Payments...* • *Are the sources paying the total fees charged each year?* Yes.	

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
1. Title V Fee Revenue - Continued		
	• *Are they paying on time?* Generally. • *If there's a collection problem, how is the Permitting Authority addressing it?* Division staff initiates a phone call follow-up if not paid within 60 days. • *Are late fees being assessed? If so, are the late fees being credited to the Title V accounts?* No	
2. Title V Expenditures		
Is the Permitting Authority identifying division of expenses between Title V and non-Title V programs? Yes.	*What matrix is the Permitting Authority using to differentiate Title V activities from non-Title V activities?* All expenditures are evaluated to determine if they are major-source related or not. Employees are given directions to complete timesheets based on the nature of their work. Small business assistance efforts are also charged to OPP. *Direct labor:* • *If used by State/local program, review time sheets and instructions given to employees as to how to code information into the time sheet. If time sheets are not used, investigate method that State/local program uses to differentiate Title V and non-Title V direct labor.* Latest version of timesheet instructions, page one, attached.	*If used by State/local program, sample time sheets and instructions given to employees; equivalent records for alternate direct labor differentiation methods.* *Accounting system records showing that administrative/ clerical personnel costs are accounted for in the Title V program.*

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
2. Title V Expenditures - Continued		
	• *Ensure that accounting system is set up to utilize the various coding information.* Monthly budget report attached. • *Analyze time sheets/instructions (and/or other direct labor differentiation method) for conformance with the matrix of acceptable Title V activities* *Direct non-labor:* • *Does the Permitting Authority utilize an allocation system that separates travel and equipment costs for Title V and non-Title V functions?* Yes. See travel request form. All equipment procurement also requires coding which indicates funding source. • *If so, are the allocations in accordance with the Permitting Authority's Title V/ non-Title V activity separation?* Yes. • *If not, are these included as part of indirect costs? (Direct non-labor needs to be addressed somewhere.)* *Indirect labor & non-labor:* • *How are indirect labor & non-labor costs apportioned between Title V vs. non-Title V accounts? (Indirect costs include parts of secretarial & managerial overhead, paper & supplies, space, utilities, generalized computers, etc., that is not addressed as direct labor/non-labor)* The department negotiates an indirect cost rate agreement with the federal government. The Title V program is not charged indirect costs since the funds are non-federal.	*Accounting system records showing that non-labor costs (travel, equipment, office space costs, etc.) are accounted for in some fashion and a portion is billed to Title V.* *EPA Guidance includes: "Matrix of Title V-Related and Air Grant-Elegible Activities, Information Document," Office of Air & Radiation, May 31, 1994*

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
3. Accounting System (i.e., the system that provides for analysis of the Title V program revenue and expenditure information gathered above)		
Has the Permitting Authority integrated features into its accounting/financial management system which will: • *identify Title V fee revenues separate from other funding?* • *identify Title V expenditures separate from other expenses?* • *produce management reports, periodically and as requested, which the Permitting Authority will be able use to certify as to the disposition of Title V funds?* Yes. See monthly budget report.	*Describe the accounting structure that the Permitting Authority uses to differentiate Title V $ from other funds. [i.e., govt. fund, enterprise fund, etc. -- for more detail on options, see the U of MD report.]* A special revenue fund is used to account for Title V financial activity. In accordance with GASB 54, the significant revenue stream is considered committed. *Does the accounting system have separate categorization for Title V and non-Title V funding and expenses?* Yes. *If yes, are these features being used to track Title V monies separate from non-Title V monies?* Yes. *If no, does the Permitting Authority keep any separate records that identify Title V monies separate from non-Title V monies? Could such information potentially be integrated into an accounting/financial management system?* N/A	*Review sample reports/specific reports for the time period being reviewed.* *For background: Overview of CLEAN AIR Title V Financial Management and Reporting. A Handbook for Financial Officers and Program Managers, Environmental Finance Center, Maryland Sea Grant College, University of Maryland, 0112 Skinner Hall, College Park, MD 20742, January 1997, [Publication Number UM-SG-CEPP-97-02]*

Basic Questions for All Permitting Authorities	More Detailed Questions -- Factors to Support a Permitting Authority's Answer to the Basic Questions (Note: these are not all-inclusive, and some ideas will not apply in all cases)	Possible Resources Available
4. Separation of Title V from §105 grant and grant match funding		
Can the Permitting Authority confirm that the Title V fees collected from sources are used to pay for the entire Title V program, and that no Title V fees are used as match to the CAA section 105 Air Program grant? Yes.	*Determine the federal §105 grant award received, and the amount of state/local funds used during the time period being reviewed.* For the current biennium (July 2010 to June 2012), the 105 grant award is estimated to be $1,559,426 (please note this does not correspond to the federal fiscal year). The total amount of funding from the state general fund for the same period is $4,369,612. The total amount of permit fees (NSR plus Title V) authorized by the legislature for AQD to collect is $11,631,780. Of that, $8,762,211 is Title V fees. *Determine the Title V fees collected (and Title V funds available, if carryover of Title V fees is allowed by state/local regulations) during the time period being reviewed.* Total fees collected to date during the current biennium are $768,895. Bills for the 2010 calendar year are just starting to be sent out. *Determine Title V expenditures during the time period being reviewed.* Actual expenditures to date (July 2010 to March 2011) are $3,016,780. *Ensure that adequate non-Title V state/local funds were available to provide required match to the federal grant.* See answer to the first question above. *Ensure that sufficient Title V funds were available to pay for the Title V program (i.e.--Title V program is self supporting)* Has not been a problem.	*Grant files -- FSR's for applicable years. (See appropriate EPA Region grant & project manager staff)* *Permitting Authority accounting system reports showing revenue and expenditure summaries for Title V, grant, and other activities*

Attachments to Wyoming Title V Program Fiscal Tracking Questionnaire (April 2011)

Billing Documentation Example

Timesheet Instructions

Monthly Budget Report Example

Travel Request Form

Billing Documentation Example

Department of Environmental Quality

To protect, conserve and enhance the qu environment for the benefit of current and

Matthew H. Mead, Governor

3/2011

Example of Title V Fee invoice

April 4, 2011

Steven Lee
Environmental Manager-Western
Jonah Gas Gathering Company
c/o Environment Department
P.O. Box 4324
Houston, TX 77210

CERTIFIED MAIL

RE: OPERATING PERMIT PROGRAM EMISSIONS FEE, 2010 INVOICE

Facility Name	**-- Falcon Compressor Station**
Permit File ID	**-- 3-0-211**
Facility ID	**-- WY03500018**
Amount Due	**-- $ 8,634.40**

Dear Mr. Lee:

In accordance with Chapter 6 (f)(v)(G) of the Wyoming Air Quality Standards & Regulations and pursuant to Wyoming Statute 35-11-211, the Division has calculated emission fees due based on the 2010 emission inventory submitted by the company and other information available to the Division for the referenced facility. The worksheets on which the fee calculation is based are included as an attachment. This billing is intended to represent a final assessment of fees due for 2010 operations, however, the Division, at its option, reserves the right to modify the assessment to correct errors or omissions based on new information not available at the time of this billing, if such information surfaces. Adjustments to assessed emission fees for 2010 due to newly developed emission factors and/or emissions unit stack tests occurring after this fee assessment will not be allowed. Such refinements and improvements in emissions data may be utilized, on approval of the Division, in subsequent emission inventories. The assessed fee for 2010 operations is due upon receipt of this notice.

Please submit payment to the Wyoming Air Quality Division, Operating Permits Program, 122 West 25th Street, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002, and make check payable to the **Wyoming Air Quality Division.** Please include reference on your check to the **Facility name and Permit File ID number** referenced above to insure proper accounting of your payment.

If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Dietrich
Administrator
Air Quality Division

SD/js

Title V Fee

Invoice #: 3-0-211-2010
Date: April 04, 2011

To: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

From: Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality
Air Quality Division

Facility: Falcon Compressor Station

Facility NIF ID: 2344

Facility Address: Section36, T30N, R108W
Sublette County, WY 82941

County: Sublette

Annual

Start Date: 01-Jan-2010 End Date: 31-Dec-2010

Code	Pollutant Description	Actual	Payable	Fee Rate	Fee
		[tons]	[tons]	[$/ton]	[$]
NOX	NITROGEN OXIDES	167.70	167.70	$29.58	$4,960.57
VOC	VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS	124.20	124.20	$29.58	$3,673.84

Annual Fee: **8,634.40**

Total Fee Due: **$8,634.40**

On July 1, 2010 the Title V emission fee increased from $28.16 per ton to $31 per ton. As a result, emissions occurring from January 1 through June 30, 2010 are billed at $28.16 per ton, and emissions occurring from July 1 through December 31, 2010 at $31 per ton. Your emission inventory submission indicated that the Division should charge half the 2010 emissions at $28.16 per ton and half at $31 per ton. For ease of processing, we have charged your full year of emissions at $29.58/ton (the average of the two fees) as shown above; this results in the same final fee as breaking up your billable emissions into two halves and charging the separate fees to each half.

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
TITLE V EMISSION FEES FOR CALENDAR YEAR

2010

JONAH GAS GATHERING COMPANY, FALCON COMPRESSOR STATION

ATT: Terry Hurlburt, Senior Vice President, Operations
Enterprise Products Operating L.P.
P.O. Box 4324
Houston, TX 77210-4324

POLLUTANT	ACTUAL EMISSIONS (TPY)	FEE EMISSIONS (TPY)
Particulate Matter (PM)	0.0	0.0
Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)	167.7	167.7
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	66.6	NO FEE FOR CO
Volatile Organics (VOC)	124.2	124.2
Sulfur Dioxide (SO2)	0.0	0.0
F-Aldehyde	9.0	0.0
HAPs	1.8	0.0
	0.0	0.0

Total Tons of Fee Emissions: 291.9

COMMENTS

Formaldehyde and HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes. Calculation method for engines E4, E5, E6, G5, and G6 are based on tested lb/hr values. These engines were tested in 2010 for formaldehyde per section 63.6610 of the RICE MACT.

REVIEWING ENGINEER: _____ DATE: 3/18/11

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
ANNUAL EMISSIONS SUMMARY - TONS PER YEAR

JONAH GAS GATHERING COMPANY
FALCON COMPRESSOR STATION

YEAR	PM-10	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	OTHER POLLUTANTS	
2001		0.8	4.5	2.4			
2002		29.1	16.3	9.4			
Increased emissions are due to the addition of sources.							
2003		58.6	27.6	74.2			
Increased emissions due to new sources and increased operating hours.							
2004		86.8	67.1	98.4		F-Aldehyde: 10.9	
VOC emissions from catalytically controlled engines were calculated from estimates provided in Permit MD-1104. Formaldehyde emissions from catalytically controlled engines were calculated from tested emissions when available, otherwise were calculated from estimates provided in Permit MD-1004. The increase in emissions was due to the addition of sources.							
2005		93.3	47.7	117.5		F-Aldehyde: 1.7	HAPs: 2.2
Formaldehyde emissions were lower than 2004 emissions because tested values for the engines were used instead of estimates. CO emissions also dropped due to lower tested values and the retirement of generator engine G4. NOx and VOC emissions increased from last year due to the addition of new sources (E6, G5, & G6). Formaldehyde and other HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes.							
2006		152.7	61.6	115.7		F-Aldehyde: 15.6	HAPs: .4
NOx, CO, and formaldehyde emissions increased due to the use of allowable values instead of tested values on compressor engines. The Condensate Storage Tanks (Source 08) emissions were included last year. The tanks are controlled via the Smokeless Combustion Unit (Source 22), which is why the HAP emissions dropped. Formaldehyde emissions are included in VOC emissions for fee purposes. Fee emissions for the first half of 2006 - 134.2 tons Fee emissions for the second half of 2006 - 134.2 tons							
2007		142.5	58.4	107.9		F-Aldehyde: 15	HAPs: 1.8
Formaldehyde and HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes.							
2008		164.1	65.5	122.8		F-Aldehyde: 17.5	HAPs: 1.8
Formaldehyde and HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes. Increased emissions due to increased compressor engine operating hours.							
2009		165.0	64.4	118.9		F-Aldehyde: 10.2	HAPs: 1.8
Formaldehyde and HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes. Decrease in Formaldehyde emissions due to a change in calculation method from estimated to tested for engines E4, E5, E6, G5, and G6. These engines were tested in 2009 for formaldehyde per section 63.6610 of the RICE MACT.							
2010		167.7	66.6	124.2		F-Aldehyde: 9	HAPs: 1.8
Formaldehyde and HAP emissions are included with the VOC emissions for fee purposes. Calculation method for engines E4, E5, E6, G5, and G6 are based on tested lb/hr values. These engines were tested in 2010 for formaldehyde per section 63.6610 of the RICE MACT.							
MAXIMUM		167.7	67.1	124.2			

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

8 (08) 4 Condensate Storage Tanks - 400 BBL (T1-T4)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2001 Opacity:
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: storage
Controlled By: Smokeless Combustion Chamber % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput:
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

Source Comments
Tanks are controlled by a smokeless combustion chamber

EI Notes

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	HAP	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		0.3	1.4	0.6		0.1	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004		MD-1004	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method							
2010 Emissions in Tons							
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

10 (09) Truck Loading (TL1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2002 Opacity:
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: VOC FUGITIVES
Controlled By: % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput: 90,000 BBL
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

Source Comments

EI Notes

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				1			
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation				MD-815			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method				VX			
2010 Emissions in Tons				3.3			
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

11 (10) Fugitive Emissions (FU1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2002 Opacity:
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: VOC FUGITIVES
Controlled By: % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput:
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	HAPS	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				1		0.1	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation				MD-1104		MD-1104	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method				VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons				4.4		0.4	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments

EI Notes

12 (11) Pneumatic Equipment (P1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2002 Opacity:
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: VOC FUGITIVES
Controlled By: % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput:
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				0.3			
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation				MD-815			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method				VE			
2010 Emissions in Tons				1.3			
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

14 (13) Caterpillar G3406TA (VRU)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2002 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 10/18/2005 | Capacity: 245 HP - ?
Source Type: RECIP. ENGINE
Controlled By: NSCR w/Air:Fuel Controller | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft | Stack Diam: ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		0.5	1.1				
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				0.5		0.03	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		0.43	0.66				
Basis		1.0 g/hp-hr	2.0 g/hp-hr	1.0 g/hp-hr		0.06 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-815	MD-815			MD-1189	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons		1.5	3.3	1.5		0.1	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments

EI Notes

15 (14) Hot Oil Heater (H-1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2002 | Opacity:
Latest Test: | Capacity: 3.8 MMBTU/HR
Source Type: HEATER
Controlled By: | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft | Stack Diam: ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		0.4	0.3	0.02			
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NE	CE	VE			
2010 Emissions in Tons		1.8	1.3	0.1			
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

16 (15) Fuel Gas Heater (H2)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2000 | Opacity:
Latest Test: | Capacity: 0.25 MMBTU/HR
Source Type: HEATER
Controlled By: NONE | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft | Stack Diam: ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted] BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	[redacted]
Oil:	[redacted]	M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		0.02	0.02				
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation							
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NE	CE				
2010 Emissions in Tons		0.1	0.1				
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments

EI Notes

18 (17) 400 bbl Produced Water Tank (T5)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2004 | Opacity:
Latest Test: | Capacity: 400 BARRELS
Source Type: TANK
Controlled By: | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft | Stack Diam: ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted] BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	[redacted]
Oil:	[redacted]	M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)							
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation							
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method							
2010 Emissions in Tons							
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Emissions are insignificant from this source.

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

19 (18) Emergency Flare (FL1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2004 Opacity:
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: FLARE
Controlled By: % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput:
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

Source Comments

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2		
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		0.1	0.1	0.1			
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NE	CE	VE			
2010 Emissions in Tons		0.4	0.4	0.4			
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

EI Notes

23 (22) Combustion Chamber (CU-1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME Effective Date: 2005 Opacity: 0
Latest Test: Capacity:
Source Type: FLARE
Controlled By: Flare % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft Stack Diam: ft Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: 8760 Throughput:
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:		MMSCF	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons	BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons	BTU/Gal	
			BTU/	

Source Comments

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	HAPS	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)							
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		0.3	1.4	0.6		0.31	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)							
Basis							
Regulation		MD-1186	MD-1186	MD-1186		MD-1186	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NE	CE	VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons		1.3	6.1	2.6		1.4	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM
2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

2 (E1) Caterpillar 3612LE Compressor Engine (E1)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2001 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 1/24/2005 | Capacity: 3668 HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP. ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2				
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		3.6	1.35			0.023	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr	0.25 g/hp-hr			0.08 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons		24.5	8.6	17.2		2.8	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments: Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.

EI Notes:

3 (E2) Caterpillar 3612LE Compressor Engine (E2)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2001 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 2/21/2005 | Capacity: 3668 HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP. ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2				
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		3.8	0.55			0.045	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr	0.3 g/hp-hr			0.08 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons		24.0	8.4	16.9		2.7	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments: Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.

EI Notes:

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

5 (E3) Caterpillar 3612LE Compressor Engine (E3)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2001 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 2/22/2005 | Capacity: 3668 | HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP. ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content		Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal	
				BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2				
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		4	0.9	4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		3.65	0.46			0.15	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr	0.3 g/hp-hr			0.08 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OE	
2010 Emissions in Tons		24.5	8.6	17.2		2.8	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.
Tested 2.5 lb/hr NOx, and 1.3 lb/hr CO in 2002. Serial No. prior to 2004 testing was 1YO00231,

EI Notes

6 (E4) Caterpillar 3612LE Compressor Engine (E4)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2001 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 3/30/2006 | Capacity: 3668 | HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP. ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted] | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu): [redacted]

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content		Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal	
				BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2				
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)		4	0.9	4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		1.46	1.37			0.042	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr	0.3 g/hp-hr			0.08 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004			
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OT	
2010 Emissions in Tons		23.8	8.4	16.7		0.2	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.
New engine started 12/7/05 subject to RICE MACT.

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

17 (E5) Caterpillar G3612LE (E5)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2004 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 2/24/2005 | Capacity: 3668 | HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP, ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content		Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal	
				BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2			0.65	
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		3.92	0.5			0.058	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr		0.5 g/hp-hr			
Regulation		MD-1004	MD-1004	MD-1004		MD-1004	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OT	
2010 Emissions in Tons		24.2	8.5	17.0		0.2	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.
Catalyst operating parameters during 3/8/07 test; inlet temp - 795 deg F, pressure drop - 1.8 in. H2O.

EI Notes

20 (E6) Caterpillar G3612LE (E6)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2004 | Opacity:
Latest Test: 12/21/2005 | Capacity: 3668 | HP - SITE
Source Type: RECIP, ENGINE
Controlled By: lean burn/oxydation catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 46 ft | Stack Diam: 2.5 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 24,050 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content		Sulfur (%)
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF	
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB	
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal	
				BTU/	

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F-ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		5.7	2			0.65	
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				4		0.65	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		3.59	1.31			0.026	
Basis		0.7 g/hp-hr		0.5 g/hp-hr			
Regulation		MD-1104	MD-1104	MD-1104		MD-1104	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OT	
2010 Emissions in Tons		24.0	8.4	16.8		0.1	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.
3/7/07 test - Catalyst inlet temp - 779 °F, ΔP - 2.5 in H2O.

EI Notes

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
AIR QUALITY DIVISION
EMISSION INVENTORY REPORT FORM

2010 - Jonah Gas Gathering Company - Falcon Compressor Station

21 (G5) Caterpillar G3516B (G5)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2004 | Opacity: 0
Latest Test: 5/12/2005 | Capacity: 1800 HP - ?
Source Type: RECIP, ENGINE
Controlled By: Lean Burn w/Oxidation Catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: 38 ft | Stack Diam: 1.33 ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: 9,022 ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

Sulfur (%): [redacted]

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F_ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		4	1			0.28	
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				2		0.28	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		2.82	0.16			0.02	
Basis		1.0 g/hp-hr	-			0.07 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1104	MD-1104	MD-1104		MD-1104	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OT	
2010 Emissions in Tons		8.0	2.0	4.0		0.0	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
Stack location in UTM (NAD27) Feet - Northing, Easting.
ΔP - 4.5 in. H2O, Catalyst inlet temperature - 926°F - 10/20/05
S/N from November 2010 site visit.

EI Notes

22 (G6) Caterpillar G3516B (G6)

GENERAL SOURCE INFORMATION

Status: FULL-TIME | Effective Date: 2005 | Opacity: 0
Latest Test: 12/20/2005 | Capacity: 1800 HP - ?
Source Type: RECIP, ENGINE
Controlled By: Lean Burn w/Oxidation Catalyst | % Eff.:

STACK PARAMETERS

Stack Ht: ft | Stack Diam: ft | Stack Temp.: F
Exhaust Rate: ACFM

OPERATING PARAMETERS

Operating Hours: [redacted] | Throughput: [redacted]
NOx CEM (lb/MMBtu): | SO2 CEM (lb/MMBtu):

OPERATING FUELS (If Applicable)

Fuel	Quantity	Units	Heat Content	
Natural Gas:	[redacted]	MMSCF	[redacted]	BTU/SCF
Coal:		Tons		BTU/LB
Oil:		M Gallons		BTU/Gal
				BTU/

Sulfur (%): [redacted]

POLLUTANT EMISSIONS

	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2	F_ALDEHYDE	
Emission Limits (lb/hr)		4	1			0.28	
Estimated Emissions (lb/hr)				2		0.28	
Tested Emissions (lb/hr)		2.45	0.47			0.023	
Basis		1.0 g/hp-hr	-			0.07 g/hp-hr	
Regulation		MD-1186	MD-1186	MD-1186		MD-1186	
lb/MMBtu							
Calculation Method		NA	CA	VE		OT	
2010 Emissions in Tons		9.6	2.4	4.8		0.1	
Allowed Particulate - Tons							

Source Comments
3/6/07 test - Catalyst inlet temp 961 °F, ΔP - 5.8 in. H2O.
Test reports listed serial # as ZBC00123 - check it out.

EI Notes

CRITERIA POLLUTANT:	Fee PART	PART	NOx	CO	VOC	SO2
Total Emissions - 2010:			167.7	66.6	124.2	

REPORT PREPARED BY:

Stack Test Results for Calendar Year 2010

Please list the year 2010 tested values below according to the source. List only the Reference Method tested value averaged over the required number of test runs. If there was more than one test in the year, please list each individual test plus the average for the year. Use pph (pounds/hour) rates.

Tested Values for calendar year 2010
Emission rate in pounds per hour (lb/hr)

Source	Date	PM-10	NOx	CO	SO2	VOC	Other
E-4	3/23/10						0.042 formaldehyde
E-5	3/23/10						0.058 formaldehyde
E-6	3/23/10						0.026 formaldehyde
G-5	3/25/10						0.020 formaldehyde
G-6	3/24/10						0.023 formaldehyde

FORM A
STATE OF WYOMING
ANNUAL EMISSION INVENTORY
HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS
Calendar Year 2010

Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Air Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Please complete an "EMISSION SOURCE FORM" for **each** process or combustion source which emits any chemicals identified in the attached list.

Company Name: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

Facility Name: Falcon Compression Station

Unit Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutant(s): FU-1 - Facility Fugitives

CAS Number	Chemical Name	Actual Amount lbs/yr	Estimation Method
110543	n-Hexane	1,920	F
71432	Benzene	580	F
108883	Toluene	820	F
100414	Ethylbenzene	20	F
1330207	Xylene	380	F
Total HAP Emissions from this Unit:		3,720	

FORM A
STATE OF WYOMING
ANNUAL EMISSION INVENTORY
HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS
Calendar Year 2010

Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Air Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Please complete an "EMISSION SOURCE FORM" for each process or combustion source which emits any chemicals identified in the attached list.

Company Name: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

Facility Name: Falcon Compression Station

Unit Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutant(s): E1 Caterpillar G3612LE

CAS Number	Chemical Name	Actual Amount lbs/yr	Estimation Method
50000	Formaldehyde	5,540	B
110543	n-Hexane	240	B
71432	Benzene	100	B
108883	Toluene	80	B
1330207	Xylene	40	B
Total HAP Emissions from this Unit:		6,000	

FORM A
STATE OF WYOMING
ANNUAL EMISSION INVENTORY
HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS
Calendar Year 2010

Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Air Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Please complete an "EMISSION SOURCE FORM" for each process or combustion source which emits any chemicals identified in the attached list.

Company Name: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

Facility Name: Falcon Compression Station

Unit Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutant(s): E-2 Caterpillar G3612LE

CAS Number	Chemical Name	Actual Amount lbs/yr	Estimation Method
50000	Formaldehyde	5,460	B
110543	n-Hexane	220	B
71432	Benzene	80	B
108883	Toluene	80	B
1330207	Xylene	40	B
Total HAP Emissions from this Unit:		5,880	

FORM A
STATE OF WYOMING
ANNUAL EMISSION INVENTORY
HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS
Calendar Year 2010

Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Air Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Please complete an "EMISSION SOURCE FORM" for <u>each</u> process or combustion source which emits any chemicals identified in the attached list.

Company Name: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

Facility Name: Falcon Compression Station

Unit Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutant(s): E-3 Caterpillar G3612LE

CAS Number	Chemical Name	Actual Amount lbs/yr	Estimation Method
50000	Formaldehyde	5,560	B
110543	n-Hexane	240	B
71432	Benzene	100	B
108883	Toluene	80	B
1330207	Xylene	40	B
Total HAP Emissions from this Unit:		6,020	

FORM A
STATE OF WYOMING
ANNUAL EMISSION INVENTORY
HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS
Calendar Year 2010

Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Air Quality
122 West 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Please complete an "EMISSION SOURCE FORM" for **each** process or combustion source which emits any chemicals identified in the attached list.

Company Name: Jonah Gas Gathering Company

Facility Name: Falcon Compression Station

Unit Emitting Hazardous Air Pollutant(s): E-5 Caterpillar G3612LE

CAS Number	Chemical Name	Actual Amount lbs/yr	Estimation Method
50000	Formaldehyde	620	B
110543	n-Hexane	220	B
71432	Benzene	100	B
108883	Toluene	80	B
1330207	Xylene	40	B
Total HAP Emissions from this Unit:		1,060	

Timesheet Instructions

TO: Air Quality Division Staff

FROM: Dave Finley

DATE: January 25, 2008

Subject: Timecode Instructions

This is to give guidance on how we should charge our time to specific AQD budgets. With the funding provided by the Southwest Wyoming operator's agreement and the footnote placed in the supplemental budget, it is important that we carefully track how we spend our time through time sheet submittals. Draft guidance was prepared a year ago; this is to provide final more detailed instructions.

The Southwest Wyoming Air Quality Management Project Agreement is "to establish a funding mechanism to support certain of WDEQ's air quality monitoring, modeling, compliance monitoring and other activities related to oil and gas air quality permitting in Southwest Wyoming." Through the agreement, DEQ and some of the operators in Southwest Wyoming are jointly funding activities over 5 years beginning in 2006. Most of DEQ's share of the joint funding agreement was anticipated to be in the form of staff time, therefore it is very important that we track all the time we spend on oil and gas issues in this geographical area. The area is bordered on the south and west by our state border; on the north primarily by the northern borders of Lincoln and Sublette counties; and on the east by a vertical line intersecting Point of Rocks up to the Shoshone National Forest. This includes all of Lincoln, Sublette, and Uinta counties and a portion of Sweetwater county, as well as a corner of Fremont county.

The footnote in the budget states: "Fees raised under the Title V operating permit program shall only be used to administer the Title V program and shall not be used for normal air quality operating activities or monitoring unless that monitoring is necessary to administer the Title V program." The Title V program applies to facilities that are "major sources".

There are five "function codes" that apply to work done in the Division, that link directly to our budget:

OPP This is for work related to major sources in the state, and is funded through fees charged to operating permittees.

NSR This is for work related to the preparation of new source permits and waivers, and is funded through fees charged to NSR permit/waiver applicants.

103 This is for efforts related to ambient monitoring of $PM_{2.5}$, and is funded by EPA grants. We anticipate that this grant will be expiring in March 2008.

105 This is for other air quality program work not covered by the other function codes. It is funded through a combination of EPA grants and general funds allocated by the state legislature.

JIO This is a special fund put in place through the Jonah Infill record of decision, that funds Jennifer Frazier's position as well as some special projects.

It is important that the appropriate function codes are used for charging your time. Additionally, we use "section codes" to internally (within AQD) track and manage how we spend our time. On your time sheets, the function code is followed by the section code – so, for example, preparing the operating permit for Wyoming Refining would be coded OPP-PAR. The following section codes are now in use, with a description to assist in determining when to use each code (Note: This is a ***change*** from previous coding guidance):

Monthly Budget Report Example

Estimate for 11-12 Biennium
March 31, 2011

Program	Total Available			Total Estimated Expenditures			Total Surplus/Deficit		
	General	Federal	Other	General	Federal	Other	General	Federal	Other
Operating Permit Program	0	0	8,762,211	0	0	8,812,856	0	0	-50,645
New Source Review Program	0	0	2,869,569	0	0	2,681,962	0	0	187,607
Air Quality Section 105	3,455,742	1,559,426	0	1,731,176	2,778,511	0	1,724,566	-1,219,086	0
PM2.5	0	188,278	0	0	413,132	0	0	-224,854	0
Not Used	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Monitoring	913,870	0	40,000	538,881	0	0	374,989	0	40,000
Not Used	0	0	0	0	0	299,819	0	0	-299,819
Total Air Quality	**4,369,612**	**1,747,704**	**11,671,780**	**2,270,057**	**3,191,643**	**11,794,637**	**2,099,555**	**-1,443,939**	**-122,857**

Estimate for 11-12 Biennium
March 31, 2011

Program	Total	100 Personnel	200 Recur Equip/Travel/Supplies	200 Non-Rec	300 Indirect	400 Telecom	500 Space	600 Interagency	900 Recur Contractural	900 Non-Rec
Operating Permit Program	8,812,856	6,381,558	326,352	150,349	0	92,069	0	153,852	15,059	1,693,617
New Source Review Program	2,681,962	2,351,511	168,552	79,727	0	22,206	0	0	1,104	58,863
Air Quality Section 105	4,630,852	3,273,465	153,295	68,235	[redacted]	21,963	24,861	0	1,637	809,343
PM2.5	413,132	196,689	17,833	6,197	29,023	0	0	0	0	163,390
SWW Air Quality Monitoring	358,810	38,324	0	13,600	0	0	0	150,240	0	156,646
Special Monitoring	538,881	0	0	56,000	0	0	0	0	0	482,881
Not Used	299,819	266,864	25,262	2,361	0	4,228	0	0	1,104	0
Total Air Quality	**17,736,312**	**12,508,411**	**691,294**	**376,469**	**307,075**	**140,466**	**24,861**	**304,092**	**18,904**	**3,364,741**

Travel Request Form

A&I-25 Rev. 11/02

STATE OF WYOMING

Travel Request

Must be completed prior to the commencement of travel when required by State Accounting Policies & Procedures and State Statutes, and attached to the WOLFS-104, Travel Expense Voucher.

DEQ-AQD
Agency / Division

CODING
BFY Fund Agy Org Appr Proj

Permission is hereby requested for _____ traveler, _____ title to

travel from _____ point of origin to _____ destination on these dates: _____ departure date to _____ return date for _____ purpose of trip.

Reimbursement Method
___ Actual lodging plus M&IE
___ Actual lodging plus actual meals

Mode of Transportation		
___ State Auto	___ Personal Vehicle	___ Rental Vehicle
___ State Airplane	___ Commercial Airplane	___ Other: _____

Constructed or Interrupted Travel (check when applicable)

___ **This trip includes Constructed Travel** - personal days will be taken ***before*** and/or ***after*** necessary business travel dates.
List constructed travel dates & times: _____

___ **This trip includes Interrupted Travel** - personal days will be taken ***between*** necessary beginning and ending travel dates.
List interrupted travel dates & times: _____

Estimated Travel Expenditures

Airfare	
Other transportation	
Lodging *	
M&IE	
Actual meals	
Registration fees	
Other (explain below)	
Total	$0.00

Previous Out-of-State Travel (optional agency use)

* Check here if lodging rate exceeds "maximum lodging rate" ____

Additional comments: _____

___ Approved ___ Disapproved	___ Approved ___ Disapproved
Supervisor / Manager signature (optional) Date	Director / Designee signature (required) Date
Governor's Approval for International Travel	___ Approved ___ Disapproved
Governor's signature (required for international travel)	Date

Attachment 3:
File Review Checklist

Title V Program Evaluation

Title V Document Reviews

February 27, 2003

Table of Contents

What To Look For in Applications

Do original and renewal applications in general:

Y ❑ N ❑ 1. List the non-exempt insignificant emissions units (IEUs), information necessary to determine applicability of, or to impose, any applicable requirement, or to evaluate the fee amount?

2. Contain the following emissions-related information:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. All emissions of pollutants for which the source is major, and all emissions of regulated air pollutants and additional information related to the emissions of air pollutants sufficient to verify which requirements are applicable to the source, and other information necessary to collect any permit fees?

Y ❑ N ❑ b. Identification and description of all points of emissions in sufficient detail to establish the basis for fees and applicability?

Y ❑ N ❑ c. Identification and description of air pollution control equipment and compliance monitoring devices or activities?

3. Contain the following air pollution control requirements:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. Citation and description of all applicable requirements?

Y ❑ N ❑ b. Description of or reference to any applicable test method for determining compliance with each applicable requirement?

Y ❑ N ❑ 4. Include an explanation of any proposed exemptions from otherwise applicable requirements?

5. Contain a compliance plan that contains all the following:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. A description of the compliance status of the source with respect to all applicable requirements?

b. A description as follows:

Y ❑ N ❑ i. For applicable requirements with which the source is in compliance, a statement that the source will continue to comply with such requirements?

Y ❑ N ❑ ii. For applicable requirements that will become effective during the permit term, a statement that the source will meet such requirements on a timely basis?

Y ❑ N ❑ iii. For requirements for which the source is not in compliance at the time of permit issuance, a narrative description of how the source will achieve compliance with such requirements?

c. A compliance schedule as follows:

Y ❑ N ❑ i. A schedule of compliance for sources that are not in compliance with all applicable requirements at the time of permit issuance? Such a schedule shall include a schedule of remedial measures, including an enforceable sequence of actions with milestones, leading to compliance with any applicable requirements for which the source will be in noncompliance at the time of permit issuance.

Y ❑ N ❑ ii. A compliance schedule that resembles and is at least as stringent as that contained in any judicial consent decree or administrative order to which the source is subject.

Y ❑ N ❑ d. A schedule for submission of certified progress reports no less frequently than every 6 months for sources required to have a schedule of compliance to remedy a violation?

6. Include a requirement for compliance certification that contains:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. A certification of compliance with all applicable requirements by a responsible official?

Y ❑ N ❑ b. A statement of methods used for determining compliance, including a description of monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements and test methods?

Y ❑ N ❑ c. A statement indicating the source's compliance status with any applicable enhanced monitoring and compliance certification requirements of the Act?

What To Look For In Permits

Y ❑ N ❑ 7. **General permits only** - Are the eligibility criteria clear? Attach.

Y ❑ N ❑ 8. Are all the emission units at the sources addressed in the permit or, if multiple permits are issued, are all the emission units addressed through all the permits that apply to the source? (Note: for nonmajor sources, the T5 permit(s) need only include the emissions units that cause the source to be subject to the part 70 program.)

Y ❑ N ❑ 9. Are all applicable requirements included in the permit or, if multiple permits are issued to one source, are all the applicable requirements addressed through all the permits that apply to that source? (Note: for nonmajor sources, the T5 permit need only include "all applicable requirements applicable to emissions units that cause the source to be subject to the part 70 program") (Identify any missing requirements.)

a. **General permits only** - Are there sources that are authorized to operate under a general permit that have source specific requirements not included in the general permit (or in another permit, if multiple permits are issued) (e.g., NSR permit terms; compliance schedules).

Y ❑ N ❑ b. Are all SIP requirements applicable to the sources included in the permit?

Y ❑ N ❑ c. If the applicable MACT or NSPS includes multiple emission limits (e.g., depending on fuel type), compliance options, monitoring, recordkeeping, or reporting requirements, or other decision trees, does the permit specify the method(s) used for determining the compliance status of the source, currently and over the reporting period consistent with required monitoring?

Y ❑ N ❑ d. Does the permit clearly specify the method(s) used for determining the compliance status of the source, currently and over the reporting period consistent with required monitoring?

Y ❑ N ❑ 10. Does the permit describe the origin and authority of each term and condition?

11. Are the following standard terms and conditions included in the permit (or, if multiple permits are issued, are these terms and conditions included as applicable to the source overall):

Y ❑ N ❑ **Severability clause (§70.6(a)(5)):** If any part of this permit is declared invalid, the remainder of this permit shall remain in effect and enforceable

Y ❑ N ❑ **Duty to comply (§70.6(a)(6)(i)):** The permittee must comply with all conditions of the part 70 permit. Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Act and is grounds for enforcement action; for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or for denial of a permit renewal application

Y ❑ N ❑ **Need to halt or reduce activity not a defense (§70.6(a)(6)(ii))**. It shall not be a defense for a permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this permit

Y ❑ N ❑ **Modification, revocation, etc for cause (§70.6(a)(6)(iii)).** The permit may be modified,

revoked, reopened, and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the permittee for a permit modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or of a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit condition

Y ❑ N ❑ **No property rights (§70.6(a)(6)(iv))**. The permit does not convey any property rights of any sort, or any exclusive privilege

Y ❑ N ❑ **Duty to provide information (§70.6(a)(6)(v))**. The permittee shall furnish to the permitting authority, within a reasonable time, any information that the permitting authority may request in writing to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating the permit or to determine compliance with the permit. Upon request, the permittee shall also furnish to the permitting authority copies of records required to be kept by the permit or, for information claimed to be confidential, the permittee may furnish such records directly to the Administrator along with a claim of confidentiality

Y ❑ N ❑ **Inspection and entry (§70.6(c)(2))**. Upon presentation of credentials and other documents as may be required by law, the permittee shall allow the permitting authority or an authorized representative to perform the following:

(i) Enter upon the permittee's premises where a part 70 source is located or emissions-related activity is conducted, or where records must be kept under the conditions of the permit;

(ii) Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of the permit;

(iii) Inspect at reasonable times any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and air pollution control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under the permit; and

(iv) As authorized by the Act, sample or monitor at reasonable times substances or parameters for the purpose of assuring compliance with the permit or applicable requirements.

Y ❑ N ❑ **Payment of Fees (§70.6(a)(7))**. The source must pay fees to the permitting authority consistent with the approved fee schedule

Y ❑ N ❑ **Changes provided for in permit (§70.6(a)(8))**. No permit revision shall be required, under any approved economic incentives, marketable permits, emissions trading and other similar programs or processes for changes that are provided for in the permit

Y ❑ N ❑ **Certification of all documents and reports (§70.5(d) and 70.6(c)(1))**. Any application form, report, or compliance certification submitted pursuant to these regulations shall contain certification by a responsible official of truth, accuracy, and completeness. This certification and any other certification required under this part shall state that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

Y ❑ N ❑ **Compliance certification (§70.6(c)(5))**. A schedule for submission of compliance certifications to the permitting authority and EPA during the permit term, to be submitted no less frequently than annually, or more frequently if specified by the underlying applicable requirement or by the permitting authority . Compliance certifications shall include:

(I) The identification of each term or condition of the permit that is the basis of the certification;

(ii) The compliance status;

(iii) Whether compliance was continuous or intermittent;

(iv) The method(s) used for determining the compliance status of the source, currently and over the reporting period consistent with required monitoring; and

(v) Such other facts as the permitting authority may require to determine the compliance status of the source;

(Note: depending on the PA's approved certification rule, a different compliance certification may be appropriate.)

Y ❑ N ❑ **Permit term (§70.6(a)(2))**. Does the permit expire at the end of 5 years, or does it expire upon renewal?

Note: Permit term of up to 5 years for most sources; fixed term of 5 years for acid rain sources; up to 12 years (with a 5 year review) allowed for solid waste incineration units combusting municipal waste subject to §129(e) standards.

Y ❑ N ❑ **Federally-enforceable requirements (§70.6(b))**. All terms and conditions of this permit, including any provisions designed to limit potential to emit, are enforceable by EPA and citizens under the Clean Air Act unless they are specifically designated as not federally enforceable .

Note: Terms and conditions must be designated as not federally enforceable (i.e. "state only") if they are not required under the Clean Air Act or under any of its implementing regulations.

Y ❑ N ❑ **Permit shield (§70.6(f))**.[1]
(a) Compliance with permit conditions shall be deemed compliance with [identification of applicable requirements included in and specifically identified in the permit] as of the date of permit issuance.

(b) The following requirements have been determined not to apply to the permittee as of the date of permit issuance for the reasons specified [permit must include the reasons for the determination of inapplicability or a concise summary thereof].

(c) Nothing in this permit shall alter or affect the following (optional):
(i) The provisions of section 303 of the Act (emergency orders), including the authority of the Administrator under that section;

(ii) The liability of an owner or operator of a source for any violation of applicable requirements prior to or at the time of permit issuance;

---

[1]Not all states require a permit to contain the permit shield. Changes under the following provisions are not entitled to the shield: operational flexibility changed under § 70.3(b)(12)(i) and (ii); off permit changes under § 70.3(b)(14); certain administrative amendments under § 70.7(d); and minor permit modifications under § 70.6(e) (including group processing).

(iii) The applicable requirements of the acid rain program, consistent with section 408(a) of the Act; or

(iv) The ability of EPA to obtain information from a source pursuant to section 114 of the Act.

Y ❑ N ❑ **Reopenings for Cause (§70.7(f))**. The permit shall be reopened and revised under any of the following circumstances :
(i) Additional applicable requirements under the Act become applicable to the permittee with a remaining permit term of 3 or more years.[2] Reopening shall be completed not later than 18 months after promulgation of the applicable requirement. No reopening is required if effective date of the requirement is later than the date of permit expiration, unless the original permit or any of its terms and conditions has been administratively extended.

(ii) Additional requirements (including excess emissions requirements) become applicable to an affected source under the acid rain program. Upon approval by the Administrator, excess emissions offset plans shall be deemed to be incorporated into the permit.

(iii) The permitting authority or EPA determines the permit contains a material mistake or that inaccurate statements were made in establishing the emissions standards or other permit terms or conditions.

(iv) The Administrator or permitting authority determines that the permit must be revised or revoked to assure compliance with applicable requirements.

(v) [Other circumstances identified in the permit as cause for reopening the permit occur prior to expiration of the permit.]

Y ❑ N ❑ 12. Does the permit contain all monitoring required by applicable requirements?

Y ❑ N ❑ 13. Does the permit have sufficient monitoring (i.e., monitoring added through periodic monitoring or 70.6(c)(1) authority) to assure compliance with all applicable requirements as required by the Act[3]?

Y ❑ N ❑ 14. Does CAM apply to any emissions units at this source? If yes does the monitoring in the permit meet CAM requirements including:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. indicator(s) to be monitored;

Y ❑ N ❑ b. the means or device to be used to measure the indicators;

---

[2]Reopening is required in such a case only for major sources.

[3] The term "monitoring sufficient to assure compliance" means adequate monitoring required by the underlying standard, CAM, periodic monitoring under 70.6(a)(3)(i)(B), sufficiency monitoring under 70.6(c)(1), or if no additional monitoring is required, a justification in the statement of basis that no additional monitoring is appropriate.

Y ❑ N ❑ c. performance requirements;

Y ❑ N ❑ d. means by which an exceedance or excursion is defined;

Y ❑ N ❑ e. obligation to conduct the monitoring and fulfill the other obligations specified in §§ 64.7 through 64.9;

Y ❑ N ❑ f. if appropriate, a minimum data availability requirement for valid data collection for each averaging period and, if appropriate, a minimum data availability requirements for the averaging periods in a reporting period;

Y ❑ N ❑ g. if the monitoring requires installation, testing or final verification of operational status, is there an enforceable schedule with milestones consistent with § 64.4(e); and

Y ❑ N ❑ h. is CAM plan not just attached to the permit? [Note: answer yes to this question if the permit correctly includes monitoring based on the CAM plan and no if the permit simply incorporates the CAM plan itself.]

Y ❑ N ❑ 15. Does the permit contain adequate record keeping requirements, such as:

Y ❑ N ❑ a. the date, place as defined in the permit, and time of sampling or measurements for all monitoring;

Y ❑ N ❑ b. the date(s) analyses were performed;

Y ❑ N ❑ c. the company or entity that performed the analyses;

Y ❑ N ❑ d. the analytical techniques or methods used;

Y ❑ N ❑ e. the results of such analyses; and

Y ❑ N ❑ f. the operating conditions as existing at the time of sampling or measurement?

Y ❑ N ❑ 16. Does the permit require the retention of records of all required monitoring data and support information for a period of at least 5 years from the date of the monitoring sample, measurement, report, or application?

Y ❑ N ❑ 17. Does the permit specify a specific time frame for completing the corrective action?

Y ❑ N ❑ 18. Does the permit specify a specific time by which any new monitoring must be operational?

Y ❑ N ❑ 19. Is credible evidence buster language included in the permit?

Y ❑ N ❑ 20. Does the permit allow the source to violate an emission limit for some amount of time before it is a violation? For example, does the permit say it is not a violation to exceed a limit less than 5% of the time.

Y ❑ N ❑ 21. Are monitoring plans and records for this permit accessible to the public?

Y ❑ N ❑ 22. Did the permit go out to public notice?

Y ❑ N ❑ 23. Were the affected State(s) (if any) notified of this permit?

What To Look For In the Statement of Basis

Y ❑ N ❑ 24. Does the permit's Statement of Basis justify how the monitoring in the permit will assure compliance including a justification if no additional monitoring was required?

Attachment 4:
May 26, 2011 Letter from Carl Daly, Air Program Director, US EPA Region 8 to Steven A. Dietrich, AQD Administrator, WDEQ
Re: EPA Information Concerning Source Determinations for Oil and Gas Sources

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
DENVER, CO 80202-1129
Phone 800-227-8917
http://www.epa.gov/region08

May 26, 2011

Ref: 8P-AR

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Steven A. Dietrich, Administrator
Air Quality Division
Wyoming Dept. of Environmental Quality
122W. 25th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Re: EPA Information Concerning Source Determinations for Oil and Gas Sources

Dear Mr. Dietrich:

We are sending this letter to the Region 8 State Air Programs in order to address questions regarding permitting activity in the oil and gas sector, specifically relating to source determinations. We are providing the enclosed documents and Internet links to assist you in making source determinations under PSD and Title V.

- The September 22, 2009, Memorandum from Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, entitled, *Withdrawal of Source Determination for Oil and Gas Industries* (McCarthy memo). The McCarthy Memo states that "[p]ermitting authorities should rely foremost on the three regulatory criteria for identifying emissions activities that belong to the same "building," "structure," "facility," or "installation." These are: (1) whether the activities are under the control of the same person (or person under common control); (2) whether the activities are located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties; and (3) whether the activities belong to the same industrial grouping."
- The Administrator's February 2, 2011 Order responding to a Title V petition submitted by WildEarth Guardians regarding a permit the State of Colorado issued to the Anadarko Petroleum Corporation's Frederick Compressor Station. (http://www.epa.gov/region7/air/title5/petitiondb/petitions/anadarko_response2010.pdf)
- EPA Region 5 and 8's source determinations, issued pursuant to the Federal Operating Permits Program (i.e., Summit Petroleum Corporation's operations in Mount Pleasant, Michigan

(http://www.epa.gov/region7/air/title5/t5memos/singler5.pdf[1]) and BP America Production Company's Florida River Compression Station in La Plata County, Colorado (http://www.epa.gov/region8/air/permitting/TitleV.html[2])).

As noted in the McCarthy Memo, "case-by-case source determinations represent highly fact specific decisions, and while informative of the necessary analytical process, no single determination can serve as an adequate justification for how to treat any other source determination for pollutant-emitting activities with different fact-specific circumstances." However, the enclosed documents provide recent examples regarding information and analyses that you might find useful in making PSD and title V source determinations in the oil and gas sector. We note that the McCarthy memo "direct[s] permitting authorities to the three criteria for making source determinations specified in the NSR regulations," and highlights the importance of "reasoned decision-making" to justify source determination decisions. Consistent with the McCarthy memo, the Region plans to "continue to review and comment on source determinations to assure that permitting authorities conduct fully-reasoned source determinations that remain consistent with existing regulatory requirements and historical permitting practice." Additionally, consistent with the Administrator's February 7, 2008 Order responding to WildEarth Guardians initial Title V petition regarding the Frederick Compressor Station permit (*In the Matter of Kerr-McGee, LLC, Frederick Gathering Station,* Petition-VIII-2007 (February 7, 2008)), permitting authorities have a "responsibility to respond to significant comments" in the record, including those concerning source determinations.

In the event you have questions regarding source determinations under PSD and Title V or any of the enclosed documents, please contact me at 303-312-6416.

Sincerely,

Carl Daly, Director
Air Program

Enclosures

---

[1] Region 5's determination was appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (*see Summit Petroleum Corp. v. EPA*, Consolidated Case Nos. 09-4348 and 10-4572).

[2] Region 8's permit was appealed to EPA's Environmental Appeals Board (EAB) (*see In re BP America Production Company, Florida River Compression Facility* Appeal No. CAA 10-04). Information can be found at:
http://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/EAB_Web_Docket.nsf/f22b4b245fab46c6852570e6004df1bd/3b51ece0beeff5cc852577e0006f8961!OpenDocument